

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

June 05, 2006

Country: **ROMANIA**

Date of Election: **November 22nd, 2009 (First round); December 6th, 2009 (Second round)**

Prepared by:

Mircea Comșa, Department of Sociology, Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca

Andrei Gheorghită, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu

Date of Preparation: **June 30th, 2012**

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.

| | |
|--|--|
| Name: MIRCEA COMȘA | Name: GABRIEL BĂDESCU |
| Title: Associate Professor | Title: Associate Professor |
| Organization: Department of Sociology, Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania | Organization: Center for the Study of Democracy, Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania |
| Address: Bd. 21 Decembrie 1989, Nr. 128, 400604 – Cluj-Napoca, Jud. Cluj, România | Address: Str. G-ral Traian Moșoiu, Nr. 71, 400132 – Cluj-Napoca, Jud. Cluj, România |
| Telephone: +40-264-424674 | Telephone: +40-264-406054 |
| Fax: +40-264-424674 | Fax: +40-264-406054 |
| E-Mail: mircea@mmt.ro | E-Mail: badescu@msu.edu |
| Website: socasis.ubbcluj.ro | Website: www.democracycenter.ro |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Name: ANDREI GHEORGHITĂ</p> <p>Title: Lecturer Organization: Department of Sociology and Social Work, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania</p> <p>Address: Str. Lucian Blaga, Nr. 2-4, Corp A, Et. 3, Sala MA3-7, 550024 – Sibiu, Jud. Sibiu, România</p> <p>Telephone: +40-269-212970 Fax: +40-269-212970 E-Mail: andrei.gheorghita@ulbsibiu.ro Website: web.ulbsibiu.ro/andrei.gheorghita</p> | <p>Name: CRISTINA STĂNUȘ</p> <p>Title: Researcher Organization: Department of Sociology, Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania</p> <p>Address: Bd. 21 Decembrie 1989, Nr. 128, 400604 – Cluj-Napoca, Jud. Cluj, România</p> <p>Telephone: +40-264-424674 Fax: +40-264-424674 E-Mail: cstanus@gmail.com Website: socasis.ubbcluj.ro</p> |
| <p>Name: CLAUDIU D. TUFIȘ</p> <p>Title: Researcher Organization: Research Institute for the Quality of Life, Romanian Academy</p> <p>Address: Calea 13 Septembrie, Nr. 13, 050711 – București, România</p> <p>Telephone: +40-21-3182461 Fax: +40-21-3182462 E-Mail: ctufis@iccv.ro Website: www.iccv.ro</p> | <p>Name: COCA VIERU</p> <p>Title: Research Assistant Organization: Department of Sociology, Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania</p> <p>Address: Bd. 21 Decembrie 1989, Nr. 128, 400604 – Cluj-Napoca, Jud. Cluj, România</p> <p>Telephone: +40-264-424674 Fax: +40-264-424674 E-Mail: coca_von@yahoo.com Website: socasis.ubbcluj.ro</p> |
| <p>Name: BOGDAN VOICU</p> <p>Title: Principal Research Fellow Organization: Research Institute for the Quality of Life, Romanian Academy</p> <p>Address: Calea 13 Septembrie, Nr. 13, 050711 – București, România</p> <p>Telephone: +40-21-3182461 Fax: +40-21-3182462 E-Mail: bogdan@iccv.ro Website: www.iccv.ro</p> | <p>Name: OVIDIU VOICU</p> <p>Title: Program Manager Organization: Soros Foundation Romania</p> <p>Address: Str. Căderea Bastiliei, Nr. 33, Sector 1, 010613 – București, România</p> <p>Telephone: +40-21-2121101 Fax: +40-21-2121032 E-Mail: ovoicu@soros.ro Website: www.soros.ro</p> |

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: Gallup Organization Romania
Address: Str. Londra, Nr. 6, Sector 1, 011763 – București, România
Telephone: +40-21-3181497
Fax: +40-21-3185560
E-Mail: Alexandru_Toht@gallup.ro
Website: www.gallup.ro

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: National Research Council Romania
(Research Grant PN II-IDEI 2174/2008 “Romanian Presidential Election Study, 2009”)
Address: Str. Mendeleev, Nr. 21-25, Sector 1, 010362 – București, România
Telephone: +40-21-3023850
Fax: +40-21-3115992
E-Mail:
Website: www.cncs-uefiscdi.ro

Organization: Soros Foundation Romania
Address: Str. Căderea Bastiliei, Nr. 33, Sector 1, 010613 – București, România
Telephone: +40-21-2121101
Fax: +40-21-2121032
E-Mail: ovoicu@soros.ro
Website: www.soros.ro

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: Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Department of Sociology,
Romanian Election Studies Project (RES)
Address: Bd. 21 Decembrie 1989, Nr. 128, 400604 – Cluj-Napoca, Jud. Cluj, România
Telephone: +40-264-424674
Fax: +40-264-424674
E-Mail: mircea@mmt.ro
Website: resproject.wordpress.com/

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive: 2013.

Study Design

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

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

Part of a three-wave panel survey, third wave, after presidential runoff.

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:

December 7th, 2009

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

December 20th, 2009

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:

'Romanian Presidential Election Study, 2009' included a three-wave panel survey, designed as following:

| | | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 1 st wave | Pre-election (before first round) | November 11-21, 2009 | Face-to-face interviews | 1504 respondents |
| 2 nd wave | Between the two rounds | November 28-December 4, 2009 | Telephonic interviews (CATI) | 1125 respondents |
| 3 rd wave | Post-election (after the second round) | December 7-20, 2009 | Face-to-face interviews | 1403 respondents |

The CSES 3 module was included in the third wave.

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:

Romanian

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:

There haven't been any problems in translating the questionnaire items.

Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

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

Adults (18+), Romanian citizens, non-institutionalized

Eligibility Requirements

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

Yes

No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

18+

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

In Romania, all eligible voters (18+) are registered automatically.

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

None

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?

Less than 0.25%

If yes, please explain:

*Some of the institutionalized persons (convicted) are excluded from sample frame (electoral register).
Some (hospitalized persons) are included, but could not be interviewed at home.*

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? _____ %

Please explain:

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

Yes

No

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?

Less than 0.25%

If yes, please explain:

There are people not registered by local authorities for an ID card, although it is mandatory in Romania. Thus, such people are not listed in the sample frame (electoral register).

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

Less than 0.50%

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.

Stratified two-stage probability sampling, with stratification of the primary units (voting districts, namely areas comprising a number of street allocated to a polling station) proportional to the number of secondary units (adults registered in the electoral register).

Regional stratification: voting districts are stratified with regard to 18 cultural areas and 7 types of municipalities (poor communes, medium developed communes, developed communes, cities with less than 30,000 inhabitants, cities of 30-100,000 inhabitants, cities of 100-200,000 inhabitants, cities with more than 200,000 inhabitants). Theoretically, the schema has $18 \times 7 = 126$ strata. The strata with less than 7 cases were added to the closest neighbour category, inside the same cultural area and the same type of residence (urban or rural). The resulting number of strata was of 96.

*The number of primary sampling units (PSU) to be selected within a stratum is obtained by multiplying the sample size n with the share p_i of each stratum in the electorate. The number of voting districts used for selection is obtained by $n * p_i / 8$ (usually not an integer).*

Stage 1:

Systematic selection of voting districts in each stratum proportional to their number of registered adults

Stage 2:

8 respondents are selected by systematic sampling with equal probabilities from the electoral register of each voting district selected (the main sample). A reserve sample of 8 respondents is selected in order to compensate for refusals, etc. The reserve sample is only used to the degree of achieving 8 completed interviews per PSU.

Design effects due to clustering:

*For $\rho = 0.03$: $DEFF_c = 1 + (8 - 1) * 0.03 = 1.21$*

*For $\rho = 0.05$: $DEFF_c = 1 + (8 - 1) * 0.05 = 1.35$*

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

Voting districts used for elections for the European Parliament in 2009.

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

PPS systematic selection of voting districts in each stratum proportional to their number of registered adults

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.

The voting districts were sorted by strata. For each voting district a measure of size (MOS) was computed by dividing to 8 the number of registered voters. For each stratum, a cumulative MOS was computed. For each stratum, the number of PSU to be selected was computed. The number of PSUs required for each stratum was selected using PPS systematic sampling (using SPSS syntax).

13. Were there further stages of selection?

- Yes
 No

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

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

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.

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

Systematic, from the electoral register

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:

In the first stage, 188 voting districts were selected (in the second stage, 8 respondents were selected within each voting district).

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):

cultural area (18 categories) × municipality type (7 categories) = 126 theoretical strata

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:

In the case of ineligible individuals or refusals, substitution with an individual selected from the reserve sample was permitted.

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

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

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

Yes

No

Please describe:

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

Yes

No

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 respondents 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):

10 RON, approximately 3 USD

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):

Age categories:

| | |
|-------|-------|
| 18-25 | 17.9% |
| 26-40 | 33.0% |
| 41-64 | 43.4% |
| 65+ | 5.7% |

Education:

| | |
|--|-------|
| Incomplete secondary | 1.0% |
| Secondary completed | 19.2% |
| Post-secondary trade/vocational school | 14.5% |
| University undergraduate degree incompleting | 9.5% |
| University undergraduate degree completed | 55.8% |

Gender:

| | |
|--------|-----|
| Male | 33% |
| Female | 67% |

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

Training session of about 3 hours: interviewers were trained on selection procedures, questionnaire.

Contacts

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

1.25

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

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

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

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

3 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:

Monday to Friday (afternoon), Saturday to Sunday (all day).

Refusal Conversion

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

- Yes
 No

Please describe:

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?

1

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:

In the field, face-to-face and by phone

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

20 %

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.)

63.2% in the first wave of the panel survey

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: | 3157 |
| B. Number of valid households: | 2219 |
| C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households: | 832 |
| D. Number of households of unknown validity: | 106 |
| E. Number of completed interviews: | 1504 |
| F. Number of partial interviews: | 0 |
| G. Number of refusals and break-offs: | 473 |
| H. Number non-contact (never contacted): | 162 |
| I. Other non-response: | 80 |

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:

We cannot estimate.

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:

The person was sick, drunk, deaf, or other reason.

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

2 (first face-to-face, second by phone)

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.

*6.7%
From 1504 to 1403 (attrition = 101 respondents).*

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:

1403

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.

| Age | First wave of study | Wave that included CSES |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 18-25 | 10.2% | 10.0% |
| 26-40 | 22.3% | 22.5% |
| 41-64 | 42.6% | 42.6% |
| 65 and over | 24.9% | 24.9% |

| Education | First wave of study | Wave that included CSES |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| None | 1.8% | 1.6% |
| Incomplete primary | 2.8% | 1.6% |
| Primary completed | 9.6% | 9.7% |
| Incomplete secondary | 42.2% | 43.8% |
| Secondary completed | 21.5% | 21.5% |
| Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational | 7.6% | 7.1% |
| University incomplete | 1.9% | 1.9% |
| University degree | 11.8% | 11.5% |

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

Due to differential response rates across socio-demographic categories, weights are necessary.

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:

weights = population structure / sample structure

The structure is defined by several variables simultaneously:

- Gender (male/female)

- Age categories (18-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+)

- Residence (urban/rural)

- Education (at least lower secondary, upper secondary, post-secondary/university)

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:

Please refer to 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 | <u>Population Estimates</u> | <u>Completed Interviews</u> | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | <u>Unweighted Distribution</u> | <u>Weighted Distribution</u> |
| <u>Age</u> | | | |
| 18-25 | 15.7% | 10.0% | 15.8% |
| 26-40 | 28.2% | 22.5% | 27.9% |
| 41-64 | 37.7% | 42.6% | 38.1% |
| 65+ | 18.4% | 24.9% | 18.1% |
| <u>Education</u> | | | |
| Pre-primary, primary, and lower secondary education | 31.4% | 34.6% | 33.4% |
| Upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education | 57.6% | 53.7% | 54.2% |
| Tertiary education | 11.0% | 11.7% | 12.4% |
| <u>Gender</u> | | | |
| Male | 48.3% | 45.8% | 48.2% |
| Female | 51.7% | 54.2% | 51.8% |

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.

*National Institute of Social and Economic Statistics (INS, www.insse.ro)
Eurostat (ec.europa.eu/eurostat)*