

***Fieldwork Experiences Related
to the Longitudinal Study of
the Demographic Responses
to a Changing Environment
in Nang Rong, 1994***



***Editors: Aphichat Chamrathirong
Chanya Sethaput***

***Institute for Population and Social Research
Mahidol University
August 1997***

**FIELDWORK EXPERIENCES RELATED TO THE
LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC
RESPONSES TO A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT
IN NANG RONG, 1994**

Editors : Aphichat Chamrathirong and Chanya Sethaput

Institute for Population and Social Research
Mahidol University
August 1997

IPSR Publication No. 216
ISBN 974-589-179-7

Fieldwork Experiences related to the Longitudinal Study of the Demographic Responses to a Changing Environment in Nang Rong, 1994

Editors : Aphichat Chamrathirong
Chanya Sethaput

IPSR Publication No. 216
ISBN 974-589-179-7

Copyright 1997 by the Institute for Population and Social Research,
Mahidol University
All rights reserved
500 copies

Catalogue in Publication Data

Fieldwork experiences related to the longitudinal study of the demographic responses to a changing environment in Nang Rong.
1994/editors Aphichat Chamrathirong, Chanya Sethaput

(Mahidol University. Institute for Population and Social Research
Publication; no. 216)
ISBN 974-588-179-7

1. Sociology--Surveys--Thailand 2. Demography--Fieldwork--Thailand 3. Longitudinal method 4. Interviewing in Sociology
I. Aphichat Chamrathirong, ed. II. Chanya Sethaput; ed. III. Series

HB 850.T5 F457 1997

Published by :

The Institute for Population and Social Research,
Mahidol University,
Salaya, Phuthamonthon, Nakhon Pathom 73170, Thailand
Tel: (662) 441-0201-4 ext. 115, 441-9666 Fax: (662) 441-9333
E-mail: prvtt@mahidol.ac.th
WWW Homepage : <http://www.mahidol.ac.th/mahidol/pr/pr.html>

**Fieldwork Experiences related to the Longitudinal Study of
the Demographic Responses to a Changing Environment in
Nang Rong, 1994**

Editors : Aphichat Chamrathirong and Chanya Sethaput

Contributors : Introduction by Chanya Sethaput

Fieldwork Design by Chanya Sethaput
and Aphichat Chamrathirong

Data Collection of the
Community Profile by Thirapong Santiphop

Data Collection of the
Old and New Households by Aree Jampaklay

Migrant Follow-up Study by Kanchana Tangchonlatip

Summary and Conclusion by Aphichat Chamrathirong

Institute for Population and Social Research
Mahidol University
August 1997

Forward

The Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University has, among other things, a long history of experience in demographic survey data collection, at the individual household village and community level. Surveys based on panel, tracing and longitudinal designs have been implemented during the past ten to twenty years. Documenting these fieldwork experience is however, still limited, except in the case of qualitative research which have been documented by the Institute in the form of textbooks of qualitative studies.

In order to contribute to the advancement of quantitative research methodology in demography, this publication of Fieldwork Experiences related to the 'Longitudinal Study on the Demographic Responses to A Changing Environment in Nang Rong, 1994' is presented. An earlier version was first presented by the five contributors at The Social Network Workshop, Carolina Population Center, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill during May 28 - June 3, 1997. Feedback from the workshop helped considerably in the revision of this version and was greatly appreciated by the five contributors and IPSR. It is hoped that publication of the fieldwork experience will help not only those who want to use the data of the "Nang Rong Project" but also those who want to understand and/or to conduct demographic and social surveys of this nature. The data collection design can be a valuable example for further development of research methodology in the future.

We would like to thank Professor Ronald Rindfuss and Professor Barbara Entwistle and their colleagues at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for their great collaboration on our project on 'The Demographic Responses to a Changing Environment in Nang Rong, 1994'. Much of their fieldwork documentation, recommendations and notes were very helpful in the preparation of this publication.

Aphichat Chamrathirong
Chanya Sethaput

Editors

Contents

	Page	
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
	1.1 Background	1
	1.2 The rich data source	2
	1.3 Ideal natural laboratory	3
Chapter 2	Fieldwork Design	5
	2.1 Data collection components	5
	2.1.1 A community profile	5
	2.1.2 A household census in all 1984 project and non-project villages	5
	2.1.3 A follow-up of migrants	6
	2.2 Organization of fieldwork	6
	2.3 Pretesting the questionnaires	7
	2.4 Recruitment and training of assistant supervisors	8
	2.5 Recruitment and training of interviewers	9
	2.6 Community preparation for fieldwork	11
Chapter 3	Data Collection of Community Profile	13
	3.1 Introduction	13
	3.2 Data topics	14
	3.3 Reasons for collecting the data	16
	3.4 Methods of collecting the data	16
	3.5 Problems of data collecting	18
	3.6 Lessons learned	20
Chapter 4	Data Collection of Old and New Households	23
	4.1 Introduction	23
	4.2 General background to the data collection	23
	4.3 Methods of collecting the data	24
	4.3.1 Questionnaires and forms required in the fieldwork	24
	4.3.1.1 Blue booklet questionnaire	24

	Page
4.3.1.2 Green booklet questionnaire	25
4.3.1.3 Form A (Form A-1, Form A-2)	25
4.3.1.4 Form H	25
4.3.1.5 Form M	26
4.3.1.6 "Code 2" tracking form	26
4.3.2 Set of identifiers	27
4.3.2.1 CEP number of CEP code	27
4.3.2.2 Ban Lek Ti	28
4.3.2.3 Village number	31
4.3.2.4 Province number	31
4.3.3 Procedure of interview	31
4.3.3.1 For old household	32
4.3.3.2 For new household	34
4.4 Problems found and problems solving	34
4.4.1 Complicated questionnaire and several kinds of forms	34
4.4.2 Quitting of interviewers during fieldwork	35
4.4.3 Following the rules	37
4.5 Cautions of data use	38
4.6 Lessons learned	39
4.6.1 Supervisors should continue from 1984 survey data	39
4.6.2 Migrant follow-up interviewers should be same team of household interviewers	39
4.6.3 Consent form is not necessary to sign in Thailand	40
4.6.4 Source of information	40
4.7 Atmosphere of interview	41
4.7.1 Place of interview	41
4.7.2 Presenting of persons other than household member	41
Chapter 5 Migrant Follow-up Study	43
5.1 Introduction	43
5.2 Studied migrants	44
5.3 Migrants' list from Form M	45
5.4 Fieldwork preparation	46

	Page
5.4.1 Questionnaire	46
5.4.2 Team formed	47
5.4.3 Documents needed in the field	48
5.4.4 Training procedures	49
5.4.5 Gift for the studied migrants	50
5.5 Fieldwork	50
5.6 Coding and data entry	51
5.7 Problems encountered during the fieldwork	52
5.7.1 Address of the migrants	52
5.7.2 The migrants	53
5.7.3 Migrant's employer	54
5.7.4 Inconvenient surroundings during the interview	56
5.7.4.1 The pollution	56
5.7.4.2 The danger	56
5.7.4.3 Drunk migrants	57
5.8 Some interesting notices from the follow-up teams	57
Chapter 6 Summary and Conclusion	59
6.1 Summary	59
6.1.1 The community profile	60
6.1.2 The household census	61
6.1.3 The migrant follow-up study	61
6.2 Conclusion	62

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Chanya Sethaput

1.1 Background

The project on Demographic Responses to A Changing Environment in Nang Rong, 1994 has been collaboratively initiated by the Institute for Population and Social Research (IPRS), Mahidol University at Salaya and Carolina Population Center (CPC), the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The Collaboration is based on the fact that IPSR has the data bank of communities and households in Nang Rong, Buriram in 1984. The main objective of the 1984 data collection was to produce baseline information for the CBIRD (Community-based Integrated Rural Development Project) Evaluation Project which was called among IPSR staff as CEP. At the end of CBIRD Project in 1988, IPSR had measured changes and impact of CBIRD Project on economic, environment and health development.

Data collection for CEP was such a big task. Very few research projects in Thailand have ever done this before. For the baseline study in 1984, it covered household census in which all households in 40 project (or experimental) villages and 10 non-project (or controlled) villages were interviewed by using a one-page

questionnaire, called Form A. Other data collection were two sample surveys, one was survey on socio-economic aspects of household (Form B), another was health and family planning practices of household members (Form B2). The fourth source of data was a community profile study in which information on 50 project and non-project villages were collected by a community level questionnaire module (Form C). This was done through group interview of key persons and participatory observation within the village settings. The fifth data collection involved the health survey of children under 5 years old in selected villages. Other periodical anthropological studies on special topics were also done during the period 1984-1988.

1.2 The rich data source

It is not exaggerated that CEP data have a very rich source of data on communities and households of Nang Rong. The household census in 1984 enumerated approximately 4,725 households with 26,154 persons in 40 project villages and 1,145 household with 6,401 persons in 10 non-project villages. Household data, collected from the head of the household or his/her spouse or one adult member of the household, were divided into 3 parts. Part one was data on all of the household members who were currently present in terms of their relationship to the head of household, sex, age, education, occupation (primary and secondary), marital status and contraceptive practice. Part two collected data

on each member who was temporarily absent from the household for a period of one month to one year prior to the census date. In addition to information in Part one, information on previous and present occupations, reason for moving, present place of residence, the intention to move back and remittance were collected. Part three consisted of housing characteristics such as type of living quarters, source of water for drinking, land uses, type of cooking, fuel for lighting, toilet facility, possession of durable household appliances, agriculture land tenure, number of livestock, type of economic activities, membership in economic, social and security groupings and the perception on household improvement.

The community profile acquired data at village level on number of households, total population by sex, communication, transportation, education, source of water, occupation, job training, cultivation, animal raising, agricultural technology, agricultural market, source of fund for agriculture, electricity, social institutions, health status and facilities, and community development.

1.3 Ideal natural laboratory

Both 1984 baseline data set from household census and community profile have been taken into consideration by IPSR and CPC for further longitudinal study. With all these data, Nang Rong district is an ideal natural laboratory to examine demographic responses to dramatic social change. During

the past ten years the poor northeasterners of Thailand have been targeted to upgrade their livings. The governments have tried to build up infrastructures such as highways, roads between communities, health centers, schools etc. for them. People in Nang Rong villages can migrate overnight to Bangkok and vice versa. There are many research questions and topics needed to be understood regarding the situation in Nang Rong which changed drastically from the past to present (1984-1994).

CHAPTER 2

FIELDWORK DESIGN

Chanya Sethaput

Aphichat Chamrathirong

2.1 Data collection components

There are three main components in 1994 CEP-CPC data collection :

2.1.1. A community profile. At this time in 1994 community data collection was conducted in every village in Nang Rong district including the villages that used to be in Nang Rong district in 1984, but now were split and annexed with Chumni district and Non Suwan district. Altogether there were 310 villages for this survey.

2.1.2. A household census. It was collected in all 1984 project and non-project villages. Number of census villages increased from 50 in 1984 to 76 in 1994 because some villages were larger so they were split for administrative purpose by the Ministry of Interior. All 76 villages became project village in 1994. The other 234 villages are non project ones instead.

2.1.3. A follow-up of migrants. This was done after the first two surveys were accomplished. The list of 2,371 migrants in 32 project villages were followed up and, 1,779 migrants were successfully interviewed.

2.2 Organization of fieldwork

Because 1994 data collection was such a big job that required many people to take part in fieldwork. For planning and management, there was a field director (who was one of project co-investigators) four supervisors (two were IPSR researchers, the other two used to be 1984 assistant supervisor and former supervisor in the national migration survey the year before) were overall responsible for supervising the data collection in villages, and solving various problems arising during fieldwork. Definitely, one supervisor took care of two teams of community data collection, the other three took turn to visit surveyed villages and census teams. Seven assistants supervisors (all had bachelor's degree) stayed in villagers' house with interviewers. Each assistant supervisor assigned her interviewers to interview every household in the surveyed village, and edited the questionnaires during her stay in the village. Each assistant supervisor had 4 interviewers under her control so there were 28 interviewers at the beginning of fieldwork. The interviewer was responsible for interviewing the head of household or an adult (senior enough) person in household. He or she

had to check the completeness of questionnaire before submitting to his/her assistant supervisor.

During the fieldwork, a newly-built townhouse in downtown Nang Rong was rented to be the headquarter of the fieldwork. All supervisors, community data collectors and drivers stayed in rented houses while assistant supervisors and household interviewers stayed in villages. Everyone in the fieldwork agreed that stay in villages was much better because it was not as hot and noisy as in downtown. Unfortunately, the headquarter of the fieldwork was located in the back of a karaoke bar.

2.3 Pretesting the questionnaires

Pretesting of household questionnaires and community profile were conducted during 21-25 October 1993. Before pretesting, the research team has to made a list of the head household's names and household administrative addresses. Comparing with a list of household from the village in 1984 it was found that some village had grown up, that is why some of them were split later on. Pretesting which was done by IPSR personnels was useful because the research team could identify the unclear and complicated questions. At the same time they were able to list names and places of destination of migrants in pretested households.

In this fieldwork, duration of interviewing was not a concerned issue, since all interviewers had stayed in the village, so they could have enough time to interview again and again if their questionnaires were not completed.

2.4 Recruitment and training of assistant supervisors

Recruitment and training of assistant supervisors were done two times for two groups. The first group of assistant supervisors were female graduates who used to be interviewers in former IPSR projects and they were proved of capacity. However they were trained to collect data both in Bangkok and Nang Rong during 7-14 February 1994. There was two recruitments of assistant supervisors because some applicants were not qualified and some who had no experience in interviewing quitted after training in Nang Rong. They confessed that the fieldwork was too difficult for them and Nang Rong was a hot place. The second training was held during 19-22 March 1994. The assistant supervisors were oriented to learn about the history of the project, its objectives and to understand both household questionnaires and community profile and make clear fieldwork forms. Most of assistant supervisors were graduates from the teachers' colleges near Bangkok, so they had to learn to get familiar with Nang Rong dialects.

The weakpoints of assistant supervisors were as follow :

2.4.1) They had learned about questionnaires before interviewers had only in a very short time. The second group of assistant supervisor just learned about a week before interviewers' training so they needed to be helped by supervisor team. However, in Thailand they seemed to be more senior than the interviewers.

2.4.2) They were not either native of Buriram Province or the Northeast. At the first month, they could not catch every word while the Nang Rong villagers were talking to them. Eventually they had conflict with interviewers during the fieldwork, because they were so strict with the rule and probably because of cultural gap.

2.5 Recruitment and training of interviewers

Experiences from the former CEP fieldworks indicated that using native interviewers was better because in Nang Rong there were at least three speaking dialect groups - Thai Korat, Lao and Khmer. At this time, IPSR asked a lecturer of Buriram Teachers' College in Buriram Province who was alumni of IPSR to recruit good students to be interviewers. We needed about 34 interviewers but we

asked her to recruit about 50 new graduates and we would pay every trainee during training though some of them would be dismissed afterward.

The training was held during 28 March - 3 April 1994. The first five days was done in the auditorium of Buriram Teachers' College. The trainees were told about the purpose of the project, the value of the project, their salaries, their responsibilities, the working schedules, and the very detail of questionnaires. In addition, the trainees were informed about how the interviewers should behave while they were working in the village, e.g. they should participate in the household chores (such as fetching water for the house they stayed. These going-to-be interviewers were also informed about the consent form required by the funding agency. The interviewers needed to read the consent form in front of a respondents who could not read and asked he/she to sign. If the respondent could not sign or he/she did not want to sign, the interviewer could sign it for the respondent.

On the first day, the trainees had seen that there were a lot of questionnaires in many forms and they were very complicated. So some trainees disappeared the next day. However, the wage of fieldwork was relatively high for Buriram students and they wanted to earn some money while they were waiting for their permanent job as government school teachers. Finally, there were enough interviewers to do our fieldwork, though there was not much choice.

During the last two days of training, 36 trainees were taken to a village to do the real thing. Makham Prong was chosen as trained village because it was close to Nang Rong and easier to commute from and to Buriram Province. On the first day interviewers did one interview and returned to have it checked by their supervisor (either a supervisor or an assistant supervisor). The interview averaged about an hour to an hour and a half. While the interviewers were interviewing, supervisors and assistant supervisors observed the interview process. Overall the interviews and training was satisfied by supervisors.

2.6 Community preparation for fieldwork

Again experience from fieldwork told us that sending letters to the village headmen to ask for permission was often done in vain because the postmen did not go to villages regularly. Therefore, before fieldwork begun the field director went to join the monthly meetings of Nang Rong, Non Suwan and Chamni districts to ask for fieldwork cooperation. This strategy was worthwhile because not only three District Officers (Nai Amphoe) acknowledge the fieldwork but also all kamnuns (heads of sub district) and phu-yai-ban (heads of village) were informed formally. In the district meeting the field director explained about the project and asked them to allow for collection of household and community data. The field director also asked them to arrange housing in the village for

fieldwork team. The project would pay the house owner for accommodation in each village.

Practically before moving to stay in each village, one supervisor would inform the village headman in advance and confirm about accommodation in his village. In every village, the fieldwork team composed of one assistant supervisor and four interviewers were warmly welcome and will taken care by the villagers. For one thing, it was because all interviewers were Northeasterners or Buriram natives, so they were treated like children of the villagers.

CHAPTER 3

DATA COLLECTION OF COMMUNITY PROFILE

Thirapong Santiphop

3.1 Introduction

The Community data is important for this project not only because the interviewers need to know about the village before the household data fieldwork would start but also for village analysis. There are 310 community profiles (76 project villages, 158 non - project villages in Nang Rong, 38 non - project villages in Non Suwan and 38 non - project villages in Chamni) that interviewers would conduct their fieldwork. The community data is necessary for study of context of the village network which does not only tie villages within the district but also villages in other districts and in other provinces.

The collection of data on the community profile is the key to information on villages in Nang Rong, Non Suwan and Chamni districts. Especially both supervisors and interviewers can be introduced quickly to the community and the villagers.

Information on 76 project villages (53 project villages in Nang Rong, 5 project villages in Non Suwan and 18 project villages in Chamni district) as well as the remaining villages in old Nang Rong district were collected before

household survey fieldwork started. CEP-CPC project collected two important informations that could be provided for the household interview. These are the list of rice mills and the name of the most active group in the village and the list of Ban Lek Ti (address number) include the list name of head household (Form H). For the list of rice mills and the most active group are not only coded in terms of the list of names but they are also numbered in the questionnaire.

3.2 Data topics

For interviews through community questionnaire, the data covered twelve sections. These sections are:

Section 1 : Q1 - Q10 :	General information
Section 2 : Q11 - Q35 :	Information on communication
Section 3 : Q36 - Q49 :	Education
Section 4 : Q50 - Q68 :	Water sources
Section 5 : Q69 - Q86 :	Occupations
Section 6 : Q87 - Q95 :	Agricultural technology
Section 7 : Q96 - Q101:	Agricultural products and marketing of agricultural products
Section 8 : Q102 - Q105:	Electricity

Section 9 : Q106 - Q109:	Communication
Section 10: Q110 - Q123:	Social institutions
Section 11: Q124 - Q144:	Health care and health services
Section 12: Q145 - Q155:	Land use

General informations are about the road and bus. Education is divided into two groups, elementary and secondary school. Water sources cover water for general use, water for agriculture and drinking water. Occupations cover labour, employment, wage and migration. Agricultural technology is consisted of informations on rice mill, tractor, fertilizer and insecticide. Agricultural products and marketing of agricultural products are about products and marketing. Rank of agriculture products is also available. Electricity and telephone are also included. Communication sections are about the television, broadcasting tower and newspaper stand. Social institutions cover three sets of information on village's temple network, dialect in the village and group committee. Health care and health services include health center, service unit and contraceptive method. Land use, the last section of community questionnaire covers information on the type of land use and land value.

3.3 Reasons for collecting the data

The reason for community profiles is to compare the changing social and environmental conditions in Nang Rong between 1984 and 1994. Compared to the 52 project villages in 1984 when IPSR did first data collection, in 1994 Nang Rong district did not only change in population size but also the administrative units. Both of Non Suwan and Chamni Sub-districts were new districts that split from Nang Rong District between 1984 and 1994.

The most important reason is to help in the study of the social network especially the networks that tie villages in all districts and provinces. As a result, the community profiles of 310 villages were conducted by supervisors and interviewers. This would provide sufficiently for social network study.

3.4 Methods of collecting the data

For the community profiles, the data were collected by group interviewing. The interviewer asked information from a group of key informants of about 8-10 persons both males and females in each village. A group of informants were usually consisted of :

- a village headman
- elderly persons
- a housewife
- an assistant to village headman
- others such as a subdistrict doctor, a village cluster chairman and a village health volunteer

Data collected by group interview method, allows for cross discussion when interviewers cannot remember everything by themselves. Interviewer could repeat any question if she/he felt that she/he need correct information. It took about one and a half hours, in general, for conducting the community profile in one village.

A village headman's house was a good place for conducting group interview. Other places such as the school temple or village center hall were also good.

CEP-CPC teams did the pretest of the community questionnaire in two villages, Makham Prong and Khok Sripattana. The interview had taken two and a half hours in Makham Prong and two hours in Khok Sripattana. The research

team revised the community questionnaire after they conducted the pretest of these two villages.

During the early stage of data collection, there were two teams for community profile fieldwork in 76 project villages. Each team is consisted of three fieldworkers (one supervisor and two interviewers) per team. After the group interview, the interviewer would draw the village map. The map showed location of rice mills and other informations of the village. Data collection of 76 project village was completed within twenty-two days.

On the second stage of the fieldwork, there was only one team (one supervisor and six interviewers) conducting the community profiles of 234 non-project villages. About forty days of fieldwork was used. For all non-project villages, the village map was not required.

3.5 Problems of data collecting

There are six problems in the field as follow :

3.5.1. "Wording" in the questions and responses. The exact wording of a question is important. The supervisors and interviewers wanted to consider wording as a constant one. Following the questionnaire is best. But the interview became difficult. For example, the question on "Did this village ever depend on

other village ?" was a skeptical. If a small village was split from a larger village, then the interviewees were likely to report it. But if a bigger village split from a small village, they were not likely to report that they used to depend on another village. The informants might forget the information on this because this has occurred many years ago.

3.5.2. Lack of opportunity to clarify meanings. In spite of the desire to clarify wording rigidity, "wording" used in questions and answer sometimes hampered successful communication. This was because specific words are interpreted differently by various interviewers and interviewees.

3.5.3. Lack of opportunity for encouraging for cooperation. When using an interview schedule, the interviewers made first direct contact with prospective informants and tried to encourage them to cooperate with the research project. Some of them had no time for this because they had to work in the field everyday especially the village head man are quite busy because of their various assignments from various government agencies. They let the interviewers take their time because Mahidol University is one of government institutions. The village headmen are also busy if their village have many activities.

3.5.4. The difficulty for people to answer the questions. The informants were not sure in answering such questions as "percentage" of migrants that return

to live in village permanently, "percentage" of cultivation area, "percentage" of household plantation, or the questions about "when was a mobile health unit ever visited this village ?" It was hard for the informants to answer because according to the concept of the villagers. They assumed that the answer should be precise and they did not know the precise number. The interviewers tried to tell them that it could be estimated answers.

3.5.5. For a "new" village headman, he could not answer any question without his assistant's help. The interviewee could not answer some questions particularly about previous village status and village committee information because he had been working as a committee for a short time only.

3.5.6 Although everything went well according to the plan but the team traveled about fifty kilometers to work each day because they had to stay in downtown Nang Rong. Traveling was another problem making some interviewers were too tired to work.

3.6 Lessons learned

3.6.1. The size of group interview is important for data collection of community profiles because the interviewers can control everything including the flow in informations, the reliability of information and time of interview. If the

size of group interview is appropriate according to plan of team work, that is good for group interview. The composition of group interview should be both males and females. A group interview of 7-8 persons should be optimum size for data collection of community profile.

3.6.2. During training, the interviewers had learned several fieldwork techniques from supervisors. Starting with general research objectives to all about the interview schedules. Training procedure for interviewers was very important and should cover all about method of interviews and questionnaire format in detail.

3.6.3. The questionnaire pretesting was found to be very important for revising questionnaire to be better than old version. Although the interviewers had experience with questioning the pretest could make them even more capable as a fieldwork expert in the future.

3.6.4. Central Thai language was used in the community profile because all village headman and key informants can speak central Thai. They usually speak central Thai when they come in government offices.

CHAPTER 4

DATA COLLECTION OF OLD AND NEW HOUSEHOLDS

Aree Jampaklay

4.1 Introduction

The objective of this paper is to describe about household data collection that is one part of CEP-CPC project. General background of household data collection, how to collect data, problems found and how to solve them, lesson learned, cautions for data use and atmosphere of fieldwork interview are included in this paper.

4.2 General Background to the data collection

To conduct a complete household census of the 1984 Nang Rong villages is the first of the data collection goals of the CEP-CPC Project. Data were collected on every household in the 51 Nang Rong 1984 study villages (that split into 76 villages by 1994). There are two different types of households in project villages to be interviewed. The first are households that were in the village in 1984. These households are referred as “1984 households or old

households”. The second type of households are those that were settled after 1984 and are considered as “new households”.

The data provided a detailed account of villager's lives between 1984 and 1994. This will help understanding of several aspects of migration processes, fertility and contraceptive behavior, life course choice within the fertility and contraceptive behavior, and life course choice within the context of rapid social and economic change. So, the information collected by the census not only concerned basic demographic data but also about individual migration experience (both temporary and permanent), life history events, sibling relationship, and also household socio-economic status and labor exchange network.

4.3 Methods of collecting the data

4.3.1 Questionnaires and forms required in the fieldwork

4.3.1.1 Blue booklet questionnaire

The blue booklet questionnaire was used for “old household”, that is, the household that was found in Nang Rong villages in 1984. The blue booklet questionnaire is consisted of :

Form 1 : a household roster for 1984 household members

Form 2 : a household roster for new household members

Form 4 : a sibling network form

Form 5 : life history calendar and

Form 6 : a household characteristics form

4.3.1.2 Green booklet questionnaire

Green booklet questionnaire was used for new household. “New household” is the household that was not found in Nang Rong village in 1984. These households were set up in Nang Rong village after 1984. The green booklet questionnaire consists of :

Form 3 : a household roster in new household and

Form 4, Form 5 and Form 6 : same as those in blue booklet

4.3.1.3 Form A (Form A-1, Form A-2)

This is for 1984 household. This form is one page for each household. There are three parts in Form A-1, A-2 and A-3. Form A-1 and Form A-2 presents list of household members and their informations. While members that currently lived in the household were listed in Form A-1, members who were temporarily absent were listed in Form A-2. And Form A-3 recorded household characteristics.

4.3.1.4 Form H

Form H is the Ban Lek Ti list that would be described in detail under the topic on set of identifiers.

4.3.1.5 Form M

The objective of Form M is to facilitate migrant follow-up fieldwork. Some significant information of migrants from each household were recorded in Form M. For example CEP code, name, sex, age, destination they moved to, etc. were copied from blue questionnaire and then filled in Form M by the assistant supervisors after household questionnaires were finished in each day.

4.3.1.6 "Code 2" tracking form

The household members who used to live in one household in 1984 and then have moved to another household in the same village by 1994 are given code 2 for question 11.1 in the blue questionnaire. The reasons of movement might be that they got married and set up a new house, or they got married and moved into the house of their spouse's parents, or some other reasons. If these people moved to another old household, they were recorded as new members with a CEP code that starts with 4 (401). If they currently lived in new household, they were given CEP code that starts with 5(501). The interviewers recorded information about these people in both types of household.

So we can see that "Code 2" persons' movement made them listed twice. Also, their information was recorded twice (in source and destination household). This repetition provides backup linking information and a mechanism for checking consistency of responses. In "Code 2" tracking form, we recorded some information that identifies individual that appeared both in source household and

destination household. So "Code 2" tracking form was implemented to make sure that "code 2" person in question 1.1 in old household questionnaire was found as a member of only one other household in the same village.

4.3.2 Set of identifiers

Since the second goal of the project is to accurately match individuals between 1984 and 1994, the most important thing to gain is the successful matches across time that will provide a valuable basis to the understanding of social phenomena during a period of very rapid social change. In order to achieve that goals, four different types of identifiers for individual, household, village and province were set. Interviewers had to use four different types of identifiers during all interviews. Each set of identifiers represents a level of observation and detail. They provide the key to the most important mechanism for matching and linking people, households and villages. The four different types of identifiers are the followings :

4.3.2.1 CEP number or CEP code

This code indicates individual to be found on household roster. There are three digit numbers in the CEP code. The first digit identifies where each person comes from on household roster. The other two digits represent the order of each individual.

CEP codes that begins with 1 (101-115) are for individuals from the 1984 household who were listed on Form A-1 in 1984.

CEP codes that begins with 2 (201-215) are for individuals from the 1984 household who were listed on Form A-2 in 1984.

Note: Form A-1 lists individuals by order as 01, 02, 03, 04, and A-2 lists individuals by order as 01, 02, 03, 04, Interviewers had to add 1 in front of this order number if the person came from A-1 and add 2 if the person came from A-2.

CEP codes that begins with 4 (401-415) are for new household members (members that moved into old household after 1984)

CEP codes that begins with 5 (501-515) are for individuals listed in a new 1994 household (green booklet questionnaire)

4.3.2.2 Ban Lek Ti

Ban Lek Ti is Thai word that means administrative address number given by the government to each household. Every village has list of Ban Lek Ti that usually kept by village's headman. Ban Lek Ti list is associated with the name of the head of the household. In this study we made a form that is called Form H to fill the names of household heads in the village. So each village has one Form H that was filled during community profile fieldwork that was

conducted a month before the household survey. Form H is needed in household data fieldwork for several questions in every form of questionnaire that refer to other household within the village to identify household level. Interviewers needed to look up the Ban Lek Ti in Form H. Usually in the fieldwork when respondents referred to household level, they would answer the name of household head or household member's name because they can not remember Ban Lek Ti of households. Then interviewer had to look up in Form H to find Ban Lek Ti of those households. So interviewers needed to bring Form H with them for every interview. Of course, the same Form H must be used by all interviewers within a village.

In village that was split, the procedure was a little bit different. Form H of two or three villages that were formerly one village, were used by interviewers in split village. To identify household was not done only by means of Ban Lek Ti, but also by a village number so that we could differentiate household whether it came from which village without having overlapping Ban Lek Ti. This is the case for questions on Form 1 (1.6, 1.11, 1.12, 1.15), Form 2 (2.6, 2.11, 2.12, 2.15), Form 3 (3.6, 3.11, 3.12, 3.15), Form 4 (4.5, 4.10, 4.15, 4.20), Form 5 (5.5) and Form 6 (6.3, 6.12, 6.13, 6.24, 6.45)

Regarding Ban Lek Ti list or Form H which could be usually taken from the village's headman, the fieldwork still faced two main problems. First, in

some villages, some households are not listed - especially for new households or households that just separated from old households. During fieldwork, when interviewers found any household not being listed, interviewers had to inform assistant supervisors when they got together at night. Assistant supervisor, then, would check with the headman whether this was another house to add to the list. If yes, assistant supervisor would assign the Ban Lek Ti by the next available sequential number, even though it was not the real Ban Lek Ti of that household. Also the assistant supervisor had to add the name of the head of that household in form H. Each interviewer's form H would be revised, and completed questionnaires would be revised with Ban Lek Ti's inserted where names should be. It is worth noting that assistant supervisor had to make sure that the household was a new household to avoid the problem of household being listed twice. Another problem is that some households on the list had duplicate Ban Lek Ti or the Ban Lek Ti in the slash form (for example 12/1). It often happened for households that were related and located closely to each other. When households were separated, the new household had not been given new Ban Lek Ti yet, the old Ban Lek Ti was then used. In this case, assistant supervisor had to check the list on the first day of any village fieldwork. When he/she found such problem, he/she had to change the Ban Lek Ti that duplicated to be another number (next available sequential number). So the Ban Lek Ti of every household on Form H must not be repeated.

4.3.2.3 Village number

Each village in old Nang Rong district is assigned a unique number. The village list is divided or grouped by district and sub-district. So in case of duplicate names of the village, we could clarify by sub-district or district. All interviewers carried the same village list during interviews. During the fieldwork, interviewers recorded the village name first in questionnaire and then change to according number when they came back to the place they stayed in the village each day. However, village list was still needed during interview to check that the village names of the respondents were listed and given the number. There were some villages that were found only during household survey. They had just splitted from project village right after community data fieldwork were completed. The new villages were added to the village list and also were given the numbers that are not repeated with old ones.

4.3.2.4 Province number

A unique number is also assigned to each province in Thailand and all interviewers used the same province list for all interviews.

4.3.3 Procedure of interview

In the fieldwork, the interviewers were trained to completed all old households first. The Ban Lek Ti list or Form H and Form A's of a village were used together to identify old household. After each old household was

interviewed, the corresponding 1994 household on Form H would be checked off. After all old households were found and interviewed, the remaining households in the village that were considered as new households were interviewed next.

4.3.3.1 For old household

The first part of blue booklet questionnaire has information that helps to identify the household, such as Ban Lek Ti, village number, sub-district, district in 1984 and 1994, informant's CEP code, total time to fill all forms, and type of window.

1994 Roster listing

In the fieldwork, the interviewer needed to record accurately and verify the 1984 i.d. variable for each person in the old household (1984 household) with the right person in the 1994 household. The method was done when the interviewer conducted the household interview. She/he brought with her/him a copy of the 1984 household census of that household (Form A). The first thing she/he did after a household was found was to staple Form A of that household onto the inside cover page of the blue booklet. Then the interviewer wrote down the names of every member of the 1984 household that appeared on Form A-1 and Form A-2 on the 1994 household roster (Form 1) with CEP number of 101 -- and 201 --. Besides, if there were any other household members who were currently residing in the household but who were not on list in Form A., or in

other word, those members who moved into the household after 1984, the interviewer had to record them in Form 2 with CEP number of 401--. The interviewer had to make sure to ask about the new member. So she/he could distinguish the two types of these people by the form they were listed and their CEP number.

Information of individual in Form 1 and Form 2 were asked one by one after the process of the whole roster listing was finished.

Migrant destination (question 1.37, Form M)

Since migrant follow-up was the process to be followed after household survey was finished, the most detail destination of each migrant was needed. In questionnaire, destination information was recorded in question 1.37. This part recorded important informations of migrant or informants who knew how to find migrant in detail as much as possible. These informations are such as CEP number, informant name and nickname, relationship to migrant, address, telephone number, including a map if the informant can draw. And then, as mentioned in topic forms required, the information in questionnaire 1.37, would be transferred by assistant supervisor to Form M that was completed after the interview in the village was finished.

Afterwards, the interview followed to Form 4, Form 5, and Form 6 respectively.

4.3.3.2 For new household

The procedure of interviewing new household is not as complicated as old household. After the first part was filled, the interviewer started with Form 3 which was for new household roster and then followed by Form 4, Form 5 and Form 6.

4.4 Problems found and problems solving

Problems raised in this part are identified as points that could affect data quality as follows :

4.4.1 Complicated questionnaire and several kinds of forms

If we compare between blue booklet and green booklet, blue booklet for old household is more likely to lead to making error than green booklet. The problem started in the completion of Form 1. Since members in Form 1 needed to be accurately the same persons with members in Form A, in CEP number, order in the list, as well as name of the persons. Error in only one point could make incorrect matching in the process of data analysis and it would be difficult to find

out this error. Although we had addressed the importance of this point as much as we could in questionnaire training, such error is still found.

The complication can also be obviously found from set of identifiers that needed several kinds of list. The interviewers had to record unique number to refer to individual, household, village, district or province in many questions of every form. So it consumed time to complete questionnaire and also made confusion. The confusion often occurred from village list more than district or province list. Since in Nang Rong, there were some villages that had duplicate name. We recommended interviewers to record the name in the booklet during the interview and then change to be the number when they had time to check carefully after interview. However, interviewers still carried all the lists to make sure that the village names that the respondents gave were already listed and correctly located in corresponding sub-district.

Questions that needed answer of the Ban Lek Ti were quite difficult to get answer. Especially, the question that needed the Ban Lek Ti of many households in only one question. For example, question 6.24 in Form 6 asked about the people in the same village who helped in harvesting. In some households, they had many people help in this kind of work. So, the respondents had to recall each person which household they came from. It took a lot of time. And some could just tell approximate information.

Data collection on life history in Form 5 was also a complicated part. It was hard not only for respondents to reply, but also for interviewers to ask question. For interviewers, they had to ask question that could remind respondents about particular events happened in each year of their life and the sequence of those events as well. The older the respondent was the more years he/she had to recall events, and the more difficult to get responses. Usually Form 5 for people aged 18-35 and currently lived in household were recorded. However, for those who were married and their spouses also lived in household, we also collected their spouse's life history regardless of their age. We found one case who was 59 years old and we had to do Form 5 for him. Such case we had to collect data from age 13 to 59 year, that is, 47 years.

Besides, for Form 4 (sibling information) and Form 5 (life history) of in-laws, it was difficult to gain information from the in-laws who had gone less than 2 months who are identified as type 1 persons, because we had to get information of their siblings and life histories. The best informants were their spouses. In case their spouses had also gone, other household members often could not give information we need. In such case, we had to try the best to ask from several persons in the household for complete data.

4.4.2 Quitting of interviewers during fieldwork

At the beginning of fieldwork, we had 28 interviewers and 7 assistant supervisors. We divided them to be 7 teams : one assistant supervisor had to take care of 4 interviewers. At the end of fieldwork the number of interviewers was 21. The interviewers had just received bachelor degree from the teacher college in Buriram. Working with CEP project was their temporary job while they were waiting for their degree and before they got permanent work. They took the examination to be government school teachers after fieldwork started for two days. The examination result was announced during fieldwork and some interviewers had passed the exam. Nine of them have got good score and they were called for work at first round. So they had to quit from the fieldwork. Besides, two interviewers also quit with other reasons. After we lost 11 from 28 interviewers, we switched two interviewers from community profile team to add to household team and reorganized the 7 teams into 6 teams. One assistant supervisor was assigned to work at IPSR office as project secretary assistant. We also took this opportunity to alternate interviewers in each team to make them fresh with new assistant supervisor and new team worker. Since three months in village was quite long time that they could feel bored with same atmosphere.

4.4.3 Following the rules

One rule of household census is that assistant supervisor had to check whether all old households were completely interviewed before new households.

It appeared that one team did a few new households before finishing all households at one scattered village. Their reason was that some households were so far from others so they preferred to finish the nearby first. But it would not be sure which household was new until all old households were found. Supervisor had to clarify one more time the importance of identifying old and new household accurately. Also, supervisor had to pay more attention to that team and other team at certain point in order that this problem would not happen again.

4.5 Cautions of data use

There are some recommendations for CEP-CPC data use. As it is noted that process of data collection of this project is not simple. Complicated questionnaire, several forms and lists required could make users who are not familiar with the project since the beginning get confused. The best way to understand clearly is to look through questionnaires, all forms and all lists. Users also have to know the method of data record that is ready in code-book. Besides, fieldwork manual that provides background, concepts of the project and questions' objectives is so important for users.

The quality of data seems to be the most important thing that users have to concern during analysis. The points that users should see the degree of data quality are variables on number of persons presented during interview and who is

the respondent. Number of persons presented could affect the questions related to network. Even though we might not conclude that it has result in higher or lower degree of data quality, but users should use take into considerations. Asking from informant rather than respondent could affect the answers' accuracy regarding personal information such as sibling, life history or other individual facts. Other informant was replaced in case respondent was not available for interview since interviewer had already tried their best.

4.6 Lessons learned

4.6.1 Supervisors should continue from 1984 survey data

Since 1994 survey was related to 1984 survey, personnels who worked in 1984 survey and have already known the project and Nang Rong district well, would work more easily and understand more of the 1994 survey process than supervisors who were new. Experience from 1984 survey could help in the 1994 fieldwork in many important points.

4.6.2 Migrant follow-up interviewers should be same team of household interviewers

This is the same idea as about supervisors. As it is mentioned, this project was rather complicated. Interviewers who were trained well about project concepts, household questionnaire, forms, identifiers and all procedures of

fieldwork were faster to understand concepts, questionnaire, procedure to complete questionnaire as well as fieldwork of migrant follow-up. They were also familiar with Nang Rong district and know migrants' family that they could refer to when they followed up migrants. They could also make migrants trusted them.

4.6.3 Consent form is not necessary to sign in Thailand

Thai people are friendly. To ask permission for interview and inform the objective of interview clearly by word is enough. People rarely refused to answer question. In contrast signing in permission paper or consent form sometimes made respondent afraid. Some respondents were illiterate and they were not sure what was in the paper that they signed. Although they might sign, they still seemed to be reluctant. However, consent form may be useful for literate and well educated persons.

4.6.4 Source of information

Searching of old household should be tried with several sources other than village headman. One good informant was old person in the village who usually knew about all villagers who were currently living or had already moved elsewhere. We found some cases of old households who had temporarily lived in the village (two or three months) for temporary job and then had gone somewhere. The villagers tended to forget such household since they were not

considered as their people. We could miss these cases if we asked about them from only village headman who was sometime still young.

4.7 At mosphere of interview

4.7.1 Place of interview

Most of household interviews took place at the opened - cellar of the house (most houses in countryside of Thailand have cellar under the house and members usually use it to do several activities). So the interview was seen by neighbors and by assistant supervisor. Usually in each day the assistant supervisor visited the household being interviewed to inspect interviewers at work whether they faced any problem either concerning questionnaire or others. For example one respondent was drunk and he was only one in the household. His answer was confusing. In this case the assistant supervisor had to accompany interviewer all time of interview for the sake safety and acquering answers. If the interviews had to be conducted at nighttime (which were not as often as at daytime), the interviewers would be invited to interview inside the house.

4.7.2 Presenting of persons other than household member

Before we did the interview in any village we informed and asked permission from the village headman. The village headman then announced to his villagers that every household would be interviewed. So the villagers knew

beforehand about the interview. When a household was interviewed, some neighbors who were not busy would be present at the household. Presenting of persons other than household members at the interview has both advantage and disadvantage. Some people felt embarrassed to be alone, face to face with interviewer. Accompanied by neighbors made them more self confident. Also, neighbors could help the respondent to recall some answers, especially that concerned of labor network in village. However, neighbors could make respondent less independent. Some of them who were already interviewed liked to give suggestions to respondent during interview. We could not make sure that the answer that was not from the respondent only was the real answer. Besides, some question was rather personal issue such as about debt, respondent might be ashamed to answer. Although, neighbors' presenting could cause to the weak points of data quality, it is hard to prevent. Since for Thai culture, fieldwork team who came to village were considered as guests and paying attention to guests is one way of warm welcome that means good manner.

CHAPTER 5
MIGRANT FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Kanchana Tangchonlatip

5.1 Introduction

The migrant follow-up was conducted during September 1994 to May 1995 after the household data collection was completed. The main objective of the study was to find and interview the migrants from the villages in Nang Rong so as to investigate their migration characteristics and their social network. The social network data would identify the social linkages between the migrants and their family members at home as well as family members at their new places of residence. The findings will be of considerable interest to policy makers who are concerned about migration patterns in Thailand.

The migrant follow-up is a challenging task of migration study. It tried to find and seek information from all migrants who were reported of migrating from the sampled villages in Nang Rong to selected destinations. The data collection was quite successful. The CEP-CPC team put all effort to find all migrants in the migrant's list. Although they faced various problems, the well organized and effective co-operative plan assisted in coping with the problem.

5.2 Studied migrants

In this study, the migrants were the people who were listed on section A1 (those present in 1984) or section A2 (those temporarily absent in 1984) of the household form in 1984 and were not residing in Nang Rong in 1994. Then they were checked code 3 on the question 1.1 of household questionnaire which asked about their absence from the household during the last two months. Only the migrants from 32 sampled villages in Nang rong who moved to the specific destination areas i.e., Bangkok and its peripheral provinces (Samuthprakarn, Samuthsakorn, Nakornprathom, Nonthaburi and Pratumthani), Eastern Seaboard provinces (Chonburi, Rayong and Chachoengsoa), Muang district of Burirum and Korat, were studied migrants. The 32 studied villages were sampled on the basis of level of cassava growing in the villages (less or more than 50 percent of growing) and the road length from village to urban area (less or more than 5 kilometers). The information was drawn from community profile data in 1984. It was found that 22 villages in 1984 were splitted into 32 villages in 1994. The destination areas where the migrants moved to were also purposively selected based on the places most people tended to migrate to. Time and budget utilizing in collecting data were also the important factors when selecting the destination provinces.

5.3 Migrants' list from Form M

The names of all migrants (who answered 3 on question 1.1) were recorded in D-Base file called Form M. Form M was primarily designed by IPSR to record only information on migrants' current places of residence which was drawn from question 1.37 of the household questionnaire. Later it was revised to be more systematic data file with more useful information such as migrants' CEP code, their sex, age and banlekti, and village's number. Then the information could identify and link the studied migrants with the household data in 1984 and 1994. There were totally 2,371 migrants in the list to follow.

5.4 Fieldwork preparation

The field-work to follow up the studied migrants was prepared for various months (since December 1993 when the first phase was still being conducted). Form M was sorted by villages and places of destination. Questionnaire was designed and pretested 3 times during 1993 -1994. The training of supervisors and interviewers were carried out. The gifts for the migrants were prepared. The followings were the preparations before the actual field-work started.

5.4.1 Questionnaire

The first draft of migrants questionnaire was pretested by the end of the year 1993. The purposes of the first pretest were not only to test the questions but also to see the possibility to find the migrants and the problems derived from the follow-up process. Then 13 migrants from Makamprong village who moved to Bangkok were on the list for pretest. The pretest team could find and successfully interview 8 migrants. Many lessons including the techniques to find migrant's residence were learned from this pretest. The migrants' places of residence could effectively be identified by using snowball technique, checking the residence's telephone number and calling or asking the nearby post office, etc. Supervisor field note during the pretest provided many useful informations and suggestions for planning the actual fieldwork. The major problem was the unclear addresses of the migrants as well as the time consumed in the bad traffic of Bangkok.

The questionnaire was pretested once more in February 1994 but no serious changes. The questionnaire format particularly Form 7 was revised to make it less complicated and more understandable by the interviewers. In addition, Form F was suggested and designed by the CEP team to separately record detail of follow-up of each migrant. Then questionnaire was consisted of 7 Forms (not included Form F which was the separate form): **Form 7:** Characteristics of the migrant's household; **Form 8:** Household roster of the

migrant; **Form 9**: Type of migration; **Form 10**: Life history calendar; **Form 11**: Migrant's sibling network; **Form 12**: Different aspects of support. It also included some important information such as interview attempt which was designed to provide the number of attempts and to assess the success of the interview; **Form S** section was designed to fill up the major data which could link migrant's data with the household data in 1984 and in 1994; and lastly, the information would be asked about other migrants from the same village who stayed in the same places as the studied migrant. Interview attempt and form S were put in the first part of the questionnaire prior to Form 7.

5.4.2 Team formed

The data collection teams were formed into three teams. Each team was consisted of one supervisor and 3-4 interviewers. The experiences from collecting household data made the CEP-CPC team decided that the supervisors should be the ones who used to be responsible for collecting the household and community profile data in the first phase. They were accustomed to the names and had some background information of the migrants. In addition, two forms of migrant's questionnaire and household questionnaire were the same forms: the Life history calendar and Migrant's sibling network forms. As for the interviewers, all of them were also recruited from the ones who used to collect household data. Besides the benefit of being accustomed to the questions and format of the questionnaire, their north-eastern background was also helpful when

they approached the migrants in the destination residence since they could communicate with the migrants in the same dialect.

Each team was assigned to be responsible for finding migrants in different places of residence. The communication among each team was linked by modern technology: the mobile telephone. The three teams could contact each other through mobile telephones. There was also a person who was assigned to be the center of the connection. In case if the connection through mobile telephone did not work, each team could leave all necessary information to other teams to the focal person who resided at IPSR. She would transfer the message to the concerned teams. For example, one team called to inform that the team had already found and interviewed the migrant whose name was in the places of destination of another team (since the migrant moved his residence). Then the other team would not have to spend time to follow-up that migrant.

5.4.3 Documents needed in the field

There were abundant documents necessary for the interview. Such documents provided the information to link the study migrants and the previous household data. There were migrants' list sorted by villages and their places of destination; list of Ban Lek Ti in 32 villages; codes of countries, provinces, districts and villages in Nang Rong, Chamni, and Non Suwan; Form 1 or Form A of all studied migrants; map of places of destination and the printout of Form M

which consisted of information of the studied migrants i.e. name, CEP code, village's name and destinations address. Then a van to carry the documents was unavoidably provided to each team.

5.4.4 Training procedures

The training were set for two times: one for the supervisors and another for the interviewers. The training for the supervisors was held first to assist them to understand the objectives and the questions in the questionnaire. Then they would be more understanding of all the issues when the training for interviewers was carried out secondly. The field manual was prepared for supervisors and interviewers to give them necessary information of the study as well as the explanation of the major questions in the questionnaire.

The field pretest was also carried out after the completion of questionnaire training. Samuthsakorn Province was chosen to be the pretesting area. The problems learned from the field pretest were not only from the questions in the questionnaire but also the techniques in follow-up of migrants especially snowball approach where interviewers asked for other migrants' residence from the respondents. The meeting to discuss about the pretest was arranged in order to let the teams share their fresh experiences. The pretest was quite successful, 12 migrants out of the total 21 migrants in the destination were found and interviewed. The nine migrants were reported of moving to other places

including moving back to Nang Rong. Only two migrants had no clue since their addresses had little information.

5.4.5 Gift for the studied migrants

A T-shirt which had a design of Nang Rong map was prepared to be the gift for every migrant who was interviewed. The gift was chosen on the basis of usefulness for the migrants and to increase the connection among Nang Rong migrants and between them and IPSR staff.

5.5 Fieldwork

The actual fieldwork started in September 1994. The meeting between the teams was set to be held every 10-14 days. The problems which derived from conducting the fieldwork would be taken to discussion and for solution in the meeting. For example, some questions were raised to make them clearly understood among each team. Sometimes the problematic questions were sent to CPC to consult. It was a good example of effective co-operative work among the teams in the field and the center at IPSR and CPC at Chapel Hill.

The fieldwork was planned to follow two strategies. Firstly, the teams tried to follow the migrants at their places of residence. The second approach was to find the migrants in their villages. The last technique was planned on the basis

of Thai traditional practices that those who left their family for quite a long time would come home to visit their family during the important occasions like Thai New Year, Chinese New Year, and Songkarn festival. There would be a long holiday during such occasions. Then most of the migrants took these good occasions to visit their home. The teams spent 10-14 days to collect data in the villages. The going-back to Nang Rong approach was not only technique for finding migrants in the villages but also a chance to update addresses of some remaining migrants from their family. Then the remaining migrants were followed at the places of destination after the teams went back to IPSR.

The CEP Team decided to stop the field-work in the mid of May 1995. It took about 8 months to do the fieldwork. There were still some unfound migrants, but the number of migrants who were interviewed were quite satisfied. There were totally 1,779 migrants who were successfully interviewed.

5.6 Coding and data entry

The follow-up migrant codebook was prepared by IPSR and CPC. Only some interviewers were chosen to be the coders. The training was set to let the coders understand the meaning of each code. During the fieldwork, only village's, district's and province's numbers were coded. Then most of the coding was carried out after the end of the field-work. The codes were checked their

correction by the supervisors. It took about four months to finish the coding and data entry processes: from May to August 1995.

5.7 Problems encountered during the fieldwork

As mentioned earlier, there were not only the problems from the questionnaire but also the difficulty in seeking the migrants. The problems were solved by the teams themselves and through the discussion in the meetings. The followings are some major problems found in the fieldwork.

5.7.1 Address of the migrants

The migrant's address on the list utilized in the field could be classified into 3 categories: clear, unclear and very unclear addresses. Clear address had enough information for the interviewers to find the migrants. This might mean having a phone number, name of the place of residence and street address. Unclear address had few information on migrants' destination which was not enough for the interviewers to find the migrants. For these cases, techniques such as snowball approach and going back to Nang Rong to interview were used. Very unclear address had no sufficient information. It is not even known where the migrants were either in one of the places of destination chosen for the study or not. The snowball and go-back home techniques were also useful methods to find these cases.

Thus, the most useful information was the address with phone number, name of place of residence, or name of street. These information assisted to find the migrants more easily. However, it was found that sometimes the team could not find migrants from the clear address. It might be the wrong address given or the migrants had already moved to other places. Sometimes the teams also accidentally found the migrants with unclear or very unclear addresses especially if they resided in the same places as the migrants with clear address.

One technique which the interviewers always used to find the migrants was asking the place from the postman or people in the post office. They would easily be informed where the destination place was located because in the post office, there was a map that locate each house in their area.

5.7.2 The migrants

The migrants who worked in the construction sites had often experienced moving from one place to the other. Occasionally, the change of address made the team unable to find their new places of residence. Some construction areas were too wide or too complicated to search for the migrants (many storey condominium, for instance).

It was also found that some migrants were unwilling to give the information. The reason they often gave was that they had no time. Not many

migrants directly refused to response by indicating that the interview was useless for them.

5.7.3 Migrant's employers

In the places like factory, grocery shop, or restaurant the interviewers had difficulty to get permission from the authority to interview the migrants. One owner of the grocery shop did not directly refuse to let the migrant answer the questions but did not give chance for the migrant to be interviewed. Some shop owners sat nearby when the interviews took place. This made the migrants dared not answer clearly and sometimes instead of letting the migrants answered, they themselves tried to answer the questions. The interview in the factory also had problem. Some factories did not allow the migrants to be interviewed during the work time. Then the interviewers had to wait for the lunch time or the after work in order to catch the migrants. There were some factories that not even allowed the interviewers to enter the factories although the team had and official letter to explain the objectives of the study including showing the questionnaire to them see that there were not any sensitive questions that could affect their factories. So the team had to stay outside the factories and wait until the migrants stopped working. The team could identify the migrants by asking the factory guard or other workers who knew the migrants.

One time when the team went to one study village, it was found that there was rumor about the villagers who were interviewed. It was mentioned that the villagers might pay tax which cost 10,000 Baht if they were interviewed. The team spent time to explain the correct information to the villagers. It was found later that the rumor was from one of the migrant whose employer was unwilling to let the migrant be interviewed and this case was the unsuccessful one. The migrant wrote the letter to her family informing that her employer told her about the tax. Finally, after the explanation, the villagers seemed to understand and the interviews in this villages could be continued without any obstacle.

There was also another example of unwilling employer. The interviewer had asked for permission to interview the migrant. One of the employer refused to give permission while another who was her sister let the migrant be interviewed. Then the one who did not gave the permission called up IPSR office and complained. The CEP staff tried to apologize her and explained that the interviewer tried to contact the migrant again and got the permission to interview through telephone without realizing that there were two persons who could give permission to the migrants. She accepted the apology and realized that the interview was really carried out by the academic institute, not by a deceived gang.

5.7.4 Inconvenient surroundings during the interview

5.7.4.1 The pollution: It seemed that the follow-up teams experienced various kinds of pollution. The sound pollution would be firstly mentioned. The interviewers complained of interviewing in the car repair shop. The noise from the machine extremely disturbed the interview. They had to shout when they asked the questions. Also the interview in the rice mill made the interviewer get allergic from the dust. One interviewer fainted when she spent time interviewing the migrant in the place where dried fishes and squids were made due to the bad smell.

5.7.4.2 The danger: The interview which took place in the construction sites was quite dangerous. Sometimes the interviewer should climb up the temporarily ladder to catch the migrants. One entered the construction elevator which had no door and had a wide space between the floor and the elevator. She was supposed to jump out from the elevator to the floor. She said that she dared not guess what would happen to her if she missed and fell down from the building. In addition, some places of destination were located far from the community. The way to the places had no houses or any community. The migrants who were agricultural laborers in Sanamchaikhet, Chasoengsoa Province were the example migrants who resided in such distant area. The follow-up team learned later that such area was a reservation forest where someone tried to invade so they did not want any strangers to enter the area.

5.7.4.3 Drunk migrants: As mentioned earlier, the going back to Nang Rong technique was utilized to follow the migrants during some special occasions. It was found that during their home visit, some migrants spent most of their times with friends. Often they got drunk when the interviewers found them. Some migrants were too drunk to give correct responses or be unable to be interviewed. The migrants' peer group would sometimes disturb the interview. They tried to answer the questions for the migrants. The absence of the migrants from their villages were also a problem. It was found that some migrants went to visit their friends in other villages. When they came back to their house, it was time to leave for their workplace. So they did not have enough time to answer the questions.

5.8 Some interesting notices from the follow-up teams

After the fieldwork was over, the IPSR team felt that the migrant follow-up study gave them plenty of experiences. They also got a lot of impression from the work. These were some interesting notices about the study which might be useful for analyzing the data.

The migrants from the same village or nearby villages tended to reside in the same places of destination. The IPSR teams also noticed that the villages where the migrants came from could reflect their level of networking (whether

there were good or bad linkages among the migrants) and their village circumstances. The migrants in some villages seemed to be able to identify the locations of the migrants from their villages, while in other villages, few migrants had addresses or location information of other migrants from the same villages. Then the snowball technique could not be used among the migrants from latter villages.

We noticed that the migrants whose residences at the destination were clean usually came from the tidy villages. On the contrary, the migrants from untidy and dirty villages always had filthy residences at the destination. We can compare the places of destination and the villages they came from, because we have seen both places.

The interviewers were impressed that they were sometimes playing role as the messengers for the migrants. They used to take letters or messages from migrants to their friends and families in the village. Conversely they brought the news from migrants' family to the migrants in Bangkok. They felt that such work also gave people some other good things.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Aphichat Chamrathirong

6.1 Summary

The fieldwork experiences among IPSR staffs from the Project on "Demographic Responses to A Changing Environment in Nang Rong, 1994", which had also been accumulated since CEP Project in 1984, are discussed here in great detail. These rich data sources providing an ideal natural laboratory for the study of the changing environment in Nang Rong, can be analyzed more efficiently and with greater insights when we learn more about the complexity of the data collection process and the unique fieldwork experiences among IPSR researchers.

The three components of the CEP-CPC Project namely, the community profile, the household census and the follow-up study of migrants resulted in the complexity of the fieldwork organization. Several teamworks were set up for different components. The development and pretests of questionnaires, recruitment and training of assistant supervisors and interviewers and the community preparation were all carefully designed and implemented.

Experiences from other previous researches especially those in Nang Rong had helped a great deal in the fieldwork of CEP-CPC project.

6.1.1 The community profile

As for the community profile of 310 villages, the group interview methodology was employed. Although the organization of the group interview was successful, and the pretest was very helpful, there were some problems encountered in the field. These involved, for example, the "wording" of the questionnaire and the lack of time for the better clarification of meanings of certain words. Finally, lessons learned from the group interview are discussed. The optimum size of group interview is recommended. From the field experience, the importance of detailed fieldwork training and pretest is strongly stressed.

6.1.2 The household census

The implementation of the household census in 1994 linking to the 1984 individuals presents a unique methodology for the field operations. Different questionnaire and forms with their specific and clear objectives were made easily understood by the interviewers. Set of identifiers namely, CEP code and Ban Lek Ti were invented techniques for the longitudinal data collection. although regulations were made in order to maintain the standard procedure of matching and interview, problems of the fieldwork still arose and needed to be

solved all the time. This was because of the complicatedness of the questionnaires and the wide variety of forms, as well as the choices to be made of sources of information. Moreover, some unexpected and specific individuals problems of respondents' recall of their social-network individuals and their life history events were encountered in the field. During the fieldwork continuing effort to solve problems was always needed. Personnels (staff and interviewer) involved in the field, which sometimes changed, were also so crucial for the field success. Lastly, atmosphere of the interview (for example, respondent's character and the presence of other members) had to be made under enough consideration and control by the field researchers.

6.1.3 The migrant follow-up study

As far as the migrant follow-up study is concerned, the fieldwork experience is of great interest. Although various problems were also faced, the well organized, effective and well collaborative plan helped a great deal in coping with the difficulties. The tips were the correct forming of the teams, the well availability of all necessary documents carried in the van, the two-stage strategic training of the supervisors and the interviewers, the concentrated pretests with objectives, and gifts for the migrants that connected the Nang Rong population and IPSR staffs. The follow-ups of migrants back to their villages again on their festivals were also implemented very naturally. Invented techniques of address classification of migrants and the snow ball approach were examples of serious

field attempts and success. Human relations with migrants' employers and/or migrants co-workers and migrants' network were proved to be the key of success of follow-up. Finally, it was learnt that polluted and endangered atmosphere was also there. More precaution were perhaps needed to be made.

6.2 Conclusion

The quality of fieldwork is the key factor of the high degree of validity and reliability of the data collected. The well-prepared steps of field implementation with continuing efforts to solve the problems and to answer to new questions that arise all the time in the field are found to be very important. The fieldwork experiences of the Project : Demographic Responses to A Changing Environment in Nang Rong, 1994, elaborated in this paper prove this point quite strongly. The challenges of the highly complicated study design of the longitudinal nature and the follow-up plan alert the field personnels greatly. The direct and indirect co-monitoring and the collaborative effort from the partner CPC also helped very much in making the fieldwork more active and dynamic. It also guided the fieldworkers to become even more committed as well as to enjoy the most out of their challenging task to which the international standard was continuing discussed and applied.

**Institute for Population and Social Research
Mahidol University**

Salaya Phutthamonthon Nakhon Pathom, 73170 THAILAND

Tel. (662) 441-0201-4, 441-9666 FAX: (662) 441-9333

E-mail: directpr@mahidolacth

Homepage URL: <http://www.mahidolacth/mahidol/pr/pr.html>