Description of Sample and Data Collection

I. Country: HUNGARY

II. Type of Election (e.g. presidential; parliamentary; legislative): PARLIAMENTARY

III. Date of Election: MAY 10, 1998 (2nd round on MAY 24, 1998)

IV. Organization that Conducted the Survey Field Work: MEDIAN PUBLIC OPINION AND MARKET RESEARCH INSTITUTE LTD., URL: www.median.hu

V. Investigators Responsible for Data Collection

Name: GABOR TOKA
Affiliation: CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY
Address: CEU, NADOR UTCA 9, BUDAPEST 1051, HUNGARY
Fax: (36-1) 327 3087
Phone: (36-1) 327 3084
E-mail: TOKAG@CEU.HU

Name:
Affiliation:
Address:
Fax:
Phone:
E-mail:

Name:
Affiliation:
Address:
Fax:
Phone:
E-mail:

Name:
Affiliation:
Address:
Fax:
Phone:
E-mail:

VI. Study Design (check one)
___ Post-Election Study
_X_ Pre-/Post-Election Panel Study

VII. Dates of Interviewing
Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: 14 MAY 1998
Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: 21 MAY 1998

(If Panel Study)
Date Pre-Election Interviewing Began: 24 MARCH 1998
Date Pre-Election Interviewing Ended: 24 APRIL 1998

VIII. Mode of interview (check one)
_X_ In person, face-to-face
___ Telephone
___ Mail or self-completion supplement

IX. Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

1. Eligibility Requirements
   a) age: ___18
   b) citizenship: Yes _X_ No ___
   c) other:

2. Persons Excluded From the Sample Frame
   a) Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?
      Yes ___ No _X_ If yes, explain:

b) Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?
Yes_X_ No ___
c) Were military personnel excluded from the sample?
Yes ___ No _X_(UNLESS CURRENTLY STAYING AT INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMODATION)
d) (If telephone interview) Estimated percentage of households without a phone: ___%
e) (If telephone interview) Were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled? Yes ___ No ___
f) Other persons excluded from the sample frame: HOMELESS
g) Estimated total (a+b+c+d+e+f) percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: _2-4_ %

3.1 Sampling Method (if Face-to-Face)
a) Describe how the primary sampling units were selected:
THE CENTRAL STATISTICAL OFFICE'S CENSUS LIST SERVED AS STARTING POINT. LOCALITIES WERE STRATIFIED BY COUNTY AND POPULATION SIZE. WITHIN EACH STRATUM, PRIMARY SAMPLING POINTS WERE SELECTED WITH A PROBABILITY PROPORTIONAL TO THEIR POPULATION SIZE
Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?
Yes _x (WITH THE ABOVE CAVEATS)__ No___
b) Was there a second stage selection? Yes _X__ No ___
c) Describe the method by which the second stage sampling units were selected: A STARTING POINT FOR THE SELECTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY A RANDOM ROUTE PROCESS WAS CHOSEN IN EACH SELECTED LOCALITY WITH A BLIND HIT ON THE DETAILED MAP OF THE GIVEN LOCALITY OR EQUIVALENT METHOD. THEN, A RANDOM ROUTE PROCEDURE WAS FOLLOWED TO SELECT HOUSEHOLDS, AND KISH-GRID TO SELECT RESPONDENTS WITHIN HOUSEHOLDS.
THESE PROCEDURES WERE, OF COURSE, ONLY USED TO SELECT THE RESPONDENTS FOR THE PRE-ELECTION WAVE OF INTERVIEWS. THE CSES MODULE WAS ADMINISTERED AS PART OF THE POST-ELECTION INTERVIEWS, FOR WHICH THE INTERVIEWERS SIMPLY HAD TO RE-INTERVIEW AS MANY OF THE RESPONDENTS IN THE PRE-ELECTION WAVE AS THEY COULD GIVEN THE LIMITED TIME AVAILABLE FOR THE FIELDWORK.
Were the secondary sampling units randomly selected?
Yes _X__ No ___
d) Was a selection table used to select the respondent within the household? Yes _X__ No ___ If no, describe:
e) Under what circumstances was a sample line designated non-sample? (Check all that apply)
__X_ All members of household are ineligible
__X_ Housing unit is vacant
___ No answer at housing unit
___ Other, explain:

f) Were non-sample replacement methods used? Yes ___ No _X__
If yes describe:

3.2 Sampling Method (if telephone)
a) Describe how the sample was drawn

b) Was the sample
a random digit dial sample? Yes ___ No ___
listed sample? Yes ___ No ___
dual frame? Yes ___ No ___;
(if dual frame) % list frame: ___; % random-digit dial: ___
c) Was a selection table used to select the respondent within the household? Yes ___ No ___ If no, describe:
d) Criteria for designating a sample line non-sample. (Check all that apply)
___ All members of household ineligibles
___ Non-residential phone

___ No answer (if so), after how many calls to number? ___
___ Non-working number
___ Other, explain:

e) Were non-sample replacement methods used? Yes ___ No ___
If yes describe:

3.3 Sampling Method (if mail / self completion)
a) Describe how the sample was drawn

b) Was the sample a listed sample? Yes ___ No ___
c) Was a selection table used to select the respondent within the household? Yes ___ No ___ If no, describe:
d) Criteria for designating a sample line non-sample. (Check all that apply)
___ All members of household ineligibles
___ Housing unit is vacant
___ Other, explain:

e) Were non-sample replacement methods used? Yes ___ No ___
If yes describe:

4. Compliance
a) Pre-Study Strategies: Prior to the study was
a letter sent to respondent? Yes ___ No _x__
payment sent to respondent? Yes ___ No _x__
a token gift sent to respondent? Yes ___ No _x__
any other incentives used? Yes _x__ No ___
If yes, describe: THE CSES MODULE WAS PART OF THE SECOND WAVE OF AN ELECTION PANEL STUDY. EACH RESPONDENT TO THE FIRST WAVE WAS CONTACTED FOR THE MAY 1998 POST-ELECTION INTERVIEWS BY THE SAME INTERVIEWERS WHO THEY MET IN THE FIRST WAVE, IN MARCH-APRIL 1998.

b) During the Field Period
Maximum number of contacts with the household before declaring it non-sample: __3__
Maximum number of contacts with the household before declaring it non-interview:_3__
Maximum number of days over which a household was contacted: ____
Did interviewers vary the time of day at which they recontacted the household? Yes _x__ No ___

c) Refusal Conversion
Was an effort made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed? Yes ___ No _x__ If No (go to Section X)
Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part? Yes ___ No _x__
Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part? Yes ___ No _x__
Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer? Yes ___ No __x_
Maximum number of recontacts used to persuade respondent to be interviewed: _1____
Other methods used to persuade respondents reluctant to be interviewed to take part: THE INCOME OF THE INTERVIEWERS FROM THE POST-ELECTION INTERVIEWS WAS DEPENDENT SOLELY ON THE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS THAT THEY COULD COMPLETE WITH THE RESPONDENTS THAT THEY HAD INTERVIEWED FOR THE PRE-ELECTION WAVE. HENCE, THE INTERVIEWERS HAD STRONGER INCENTIVES THAN USUAL NOT TO ACCEPT A REFUSAL TOO EASILY.

X. Response Rate (to first wave if a panel study)

a) Total number of sample lines issued: __(ESTIMATE) 3892
b) Total number of completed interviews: __2400_____
c) Number of refusals: __(ESTIMATE)__893__
d) Number never contacted (no-contact): __(ESTIMATE)__537__
e) Other non-response: __(ESTIMATE)____5__
f) Number of lines of non-sample: __(ESTIMATE)___57__
g) Response Rate: (b/(a-f))*100: __(ESTIMATE) 62.6%_____

XI. Panel Attrition (Complete only if CSES questionnaire is administered as part of a 2-wave panel study)

a) Total number of respondents in wave I of the study: 2400
b) Number of wave I respondents re-interviewed in wave containing CSES Module: 1525
c) Percent panel attrition ((a-b)/a)*100: 36.5 %
d) Panel attrition by age: _____

Age	% Reinterviewed
18-25	_57_ %
26-40	_61_ %
41-65	_64_ %
65 & over	_69_ %

e) Panel attrition by education:

Education	% Reinterviewed
None	_-__ %
Incomplete primary	_73_ %
Primary completed	_64_ %
Incomplete secondary	____ %
Secondary completed	_61_ %
University incomplete	_-__ %
University degree	_57_ %

XII. Sample Weight

a) Are the data weighted? Yes _X_ No ___ If yes:
b) Are the data weighted to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection at the person or household level? Yes ___ No _X_
c) Are the data weighted to match known demographic characteristics of the population? Yes _X_ No ___
d) Are the data weighted to correct for non-response? Yes ___ No _X_

XIII. Description of interviewers (age, level of education, and years of experience):
N.A.
Description of interviewer training: N.A.

XIV. Comparison of Sample to Population

Characteristic	Population Estimates	Sample Estimates	
		Unweighted	Weighted

Age					
18-25	N.A.%		10.1%	15.3%	
26-40		N.A.%		23.2%	26.9%
41-66	N.A.%		42.7%	40.0%	
65 and over	N.A.%		24.0%	17.9%	
18-29	23.4%		15.2%	22.9%	
30-39		16.5%		15.9%	17.0%
40-59	35.0%		34.4%	35.1%	
60 and over	25.0%		34.4%	25.0%	
Education					
None	- %		- %	- %	
(None and) incomplete primary	15.2%		13.8%	14.2%	
Primary completed	50.1%		46.9%	46.0%	
Incomplete secondary	- %		4.2%	4.6%	
Secondary completed	24.0%		21.6%	20.9%	
Post-secondary trade / vocational school	- %		2.0%	2.0%	
Incomplete university	- %		1.4%	1.8%	
University degree	10.7%		10.0%	10.5%	
Gender					
Male	46.9%		40.0%	46.7%	
Female	53.1%		60.0%	53.3%	

XV. Languages used in the interviews. List: HUNGARIAN

NOTE ON WEIGHTING:

The weight variable supplied with the Hungarian micro-data was created using the following information:
(1) The number of Budapest residents and
(2) the number of cases in the cells of a four-way cross-table (gender BY a seven-category age variable BY a three-category education variable BY an urban/rural residence dummy) in the 18+ year old Hungarian citizen population as estimated by the 1997 microcensus of the Central Statistical Office of the Hungarian government; and
(3) the respective frequencies from the Hungarian micro-data for the CSES study.

The weighting variable was constructed in four steps. First, 40 demographic groups were defined by collapsing some of the cells in the above-mentioned four-way cross-table so that each group had an estimated size between 94301 and 360969 in the adult population, and an observed frequency between 11 and 79 in the unweighted CSES micro-data. Next, a dummy variable called BP was created. Thirdly, the frequency of the 40 groups defined in step 1 was calculated in the CSES micro-data weighted by variable BP. Fourth, the value of the weight variable deposited with the CSES micro-data was calculated for each respondent as:

Wij= BPij * (NCENSUSi/NCSESi) * (1525/7904813),

Where
Wij= is the value of the weight variable for the jth member of the ith demographic group in the CSES micro-data;
BP is a dummy variable coded 0.183/0.123 if the respondent was a Budapest resident and 0.817/0.877 otherwise. The numbers in the denominators for these codes show the proportion of the respective group in the adult population as estimated by the 1997 micro-census. The numbers in the divisors show the observed proportion of the respective group in the unweighted CSES micro-data;
NCENSUSi is the number of cases in the ith demographic group in the 18+ years old Hungarian citizen population as estimated by the 1997 micro-census;
NCSESi is the number of cases in the ith demographic group in the CSES micro-data weighted by variable BP; and

the multiplier 1525/7904813 shows the relative size of the unweighted number of respondents for the CSES-module in Hungary compared to the size of the 18+ years old Hungarian citizen population, as estimated by the 1997 micro-census.

The slightly odd way of adjusting the weight variable so as to reflect the true proportion of Budapest residents in the weighted sample was prompted by the concern with the particularly low panel retention rate in that city, which accounts for over 18 percent of the voting-age population. However, by splitting the 40 demographic groups defined in step 1 any further would have produced some categories with very low frequencies in the CSES micro-data, and possibly some outliers on the resulting weight variable. Instead, the weight variable deposited with the micro-data sets approximately right both the proportion of the 40 demographic groups and the proportion of Budapest residents in the weighted data while the range of values on the weighting variable remains reasonably narrow. The price to be paid for achieving the two goals simultaneously is that the composition of the weight variable does not reflect the fact that the joint distribution of age, gender and education is slightly different in the capital city than in other urban municipalities.