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: GÁBOR 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:

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

VII. Dates of Interviewing
   Date Pre-Election Interviewing Began: 24 MARCH 1998
   Date Pre-Election Interviewing Ended: 24 APRIL 1998
   (If Panel Study)
   Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: 14 MAY 1998
   Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: 21 MAY 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 ACCOMMODATION)

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: ___% 

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) Were there a second stage selection?
   Yes ___ No X

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.
   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)
      ___ All members of household are ineligible
      ___ 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 ineligible
   ___ 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 ___
   payment sent to respondent? Yes ___ No ___
   a token gift sent to respondent? Yes ___ No ___
   any other incentives used? Yes ___ No ___

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

c) Refusal Conversion
   Was an effort made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed? Yes ___ No ___
   If No (go to Section X) Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part? Yes ___ No ___
   Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part? Yes ___ No ___
   Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer? Yes ___ No ___
   Maximum number of recontacts used to persuade respondent to be interviewed: ___
   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) 883
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Population Estimates</th>
<th>Sample Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unweighted</td>
<td>Weighted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Estimates
Age
18-25 N.A.% 10.1% 15.3%
26-40 N.A.% 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 38.0% 34.4% 35.1%
60 and over 25.0% 34.4% 25.0%

Education
None - % - % - %
(Non 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 - % - % - %
Incomplete university 2.0% 2.0%
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 360769 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:

\[ W_{ij} = \frac{B_{ij} \times (N_{CNSUSI}/N_{CSES}) \times (1525/7904813)}{}, \]

Where
\[ W_{ij} \] 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 denominators show the observed proportion of the respective group in the unweighted CSES micro-data;
N_{CNSUSI} 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;
N_{CSES} 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.