

**Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)
 Module 3: Sample Design and Data Collection Report**

June 05, 2006

Country: *Estonia*
 Date of Election: *March, 6th 2011*

Prepared by: *Mihkel Solvak and Piret Ehin*
 Date of Preparation: *May, 2nd 2011*

NOTES TO COLLABORATORS:

- Where brackets [] appear, answer by placing an “X” within the appropriate bracket or brackets.
- If more space is needed to answer any question, please lengthen the document as necessary.

Collaborator(s):

Collaborators are the contact persons for election studies that appear in the CSES dataset - they are not necessarily the parties who collected the data. These collaborators and their contact information will be listed on the CSES website.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Name: <i>Piret Ehin</i> Title: <i>Senior Researcher</i> Organization: <i>Institute of Government and Politics, University of Tartu</i></p> <p>Address: <i>Ülikooli 18, 50090 Tartu, Estonia</i></p> <p>Telephone: <i>+372 7 375 583</i> Fax: <i>+372 737 5582</i> E-Mail: <i>piret.ehin@ut.ee</i> Website: <i>www.so.ut.ee/RTI</i></p> | <p>Name: <i>Mihkel Solvak</i> Title: <i>Researcher</i> Organization: <i>Institute of Government and Politics, University of Tartu</i></p> <p>Address: <i>Ülikooli 18, 50090 Tartu, Estonia</i></p> <p>Telephone: <i>++372 7 375 583</i> Fax: <i>+372 737 5582</i> E-Mail: <i>mihkel.solvak@ut.ee</i> Website: <i>www.so.ut.ee/RTI</i></p> |
| <p>Name: Title: Organization:</p> <p>Address:</p> <p>Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:</p> | <p>Name: Title: Organization:</p> <p>Address:</p> <p>Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

| |
|---|
| Organization: <i>Saar Poll OÜ</i> Address: <i>Endla 4, 10142 Tallinn, Estonia</i> |
| Telephone: <i>+372 631130</i> Fax: <i>+372 6312486</i> E-Mail: <i>infosaar@saarpoll.ee</i> Website: <i>http://www.saarpoll.ee/</i> |

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

| |
|---|
| Organization: <i>Estonian Science Foundation</i> Address: <i>Endla 4, 10142 Tallinn, Estonia</i> |
| Telephone: <i>+372 699 6210</i> Fax: <i>+372 699 6211</i> E-Mail: <i>etf@etf.ee</i> Website: <i>http://ww.etf.ee</i> |
| Organization: <i>Estonian Ministry for Science and Education</i> Address: <i>Munga 18, 50088 Tartu, Estonia</i> |
| Telephone: <i>+372 735 0222</i> Fax: <i>+372 730 1080</i> E-Mail: <i>hm@hm.ee</i> Website: <i>http://hm.ee/</i> |

| |
|--|
| Organization: Address: Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website: |
|--|

Archiving Organization

If appropriate, please indicate the primary location where the full, original election study dataset (not just the CSES portion) will be archived:

| |
|---|
| Organization: <i>University of Tartu, Institute of Government and Politics</i> Address: <i>Ülikooli 18, 50090 Tartu, Estonia</i> Telephone: +372 7 375 583 Fax: +372 737 5582 E-Mail: <i>rti@ut.ee</i> Website: <i>http://www.so.ut.ee/RTI_eng</i> |
|---|

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive:
November 2011

Study Design

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:

- Post-Election Study
- Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:

March 7th, 2011

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

March 25th, 2011

3. Mode of (post-election) interview:

- In person, face-to-face
- Telephone
- Mail or self-completion supplement
- Internet

4a. Was the survey part of a panel study?

Yes

No

4b. If the survey was part of a panel study, please describe the design of the panel study, including the date at which interviewing for each prior wave began and ended:

Translation

Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used as part of the election study deposit. For questionnaires in a language other than English, please also provide a version of each translated back into English. Note: Questions are based on those developed for the ISSP.

5. Was the questionnaire translated?

- Yes, translated by member(s) of research team
- Yes, by translation bureau
- Yes, by specially trained translator(s)
- No, not translated

6. Please list all languages used for the fielded module:

Estonian

Russian

7a. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?

- Yes, by group discussion
- Yes, an expert checked it
- Yes, by back translation
- Other; please specify: _____
- No
- Not applicable

7b. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

7d. If the questionnaire was translated, please provide a list of all questions which caused problems when translating. For each question listed, describe what problems were encountered and how they were solved:

Q6. Now thinking about the performance of the [government in [CAPITAL]/president] in general, how good or bad a job do you think the [government/president in [CAPITAL]] has done over the past [NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE LAST GOVERNMENT TOOK OFFICE, BEFORE THE CURRENT ELECTION] years?

We decided to omit the reference to the capital city, Tallinn, because in Estonian, the national government is never referred to in this way. In fact, we suspected that respondents could interpret “government in Tallinn” as signifying the Tallinn city government (controlled by opposition parties).

Thus, the version of the question we used asked about the performance of the “government of the Republic” (vabariigi valitsus)

D20 Household income.

The original CSES item asked for the annual household income quintile in which the respondents’ household falls. In Estonia, it is conventional to talk about monthly income or salary, not annual figures. The question we used thus asked about net household income in ONE MONTH. To obtain annual figures, the answers were multiplied by 12 and recoded into quintiles.

Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

8. Please describe the population that your sample is meant to be representative of:

The sample is representative of eligible voters (18 years and older; citizens of Estonia)

Eligibility Requirements

9a. Must a person be a certain age to be interviewed?

Yes

No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

18 years and older

9b. Must a person be a citizen to be interviewed?

Yes

No

9c. Must a person be registered to vote to be interviewed?

Yes

No

9d. Please list any other interviewing requirements or filters used:

Sample Frame

10a. Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

10b. Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame?

_____ *Unable to assess*

If yes, please explain:

10c. Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

10d. If interviews were conducted by telephone, what is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? _____ %

All interviews were face-to-face.

Please explain:

10e. If interviews were conducted by telephone, were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?

Yes

No

All interviews were face-to-face.

If no, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

10f. Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

10g. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: _____ %

Sample Selection Procedures

11. Please describe, in your own words, how the sample for the study was selected. If the survey is part of a panel study, please also describe the original sample, from the beginning of the study.

The sample was a stratified random sample. In the first stage sampling points were chosen in 15 counties. The exact number of sample points in each county was determined by the county's share of the total eligible population according to information from the Population Register (<http://www.siseministerium.ee/35796/>). Total number of sampling points was 212.

The interviews were conducted by using the random route method (from a randomly chosen start address at the sampling point), conducting five interviews on average per sampling point. A household in every third house or apartment was chosen and the last birthday rule was used to pick a respondent from the household. Three visits were made before replacing a household with another in case the respondent was not available. No substituting within the household was allowed.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

See question 11.

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

See question 11.

12c. Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

Yes

No

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

See question 11.

13. Were there further stages of selection?

Yes

No

See question 11.

13a. If there were further stages of selection, what were the sampling units at each of the additional stages?

See question 11.

13b. If there were further stages of selection, how were the sampling units selected at each of the additional stages?

See question 11.

13c. If there were further stages of selection, were units at each of these stages randomly selected?

- Yes
 No

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

See question 11.

14a. How were individual respondents identified and selected in the final stage?

The last birthday rule was used to select the respondent in the household.

14b. Could more than one respondent be interviewed from a single household?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please explain:

15. Did the sample design include clustering at any stage?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

See question 11.

16. Did the sample design include stratification?

Definition: Stratification involves the division of the population of interest according to certain characteristics (for instance: geographic, political, or demographic). Random selection then occurs within each of the groups that result.

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (please include the list of characteristics used for stratification):

See question 11. Geographic stratification (by county) was used.

17. Was quota sampling used at any stage of selection?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

18. Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of the selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

There was no substitution within a household. If after three visits the original respondent could not be contacted another household was chosen.

19. Under what circumstances was a household designated non-sample? Please check all that apply:

Non-residential sample point

All members of household are ineligible

Housing unit is vacant

No answer at housing unit after 3 callbacks

Other (Please explain):

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?

Yes

No

Please describe:

21a. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a random digit dial (RDD) sample?

Yes

No

All interviews were face-to-face.

21b. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a listed sample?

Yes

No

All interviews were face-to-face.

21c. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a dual frame sample?

Yes

No

All interviews were face-to-face.

If yes, what % list frame _____ and what % RDD _____

22. For surveys conducted by mail, was the sample a listed sample?

Yes

No

All interviews were face-to-face.

Please describe:

23. For surveys conducted on the Internet, did any respondents self-select into the survey?

Yes

No

All interviews were face-to-face.

Please explain:

Incentives

24a. Prior to the study, was a letter sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter.)

24b. Prior to the study, was a payment sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

24c. Prior to the study, was a token gift sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

24d. Did respondent receive an additional payment after their participation? (Do not include any payment made prior to the study.)

Yes

No

If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

24e. Were any other incentives used?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Interviewers

25. Please describe the interviewers (e.g., age, level of education, years of experience):
Average age of interviewers was 52. Approximately 50% of the interviewers had higher education and 50% secondary education. Average experience with the survey company conducting the survey was 4.5 years. Roughly 79% of interviewers conduct interviews in Estonian and 21% in Russian.

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

All interviewers received written instructions. In addition there were group and individual trainings organized by Saar Poll both in Estonian and Russian. In case the interviewer could not attend a training session, he or she was briefed by phone (in addition to receiving written instructions). The training included detailed instructions on the subject of the survey, the questionnaire, the sampling method and standard techniques of selecting the household and respondent.

Contacts

27a. What was the average number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample?

2.5

27b. For households where contact was made, what was the average number of contact attempts prior to first contact?

Not available

27c. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-sample**?

One contact if contact was made the first time and nobody was eligible. Up to three contacts until ineligibility could be determined. If eligibility could not be determined after three contact attempts the contact was classified as unknown eligibility.

28d. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-interview**?

Three

28e. During the field period, what were the maximum number of days over which a household was contacted?

5-6 days

28f. During the field period, did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

All three contact attempts were made on different weekdays and times.

Refusal Conversion

29a. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

Yes

No

Please describe:

If initial refusal was due to lack of time (i.e. soft refusal) a more suitable day and time was agreed. In case of straight refusal and a refusal to discuss reasons for it no further attempts were made.

29b. Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part?

Yes

No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter or letters.)

If yes, please describe:

29c. Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part?

Yes

No

If yes, how much?

29d. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer?

Yes

No

29e. What was the maximum number of re-contacts used to persuade respondents to be interviewed?

Not available. See 29a.

29f. Were any other methods used to persuade respondents reluctant to be interviewed to take part?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Interview/Survey Verification

Definition: Interview/survey verification is the process of verifying that an interview was conducted and that the survey was administered to the correct respondent, for quality control purposes.

30. Was interview/survey verification used?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe the method(s) used:

10% of respondents were polled again through mail with a shortened questionnaire.

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: 10_____ %

Response Rate

31. What was the response rate of the survey that the CSES Module appeared in? Please show your calculations. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the response rate of the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

Response rate was 61%

I- complete interviews (over 90% of questions answered) - 1000

P- partial interviews (70-90% questions answered) – 0

M- break offs (less than 70% questions answered) – 0

M- refusal (unknown eligibility) – 428

K- refusal (known eligibility) – 247

MK- eligible respondent not available after three visits – 29

MK- non-contact after three visits (unknown eligibility) – 363

M- not eligible – 269

M-other non-contact – 177

$$RR=I+P/(I+P+K+MK)=1000/(1000+0+247+(29+363))=0.61$$

32. Please provide the following statistics for the survey that the CSES Module appeared in. Note: If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the statistics for the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

| | |
|---|-------------|
| A. Total number of households in sample: | <u>2513</u> |
| B. Number of valid households: | <u>1453</u> |
| C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households: | <u>269</u> |
| D. Number of households of unknown validity: | <u>791</u> |
| E. Number of completed interviews: | <u>1000</u> |
| F. Number of partial interviews: | <u>0</u> |
| G. Number of refusals and break-offs: | <u>247</u> |
| H. Number non-contact (never contacted): | <u>29</u> |
| I. Other non-response: | <u>177</u> |

The sum of B+C+D should equal the value of A. If not, please describe why:

If statistic D (number of households of unknown validity) has a value greater than zero (0), please estimate the proportion of households of unknown validity that are valid:

The sum of E+F+G+H+I should equal the value of B. If not, please describe why:

If statistic I has a value greater than zero (0), please describe what cases fall into this category:

Non-residential building, vacant residential building

33. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, how many waves were conducted prior to the wave that included the CSES Module?

N/A

34. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, what was the total panel attrition between the first wave of the study and the wave that included the CSES Module? Please show your calculations.

N/A

35. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the number of completed interviews for the wave that included the CSES Module:

N/A

36. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the following statistics for panel attrition by age and education. In each cell, indicate the percent of all completed interviews in each category for the indicated wave.

N/A

| Age | First wave of study | Wave that included CSES |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 18-25 | % | % |
| 26-40 | % | % |
| 41-64 | % | % |
| 65 and over | % | % |

| Education | First wave of study | Wave that included CSES |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| None | % | % |
| Incomplete primary | % | % |
| Primary completed | % | % |
| Incomplete secondary | % | % |
| Secondary completed | % | % |
| Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational | % | & |
| University incomplete | % | % |
| University degree | % | % |

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

37. Are weights necessary to make the sample representative of the population being studied?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

A weight combining gender, ethnicity, region and rural-urban nature of settlement was calculated based on data from the Population Register. No subpopulation was purposefully oversampled.

38. Are weights included in the data file?

Yes

No

39. If weights are included in the data file, please describe in detail how the weights were constructed:

The combined weight was calculated based on the Population Registers data on the breakdown of the eligible voters according to the following categories:

- *Type of settlement:*
 - *urban*
 - *rural*
- *Gender:*
 - *male*
 - *female*
- *Ethnicity:*
 - *Estonian*
 - *non-Estonian*
- *Region:*
 - *Northern Estonia*
 - *Western Estonia*
 - *Central Estonia*
 - *North-Eastern Estonia*
 - *Southern Estonia*

40a. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

40b. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to match known demographic characteristics of the population?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

See question 39.

40c. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct for non-response?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

40d. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct to the official election results?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

41. Comparison of Completed Interviews to Population (please provide as percentages of the total):

| Characteristic | Population Estimates* | Completed Interviews | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | Unweighted Distribution | Weighted Distribution |
| <u>Age</u> | | | |
| 18-25 | *% | 15.9 % | 16.0 % |
| 26-40 | *% | 24.4 % | 24.4 % |
| 41-64 | *% | 39.2 % | 39.2 % |
| 65 and over | *% | 20.5 % | 20.4 % |
| <u>Education</u> | | | |
| None | **% | % | % |
| Incomplete Primary | **% | 2.1 % | 2.1 % |
| Primary Completed | **% | 16.9 % | 16.9 % |
| Incomplete Secondary | **% | 4.1 % | 4.1 % |
| Secondary Completed | **% | 19.3 % | 19.3 % |
| Post-Secondary Trade/ Vocational | **% | 36.1 % | 35.9 % |
| University Incomplete | **% | 3.9 % | 4.0 % |
| University Degree | **% | 17.5 % | 17.6 % |
| <u>Gender</u> | | | |
| Male | 44.5 % | 43.3 % | 44.5 % |
| Female | 55.5 % | 56.7 % | 55.5 % |

* Please note that in the Estonian case, the overall population or 18 years or older differs significantly from the population that is eligible to vote. This is due to the large number of non-citizens living in Estonia. As of January 1, 2011, 84% of the permanent residents of Estonia had Estonian citizenship, 7% had Russian citizenship and 7.1% were stateless. Population estimates thus do not adequately characterize the voting age population that is eligible to vote.

**No reliable data on education is available as the Peoples Register collects information on education on a voluntary basis. Data from the last census (2000) is outdated.

42. Please indicate the source of the population estimates in the prior question. English language sources are especially helpful. Include website links or contact information if applicable.

All the estimates come from the Peoples Register administered by the Ministry of the Interior and processed by the company AS Andmevara

Ministry of Interior: <http://www.siseministeerium.ee/11577/index.php>

AS Andmevara: <http://www.andmevara.ee/pr>