

**Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)
Module 4: Design Report (Sample Design and Data Collection Report)**

September 10, 2012

Country: Romania

Date of Election: December 9th 2012

Prepared by:

Mircea Comşa, Department of Sociology, Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca

Andrei Gheorghişă, Centre for Social Research, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu

Date of Preparation: December 30, 2016

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 COMŞA Title: Professor Organization: Department of Sociology, Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania Address: Bd. 21 Decembrie 1989, Nr. 128, 400604 – Cluj-Napoca, Jud. Cluj, România Telephone: +40-264-424674 Fax: +40-264-424674 E-Mail: mirceacomsa@gmail.com Website: www.socasis.ubbcluj.ro	Name: FLORIN N. FEŞNIC Title: Researcher Organization: Center for the Study of Democracy, Department of Political Science, Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj- Napoca, Romania Address: Str. Minerilor, Nr. 85, Sala 302, 400132 – Cluj-Napoca, Jud. Cluj, România Telephone: +40-264-431505 Fax: +40-264-406054 E-Mail: fesnic@fspac.ro Website: www.democracycenter.ro
--	--

<p>Name: ANDREI GHEORGHITĂ Title: Associate Professor Organization: Centre for Social Research, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania Address: Str. Lucian Blaga, Nr. 2-4, Corp A, Et. 3, Sala SA3-1, 550024 – Sibiu, Jud. Sibiu, România Telephone: +40-269-212970 Fax: +40-269-212970 E-Mail: andrei.gheorghita@ulbsibiu.ro Website: web.ulbsibiu.ro/andrei.gheorghita</p>	<p>Name: GABRIEL BĂDESCU Title: Professor Organization: Center for the Study of Democracy, Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania Address: Str. G-ral Traian Moşoiu, Nr. 71, 400132 – Cluj-Napoca, Jud. Cluj, România Telephone: +40-264-406054 Fax: +40-264-406054 E-Mail: badescu@fspac.ro Website: www.democracycenter.ro</p>
<p>Name: CLAUDIU D. TUFIS Title: Associate Professor Organization: Department of Political Science, University of Bucharest Address: Str. Sf. Ştefan, Nr. 24, 023997 – Bucureşti, România Telephone: +40-21-3139007 Fax: +40-21-3125378 E-Mail: claudiu.tufis@fspub.unibuc.ro Website: http://www.tufis.ro</p>	<p>Name: CRISTINA STĂNUŞ Title: Associate Professor Organization: Department of Political Science, International Relations, and Security Studies, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, România Address: Calea Dumbrăvii, Nr. 34, Et. 2, Sala 10, 550324 – Sibiu, Jud. Sibiu, România Telephone: +40-269-422169 Fax: +40-269-422169 E-Mail: cristina.stanus@ulbsibiu.ro Website: web.ulbsibiu.ro/cristina.stanus</p>
<p>Name: BOGDAN VOICU Title: Principal Research Fellow Organization: Research Institute for the Quality of Life, Romanian Academy Address: Calea 13 Septembrie, Nr. 13, 050711 – Bucureşti, România Telephone: +40-21-3182461 Fax: +40-21-3182462 E-Mail: bogdan@iccv.ro Website: www.iccv.ro</p>	<p>Name: CAMIL POSTELNICU Title: Researcher Organization: Department of Sociology, Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania Address: Bd. 21 Decembrie 1989, Nr. 128, 400604 – Cluj-Napoca, Jud. Cluj, România Telephone: +40-264-424674 Fax: +40-264-424674 E-Mail: camilpostelnicu@yahoo.com Website: www.socasis.ubbcluj.ro</p>

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: KANTAR TNS (CSOP)
Address: 1 Louis Blanc Street, Louis Blanc Offices, District 1, Bucharest,
Romania
Telephone: +40-31-8055362/63
Fax:
E-Mail: office@tns-csop.ro
Website: <http://www.csop.ro/>

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: Unitatea Executivă pentru Finanțarea Învățământului Superior,
a Cercetării Dezvoltării și Inovării - UEFISCDI
(Research Grant PN II-IDEI 233/2011 “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: <http://uefiscdi.gov.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: mirceacomsa@gmail.com
Website: <http://resproject.wordpress.com/>

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive:
2017

Study Design

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

- Post-Election Study n=1,203
- Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study n=1,080
- Between Rounds

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:
 December 15th 2012

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:
 January 30th 2013

3. Mode of interviewing for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared:
 (If multiple modes were used, please mark all that apply.)

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

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

- Yes n=1,080
- No n=1,203

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:

1,080 respondents were included in a 2-wave panel survey:

1 st wave	Pre-election	October 30 th 2012 – December 9 th 2012	Face-to-face, tablet (TAPI)	1,248 respondents
2 nd wave	Post-election	December 15 th 2012 - January 30 th 2013	Face-to-face, tablet (TAPI)	1,080 respondents

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: two independent translations
- 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:

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

Note: 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?

< 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.

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?

<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:

<0.5%

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 neighbor 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 $n * p_i / 10$ (usually not an integer).

Stage 1: Systematic selection of voting districts in each stratum proportional to their number of registered adults.

Stage 2: 10 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 10 respondents is selected in order to compensate for refusals, etc. The reserve sample is only used to the degree of achieving 10 completed interviews per PSU.

Design effects due to clustering:

For $\rho / \text{icc} = 0.03$: $\text{DEFFc} = 1 + (10 - 1) * 0.03 = 1.27$

For $\rho / \text{icc} = 0.05$: $\text{DEFFc} = 1 + (10 - 1) * 0.05 = 1.45$

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

Voting districts used for elections for the Local Elections in 2012.

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.

Units were selected using "Complex sample" in IBM SPSS Statistics.

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, 110 voting districts were selected (in the second stage, 10 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) x 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 5 callbacks (different days and hours)

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 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):

10 RON food coupon, approximately 3 USD (only for the participants to the panel survey).

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):

Generally, were young people (20-30 years old), at least high school, who have participated in minimum 5 similar surveys.

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

Training session of about 4 hours: interviewers were trained on selection procedures, questionnaire, etc.

Contacts

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

1.93

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**?

1.58 on average

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

1.58 on average

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

11

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:

Different days and different hours.

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?

10 RON food coupon, approximately 3 USD (only for the participants to the panel).

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

Note: If multiple modes of interviewing were used for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared, please repeat the following questions as appropriate for each of the modes used.

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.)

Survey	Period	Data collection	Interview mode	No of	No of cases	Response rate
1 st wave	Pre-election	October 30 th 2012 – December 9 th 2012	Face-to-face, tablet (TAPI)	2033	1248	61.4
2 nd wave	Post-election	December 15 th 2012 - January 30 th 2013	Face-to-face, tablet (TAPI)	1248	1080	53.1 / 86.5
Cross-sectional	Post-election	December 15 th 2012 - January 30 th 2013	Face-to-face, tablet (TAPI)	1763	1203	68.3

32. Please provide the following statistics for the survey that the CSES Module appeared in. (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.)

Survey	Panel W1	Panel W2	Sectional
A. Total number of households in sample:	2033	1248	1763
B. Number of valid households:	1990	1248	1752
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	43	0	11
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	0	0	0
E. Number of completed interviews:	1248	1080	1203
F. Number of partial interviews:	0	0	0
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	347	134	423
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	305	0	81
I. Other non-response:	90	34	45

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:

The person was sick, drunk, deaf, not available for the period allocated to data collection, does not know the Romanian language, 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?

The CSES Module 4 was included in two surveys: a cross-sectional survey (n=1,203) and a 2-wave panel survey (n=1,080). The panel survey had one prior wave (pre-election).

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.

1,248 to 1,080, so response rate was 86.5 and panel attrition 13.5.

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:

1,080

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	9.5	9.9
26-40	21.7	21.9
41-64	47.1	48.1
65 and over	21.2	19.9

Education	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
None	0.4	0.5
Incomplete primary	1.9	2.2
Primary completed	5.0	4.6
Incomplete secondary	42.8	43.5
Secondary completed	25.6	26.3
Post-Secondary		
Trade/Vocational	6.5	6.0
University incomplete	0.9	1.2
University degree	15.5	15.2

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 joint distribution of several variables:

- Gender (male/female)

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

- Residence (urban/rural)

- Region (Transylvania, Muntenia, Moldavia, Bucharest)

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	Population Estimates	Sectional		Panel wave 2	
		Unweighted Distribution	Weighted Distribution	Unweighted Distribution	Weighted Distribution
<u>Age</u>					
18-34	31.5	22.3	31.5	21.8	31.5
35-49	26.8	25.1	26.8	25.6	26.8
50-64	23.4	30.6	23.4	32.6	23.4
65 and over	18.3	22.0	18.3	20.0	18.3
<u>Education</u>					
Pre-primary, primary, and lower secondary education (completed)	54.1	55.3	50.4	51.2	48.3
Upper secondary and postsecondary non- tertiary education (completed)	30.0	31.8	34.7	33.7	35.0
Tertiary education (completed)	15.9	12.9	15.0	15.4	17.0
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	48.1	52.0	47.9	45.6	48.0
Female	51.9	48.0	52.1	54.4	52.0

<u>Residence</u>					
Urban	56.1	56.4	56.6	56.9	56.1
Rural	43.9	43.6	43.4	43.1	43.9

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, CENSUS 2011)

Eurostat (<http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat>)