

Using calibration in a Survey on Transportation of Goods by Road

Juris Breidaks

Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia

E-mail: Juris.Breidaks@csb.gov.lv

Introduction

The Survey on Transport of Goods by Road was initiated in January 1997 as a pilot project organized by Eurostat under the *Phare Programme*. It is a continuous survey where information about the vehicles in the sample is obtained through questionnaires mailed to respondents.

The target of survey is to obtain the information about transportation of goods by road performed by transport vehicles registered in Latvia.

The main variables of interest

- TONN Tonnes transported for total goods road transport
- TKM Tonne-kilometres performed for total goods road transport
- KML2 Kilometres travelled loaded for total goods road transport
- TO_N Tonnes transported for national goods road transport
- TK_N Tonne-kilometres performed for national goods road transport
- KM_N Kilometres travelled loaded for national road transport
- TO_EXP Tonnes transported for export goods road transport
- TK_EXP Tonne-kilometres performed for export goods road transport
- KM_EXP Kilometres travelled loaded for export goods road transport
- TO_IMP Tonnes transported for import goods road transport
- TK_IMP Tonne-kilometres performed for import goods road transport
- KM_IMP Kilometres travelled loaded for import national road transport
- TO_INT Tonnes transported for international goods road transport
- TK_INT Tonne-kilometres performed for international goods road transport
- KM_INT Kilometres travelled loaded for total international road transport

The survey covers transport vehicles that are owned by legal and natural persons and which at the moment of sample formation had undergone technical inspection and could be lawfully used. The data of the Road Traffic Safety Directorate about vehicle registrations and the number of vehicles that had undergone technical inspection reveal, and could be legally used. Special vehicles such as fire-fighting engines, crane lorries, tower cranes, road repair vehicles and other special vehicles were not included in the survey.

Simple random stratified sampling is used. The weekly sample size is 100 vehicles.

Stratification

| Stratum | Capacity and place of registration of vehicles | Year of release of the vehicles | Status of person |
|---------|--|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 3 | 3,5t<cap. ≤ 5t, Riga(including the district of Riga) | All | Legal |
| 4 | 3,5t<cap. ≤ 5t, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | All | Legal |
| 5 | 5t<cap. ≤ 10t, Riga(including the district of Riga) | 2005-2011 | Legal |
| 6 | 5t<cap. ≤ 10t, Riga(including the district of Riga) | 1998-2004 | Legal |
| 7 | 5t<cap. ≤ 10t, Riga(including the district of Riga) | 1991-1997 | Legal |
| 8 | 5t<cap. ≤ 10t, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | 2005-2011 | Legal |
| 9 | 5t<cap. ≤ 10t, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | 1998-2004 | Legal |
| 10 | 5t<cap. ≤ 10t, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | 1991-1997 | Legal |
| 11 | cap.>10t, Riga(including the district of Riga) | 2005-2011 | Legal |
| 12 | cap.>10t, Riga(including the district of Riga) | 1998-2004 | Legal |
| 13 | cap.>10t, Riga(including the district of Riga) | 1991-1997 | Legal |
| 14 | cap.>10t, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | 2005-2011 | Legal |
| 15 | cap.>10t, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | 1998-2004 | Legal |
| 16 | cap.>10t, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | 1991-1997 | Legal |
| 17 | the trucks, Riga(including the district of Riga) | 2005-2011 | Legal |
| 18 | the trucks, Riga(including the district of Riga) | 1998-2004 | Legal |
| 19 | the trucks, Riga(including the district of Riga) | 1991-1997 | Legal |
| 20 | the trucks, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | 2005-2011 | Legal |
| 21 | the trucks, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | 1998-2004 | Legal |
| 22 | the trucks, all Latvia without Riga and the district of Riga | 1991-1997 | Legal |
| 31 | 3,5t<cap. ≤ 5t, all Latvia | All | Private |
| 32 | 5t<cap., all Latvia | All | Private |
| 33 | the trucks, all Latvia | All | Private |

Table 1 – Stratification for 2011

The Horvitz – Thomson (HT) estimator and variance

$$\hat{Y}_{HT} = \sum_{i=1}^H y_i w_i$$

- y_i – value of study variable of unit i
- w_i – weight of unit i
- n^R – number of respondents
- N_h – population size of strata h

- **Variance estimator**

$$\hat{Y}_{HT}(\hat{Y}) = \sum_{h=1}^H \left(1 - \frac{n_h^R}{N_h}\right) \frac{n_h^R}{1 - n_h^R} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h^R} \left(w_i y_i - \frac{1}{n_h^R} \sum_j w_j y_j \right)^2$$

GREG estimator and variance

Set of responded transport vehicles in each month is assumed to be a sample. New frame in each month is assumed as population of transport vehicles in beginning of the month.

In each month sample was calibrated on the new frame.

As auxiliary variables has been used

- The number of respondents in each strata

- The capacity of vehicles
 - ✓ legal persons – 3,5t<capacity ≤ 5t, 5t < capacity ≤ 10t, capacity > 10t, the trucks
 - ✓ private persons – total capacity.

Package “sampling” of software R is used for the calibration, and g-weights are calculated with the help of a function “calib” from this package. Whereas calibration is based on the “raking” method in the function “calib”.

The GREG estimator is $\hat{Y}_{GREG} = \sum_{i=1}^H y_i w_i g_i$

And its estimated variance is

$$\hat{Y}_{HT}(\hat{Y}) = \sum_{h=1}^H \left(1 - \frac{n_h^R}{N_h}\right) \frac{n_h^R}{1 - n_h^R} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h^R} \left(w_i g_i e_i - \frac{1}{n_h^R} \sum_j w_j g_j e_j \right)^2$$

where estimated residual is

$$\hat{e}_i = y_i - X_s \times ((X_s \times w_i)^T \times X_s)^{-1} \times (X_s \times w_i) \times y_i$$

Results

| | Quarter | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | |
| | HT | GREG | HT | GREG | HT | GREG | HT | GREG |
| TONN | 8,0 | 7,9 | 8,0 | 7,2 | 9,0 | 8,5 | 9,6 | 9,2 |
| TKM | 4,5 | 4,5 | 4,7 | 4,7 | 4,3 | 4,3 | 4,9 | 5,0 |
| KM2 | 3,8 | 3,7 | 3,8 | 3,7 | 3,5 | 3,4 | 3,9 | 3,8 |
| TO_N | 10,2 | 10,1 | 9,6 | 8,5 | 10,5 | 9,9 | 11,4 | 11,0 |
| TK_N | 8,8 | 8,8 | 8,4 | 8,3 | 7,7 | 7,7 | 7,8 | 7,7 |
| KM_N | 7,2 | 7,1 | 6,6 | 6,2 | 5,9 | 5,8 | 6,0 | 5,8 |
| TO_EXP | 10,2 | 10,0 | 15,9 | 18,3 | 9,0 | 9,1 | 10,6 | 10,4 |
| TK_EXP | 7,9 | 7,8 | 7,6 | 7,7 | 8,1 | 8,2 | 9,2 | 9,4 |
| KM_EXP | 7,5 | 7,4 | 6,9 | 6,8 | 7,2 | 7,2 | 8,5 | 8,6 |
| TO_IMP | 16,0 | 16,6 | 18,2 | 19,0 | 18,1 | 17,6 | 12,4 | 12,2 |
| TK_IMP | 13,4 | 13,4 | 12,1 | 12,1 | 12,0 | 11,9 | 13,1 | 13,0 |
| KM_IMP | 9,1 | 9,0 | 8,2 | 8,2 | 8,1 | 8,0 | 8,3 | 8,3 |
| TO_INT | 11,3 | 11,2 | 12,7 | 12,4 | 12,9 | 12,9 | 13,0 | 12,9 |
| TK_INT | 10,5 | 10,5 | 11,2 | 11,4 | 10,5 | 10,4 | 11,9 | 12,0 |
| KM_INT | 9,4 | 9,4 | 9,8 | 10,1 | 9,6 | 9,6 | 10,4 | 10,4 |

Table 2 – The coefficients of variation (CV) for estimates of indicators in year 2011

Conclusion

- Do not get the desired result that CV for estimates of indicators in year 2011 with GREG is not given better result as CV for estimates of indicators in year 2011 with HT.
- Need to search auxiliary variables which better describe data.