

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

June 05, 2006

Country: Germany  
Date of Election: September, 27<sup>th</sup> 2009  
Prepared by: Wessels, Bernhard; Schlote, Sara (for the English version)  
Date of Preparation: November, 16<sup>th</sup> 2010

### 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: Bernhard Wessels Title: Prof., Dr. Organization: <u>WZB (Social Science Reserach Center)</u> Address: Reichpietschufer 50, 10785 Berlin, Germany  Telephone: xx49-30-25491-315 Fax: 0049-30-25491-345 E-Mail: <a href="mailto:wessels@wz-berlin.de">wessels@wz-berlin.de</a> Website:	Name: Hans Rattinger Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: Universität Mannheim Address: Lehrstuhl für Vergleichende Politische Verhaltensforschung Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften Universität Mannheim A5, 6 D-68131 Mannheim Telephone: 0049-(0)621-181-3556 Fax: E-Mail: <a href="mailto:hans.rattinger@uni-mannheim.de">hans.rattinger@uni-mannheim.de</a> Website: <a href="http://lsvp.uni-mannheim.de/lehrstuhlteam/prof_dr_hans_rattinger/index.html">http://lsvp.uni-mannheim.de/lehrstuhlteam/prof_dr_hans_rattinger/index.html</a>
---	--

<p>Name: Sigrid Roßteutscher Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: Universität Frankfurt Address: Robert-Mayer-Straße 5 60054 Frankfurt am Main Raum: AfE 3032 Telephone: 0049 69 798 - 22050 Fax: E-Mail: <a href="mailto:rossteutscher@soz.uni-frankfurt.de">rossteutscher@soz.uni-frankfurt.de</a> Website: <a href="http://www.gesellschaftswissenschaften.uni-frankfurt.de/srossteutscher">http://www.gesellschaftswissenschaften.uni-frankfurt.de/srossteutscher</a></p>	<p>Name: Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: Universität Mannheim Address: Lehrstuhl für Vergleichende Politische Verhaltensforschung Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften Universität Mannheim A5, 6 D-68131 Mannheim Telephone: Tel.: 0049-(0)621-181-2062 Fax: E-Mail: <a href="mailto:schmitt-beck@uni-mannheim.de">schmitt-beck@uni-mannheim.de</a> Website: <a href="http://www2.sowi.uni-mannheim.de/lspoll1/?page_id=8">http://www2.sowi.uni-mannheim.de/lspoll1/?page_id=8</a></p>
---	--

**Data Collection Organization:**

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: BIK MARPLAN Intermedia GmbH Address:  Marktplatz 9 63065 Offenbach Stadtteile: Offenbach Innenstadt, Offenbach Mitte, Offenbach Zentrum   Telephone: 0049 (0)69 80590 Fax: E-Mail: Website:
--

**Funding Organization(s):**

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft e. V. (DFG) Address: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft Kennedyallee 40 53175 Bonn Telephone: 0049 (228) 885-1 Fax: E-Mail: <a href="mailto:postmaster@dfg.de">postmaster@dfg.de</a> Website: <a href="http://www.dfg.de/service/kontakt_impresum_besucherinformation/index.html">http://www.dfg.de/service/kontakt_impresum_besucherinformation/index.html</a>
Organization: Address:    Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:

Organization: Address:  Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:
--

**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: GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften in Bonn Address: Lennéstraße 30 53113 Bonn  Telephone: 0049 228/2281-0 Fax: E-Mail: Website: <a href="http://www.gesis.org/">http://www.gesis.org/</a>
--

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

**Study Design**

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

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

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:  
September 28th 2009

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:  
November 23rd 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:

### 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:

German

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:

Most questions exist in English versions and have been taken from there; new questions have been discussed in the group and with the survey company. Back-translation was not regarded as necessary because most questions have a long tradition in (comparative) survey and election research.

- No  
 Not applicable

7b. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes, together with the other questions in the questionnaire.  
 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:

Respondents must be at least 16 years old and eligible to vote or if under 18 years theoretical eligible to vote.

### **Eligibility Requirements**

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

Yes

No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

16

(Please note that we deleted all observations under 18 within the CSES Dataset)

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

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

## 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? 4 %

If yes, please explain:

Because the sample just included persons living in private households.

10c. Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

(Military personnel with telephone in private households is vast majority in Germany, no professional army)

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? \_\_\_\_\_ %

If yes, please explain:

10g. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: \_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_ %

### **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.

The sample was applied on the ADM-Design. The ADM-Design is a three-step random-design. The Basic Population are all private households in Germany. The ADM-Design is a face to face area sample, which includes the whole populated area of Germany. It is based on a municipality - structure, which is lodged with data of communal statistics, and with the regional divisions prepared for the navigation systems. On the base of this data 53.000 areas are electronically defined, which include at least 350 and on average 700 private households.

The Sampling Points and the Households to be questioned have been already extracted, using the Adress-Random-Methode, for the Pre-Election Study Component of the GLES. The institute extracted by chance twelve households out of the remaining addresses and transmitted them to



the interviewer. The interviewer had to contact all the twelve addresses and should absolve at least six interviews within these addresses.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?  
See 16

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?  
See 16

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.  
See 16

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?  
See 16

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

See 16

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.

See 16

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

Kish-Selection-Grid

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:

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):

There is an oversampling of the “Bundeslaender” of East Germany.

The Sampling Points had been already stratified for the Pre-Election Study Component of the GLES using the ADM Sample Design. They have been stratified first by the population of Germany over 16 years and per municipality. This has been done using an allocation table, which crosses the distribution of the interviews (round about five per Sampling Point) within the stratification “Bundesland” with the ten “BIK-Gemeindegroessenklassen”, indicating the integration context of a municipality. This allocation table has been made separately for the “Bundeslaender” of the former GDR, to over represent the citizens of the new Laender. Berlin was separated in Berlin West and Berlin East on the basis of the district divisions of the State Statistical Office of Berlin Brandenburg.

A total of 250 points in the West with 1,400 interviews drawn to be implemented and 150 Points in the East with a realizable number of 700 interviews has been extracted. After defining the number of points to extract for each Stratification-Cell, the points have been arranged in descending sequence using the so called meaning-weight, within this units a random starting point has been selected. Following the step length, if more than one point had to be selected out of the cell, the extraction had been made. The step length is defined by the quotient of the number of households with the Stratification-Cell at large/number of Sampling Points to be extracted. This is done to take into account the different numbers of households per Sampling-Point. The extraction was made within the folded Face-to-Face Sample Nets which are available at Marplan.

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:

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 \_\_\_callbacks
- Other (Please explain): Language problems, Interviewer didn't use it.

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):

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):

199 Interviewers, who had experiences with the used program; the education of the interviewers took part in written form.

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

## Contacts

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

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

1,6

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

5

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?

The whole period: September 28<sup>th</sup> 2009 to November 23<sup>rd</sup> 2009 (57 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:

### 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?

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:

Respondents have been asked per mail, if the interview took place.

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.)

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:	<u>4668</u>
B. Number of valid households:	<u>4118</u>
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	<u>52</u>
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	<u>498</u>
E. Number of completed interviews:	<u>2117</u>
F. Number of partial interviews:	<u>71</u>
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	<u>1348</u>
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	<u>392</u>
I. Other non-response:	<u>190</u>

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:

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

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.

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:

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.

<b>Age</b>	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
18-25	%	%
26-40	%	%
41-64	%	%
65 and over	%	%

<b>Education</b>	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
None	%	%
Incomplete primary	%	%
Primary completed	%	%
Incomplete secondary	%	%
Secondary completed	%	%
Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational	%	&
University incomplete	%	%
University degree	%	%

**Post-Survey Adjustment Weights**

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

- Yes
- No

If yes, please explain:

See 39

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:

**Households and Household Members (transformation)**

In order to produce a representative population sample, the achieved sample is mathematically transformed retrospectively in order to ensure that each individual in the universe has theoretically the same probability of selection (in general by using the inverse of the household size as weighting factor). This was based on the specified size of the household. Only those household members have been taken into account, who could be respondents of the study, meaning only persons who are over 16 and German Citizens.

### **Weighting by Age, Sex and Education**

As a final step, the total sample is weighted to match the population distribution by Federal State, agegroups and sex, based on a target matrix defined by population census data. In case of the post Election study, education has been introduced into the weighting scheme.

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:

The new Laender (East Germany) have been oversampled. Survey includes 700 respondents from East Germany, 1400 from West Germany. The Sample can be analysed separately for East and West, or, if accordingly weighted, for Germany as a whole.

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:

See 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 (Statistical Office)</u>	<u>Completed Interviews</u>	
		<u>Unweighted Distribution</u>	<u>Weighted Distribution</u>
<u>Age</u>			
18-25	10%	9,63%	10,86 %
26-40	22,4%	23,13%	23,99%
41-64	43,11%	38,87%	40,16%
65 and over	24,5%	28,37 %	25,00 %
<u>Education</u>			
None	3,9%	1,58 %	1,65 %
Incomplete Primary			
Primary Completed			
Low Secondary ISCED 2	70,6%	76,37%	72,84%
High Secondary ISCED 3	18%	10,60 %	12,67 %
Post-Secondary Trade/ Vocational			
University Incomplete			
University Degree	7,4%	10,98%	12,33 %
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	48,5%	47,11%	48,3%
Female	51,5%	52,89%	51,7%

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.

Statistisches Jahrbuch 2010. Für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Statistisches Bundesamt, Wiesbaden 2010.