

## Comparative Study of Electoral Systems

### Description of Sample and Data Collection

I. Country: **Poland**

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

III. Date of Election: **21 September 1997**

IV. Organization that Conducted the Survey Field Work: **CBOS (*Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej*)**

V. Investigators Responsible for Data Collection

Name: Krzysztof Jasiewicz  
Affiliation: Washington and Lee University  
Address: Department of Sociology, Washington and Lee University,  
Lexington, VA 24450-0303, USA  
Fax: 1 540 463-8498  
Phone: 1 540 463-8790  
E-mail: jasiewicz@wlu.edu

Name: Radosław Markowski  
Affiliation: Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences  
Address: ul. Polna 18/20, 00-625 Warszawa, Poland  
Fax: +48 22 252146  
Phone: +48 22 255221  
E-mail: rmark@isppan.waw.pl

VI. Study Design (check one)

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

VII. Dates of Interviewing

Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: 29 September 1997  
Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: 6 October 1997

(If Panel Study)

Date Pre-Election Interviewing Began: N/A  
Date Pre-Election Interviewing Ended: N/A

VIII. Mode of interview (check one)

- 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  No
- c) other:

2. Persons Excluded From the Sample Frame

- a) Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?  
Yes  No  If yes, explain:
- b) Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?  
Yes  No
- c) Were military personnel excluded from the sample?  
Yes  No
- 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 (50,000-200,000)
- g) Estimated total (a+b+c+d+e+f) percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: 0 %

3.1 Sampling Method (if Face-to-Face)

- a) Describe how the primary sampling units were selected:  
Statistical districts (as defined by the Main Statistical Office) selected by Probability Proportional to Size method in regions.  
Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?  
Yes  No
- b) Was there a second stage selection? Yes  No
- c) Describe the method by which the second stage sampling units were selected:  
Random selection of addresses in statistical districts.  
Were the secondary sampling units randomly selected?  
Yes  No
- d) Was a selection table used to select the respondent within the household? Yes  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   
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 ineligible  
 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   
 If yes, describe:
- 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: 3  
 Maximum number of days over which a household was contacted: 9  
 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:

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

a) Total number of sample lines issued:	2,800
b) Total number of completed interviews:	2,003
c) Number of refusals:	232
d) Number never contacted (no-contact):	260
e) Other non-response:	11
f) Number of lines of non-sample:	160
g) Response Rate: $(b/(a-f))*100$ :	75.7%

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: \_\_\_\_\_  
 b) Number of wave I respondents re-interviewed in wave containing CSES  
 Module: \_\_\_\_\_  
 c) Percent panel attrition  $((a-b)/a)*100$ : \_\_\_\_\_

d) Panel attrition by age: \_\_\_\_\_

Age % Reinterviewed

18-25 \_\_\_\_\_ %

26-40 \_\_\_\_\_ %

41-65 \_\_\_\_\_ %

65 & over \_\_\_\_\_ %

e) Panel attrition by education:

Education % Reinterviewed

None \_\_\_\_\_ %

Incomplete primary \_\_\_\_\_ %

Primary completed \_\_\_\_\_ %

Incomplete secondary \_\_\_\_\_ %

Secondary completed \_\_\_\_\_ %

University incomplete \_\_\_\_\_ %

University degree \_\_\_\_\_ %

## XII. Sample Weight

a) Are the data weighted? Yes  No  If yes:

b) Are the data weighted to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection at the person or household level? Yes  No

c) Are the data weighted to match known demographic characteristics of the population? Yes  No

d) Are the data weighted to correct for non-response? Yes  No

## XIII. Description of interviewers (age, level of education, and years of experience):

Mean age 41 years; 51% mean, 45% women (6% N/A); education: 2% less than secondary, 21% secondary, 17% some college, 48% college (14% N/A); mean No. of years of experience 4.

Description of interviewer training:

Two stage training: (1) Local coordinators trained at the CBOS headquarters in Warsaw. Extensive training, with special attention devoted to atypical and unusual formats (including CSES module), responses to trainees questions given by investigators. (2) Interviewers trained by coordinators in their localities.

#### XIV. Comparison of Sample to Population

Characteristic	Population Estimates	Sample Estimates	
		Unweighted	Weighted
<b>Age</b>			
18-25 (18-24)	14.2%	9.3%	13.9%
26-40 (25-44)	40.2%	39.0%	40.0%
41-66 (45-65)	29.2%	32.2%	30.5%
65 and over	16.4%	19.4%	15.5%
<b>Education</b>			
None	5.6%	5.5%	4.3%
Incomplete primary			
Primary completed	57.9%	55.5%	55.7%
Incomplete secondary			
Secondary completed	26.3%	25.7%	26.1%
Post-secondary trade / vocational school	2.7%	4.4%	5.1%
Incomplete university			
University degree	7.3%	8.8%	8.8%
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	47.3%	45.0%	47.3%
Female	52.7%	55.0%	52.7%

#### XV. Languages used in the interviews. List: Polish