

## Appendix on Data Collection

### Purpose of survey

The central question of our research is to explain individual participation in anti-government protests and pro-governments rallies in Moscow in Winter-Spring 2011-2012. The survey was designed to measure competing theories of protest behavior.

### Survey content

The questionnaire consists of 6 blocks:

1. Personal Information of the Respondent (sex, age, occupation, education, nationality etc.);
2. Interest in Politics (political preferences, frequency and interest in discussion political affairs, electoral choices, awareness of world affairs);
3. General Relationship to Protest (past protest action, efficacy of protest as a participation strategy, readiness to participate in the protests, involvement to the social networks);
4. Protest Participation (frequency of protest, affect toward the police, reasons for participation, size of protest group);
5. Issue position and issue salience (political attitudes towards migrants, social policy and economic course of government, assessments of electoral fraud)
6. Sources of Information (preferences on the TV, social networks in the internet etc.)

**Target population** Participants involved to the protest activity on both political sides (pro-Putin' protests and anti-Putin' rallies). The groups were surveyed at the place of protest (stadiums, streets and squares) over the course of four different protest events between February 23 and March 5.

**Average time** of one interview was about 15-20 minutes.

### Survey data collection method – clustered sample

As we approached the events, we were uncertain about our response rate. Within the pro-Putin rallies many You-tube videos had shown rally participants unwilling to talk to the press or precluded from doing so by rally captains. In the anti-government rallies, the atmosphere was increasingly tense as the elections became closer and participants feared both violence and retaliation for participation. Finally, it was extremely difficult estimate the popular from which the sample was to be drawn. There were not reports of the composition of the crowds at individual events, indeed there were vastly different estimates of protest attendance at all events.

To ensure success we devised two strategies for data collection. The premise of each was that we would try to maximize the variation across key demographic and social groups in our sample to provide means to compare those groups. Our first plan was to construct a respondent driven sample based on a selection of participants by age and class. Our interviewers approached the respondent in his or her target demographic and then concluded the interview with a request for the contact information of three acquaintances who had also participated in a protest event. We were surprised to find that as they election grew closer, it was the anti-regime protesters who were uncomfortable providing that information. We were also excited to find that surveying within the pro-Regime rallies was not as problematic as we feared and response rates were very high.

To capitalize on participants' willingness to respond to the survey on the spot, we increased our team of interviewers and constructed a research design that would allow us to maximize our comparisons based on gender, wealth and age.

To fit the structure of the protest masses, the interviewers were divided in 9 equal teams. Each team was told to recruit respondents from a key social group and to mix the gender within their subsample. The interviewers determined the age at a glance and the social status by the approximate value of the respondent's clothes, shoes and jewelry.

Age \ Social Strata	Upper class	Middle class	Lower class
18-34	Rich young	Middle class young	Poor young
35-55	Middle-aged rich	Middle-aged middle	Middle-aged poor
55 and over	Rich pensioners	Middle class pensioners	Poor pensioners

Surveying done by the teams reflects the structure of the population and let us to compare the groups' attitudes towards the protest activity.

### **Survey method – random face-to-face interviewing**

Interviewers were randomly distributed across the meeting area. Every interviewer was asked to find randomly (every 5<sup>th</sup> respondent) the person who looks like the representative of the target group (i.e. young middle-class). Approximate response rate was 95% as the respondents stayed for some time at the rallies and were glad to speak with the interviewers while waiting between speeches and events. The interviewing was anonymous and no personal identifying information was recorded.

### **Pilot survey**

Pilot survey was conducted in the end of February on the events of pro- and anti-Putin organizations. We surveyed had 45 respondents at the pro-Putin's rally in the Luzhniki Stadium and 70 respondents at the anti-Putin rally which took place on the Sadovoe Ring around Moscow center (action "Big White Circle"). Pilot team was formed from 12 scientific associates of the Laboratory for Political Studies, HSE.

The survey gave proof that the face-to-face interviews could be done at the protest events so we abandoned the more risky respondent driven sample. The pilot led to minor changes in the survey instrument but also gave us significant confidence in the instrument.

### **Survey**

We implemented data collection on March, 5<sup>th</sup> at the rallies organized to celebrate or protest Putin's victory in the presidential election on March 4<sup>th</sup>. Our team was very big: 28 interviewers worked on pro-Putin rally at Manezhnaya Square, 31 interviewers surveyed the participants of the anti-Putin's meeting at Pushkinskaya Square. Total number of respondents was 318 on the first rally and 414 on the second one.

### **Field research problems**

While surveying we have faced number of typical field work problems. The response rate of the pro-Putin's protesters was slightly less than the response rate of the opposition. Some attenders of pro-Putin's rallies experienced the problems with the political notions (the words like "libertarianism"), wanted to skip the questions on their political activity and preferences, suspected

the survey was not politically neutral and was aimed on the discrimination of the Putin's supporters.

Also we observed some relatively aggressive reaction on the interviewing during our work on Manezhnaya Square. First, the people who were participated in the pro-Putin's rally were usually organized by their supervisors; therefore the latter tried to control their attendance and manage their time at the rally. Second, we faced a resistance to survey from the commanders of the Young Guard of United Russia while we were trying to interview the members of the organization. The commanders were against the interviewing and promised to arrest the interviewers. However, all the thorny issues were solved by our interviewers at the place of the meeting.