

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

June 05, 2006

Country: Denmark  
Date of Election: November 13<sup>th</sup> 2007  
  
Prepared by: Morten Højmoser Andersen and Jørgen Goul Andersen  
Date of Preparation: February 20<sup>th</sup> 2012

### 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: Jørgen Goul Andersen Title: Professor Organization: Dep. of Political Science Aalborg University  Address: Fibigerstræde 1 DK-9220 Aalborg Ø Denmark  Telephone: (+45) 9940 9940 Fax: E-Mail: goul@dps.aau.dk Website:	Name: Rune Stubager Title: Associate Professor Organization: Dep. of Political Science Aarhus University  Address: Bartholins Allé 7 DK-8000 Aarhus C Denmark  Telephone: (+45) 8715 0000 Fax: (+45) 8613 9839 E-Mail: stubager@ps.au.dk Website:
Name: Kasper Møller Hansen Title: Professor Organization: Dep. of Political Science University of Copenhagen Address: Øster Farimagsgade 5 DK-1353 København K. Telephone: (+45) 35323366 Fax: (+45) 35323399 E-Mail: kmh@ifs.ku.dk Website:	Name: Title: Organization:  Address:  Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: Website:

**Data Collection Organization:**

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: TNS Gallup A/S Address: Masnedøgade 22-26 DK-2100 København Ø  Telephone: (+45) 39 27 27 27 Fax: (+45) 39 27 50 80 E-Mail: Website: www.gallup.dk
---

**Funding Organization(s):**

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: The Danish Council for Independent Research, Social Sciences (FSE) Address: Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation Bredgade 40 DK-1260 Copenhagen K  Telephone: (+45) 3544 6200 Fax: (+45) 3544 6201 E-Mail: <a href="mailto:dasti@dasti.dk"><u>&lt;u&gt;dasti@dasti.dk&lt;/u&gt;</u></a> Website: <a href="http://en.fi.dk/councils-commissions/the-danish-council-for-independent-research/scientific-research-councils/social-sciences/contact">http://en.fi.dk/councils-commissions/the-danish-council-for-independent-research/scientific-research-councils/social-sciences/contact</a>
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: Dansk Data Arkiv Address: Islandsgade 10 5000 Odense C Denmark Telephone: (+45) 66 11 30 10 Fax: (+45) 66 11 30 60 E-Mail: Website: www.sa.dk/dda
---

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:

*November 21<sup>st</sup> 2007*

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

*June 12<sup>th</sup> 2008*

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:

*Of the 4.018 respondents 2.576 are from Gallup's internet panel Gallup@Forum (the data collection organization). Gallup@Forum consists of 45.000 Danes, the age of 15 and above. The sample was stratified by sex \* age, region, and education and consisted of 6.100 individuals. The remaining 1.442 respondents are from the main sample; please see section 11.*

### **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:

*Danish*

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: \_\_\_\_\_
- 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:

*All residents 18 years or more living in a private household.*

### **Eligibility Requirements**

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

Yes

No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed? *18 years or more*

9b. Must a person be a citizen to be interviewed?

Yes

No gider du lige tjekke den – det er i virkeligheden det same som ovenfor

9c. Must a person be registered to vote to be interviewed?

Yes

No (not relevant)

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

*Private household; institutionalized persons not included in sample.*

### 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? *Approximately 1 %*

If yes, please explain:

*People living in a nursing home, psychiatric hospital or prison.*

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? *0 %*

If yes, please explain:

10d. If interviews were conducted by telephone, what is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? 0 %

Please explain: *97 per cent of the adult population possesses a cell phone according to Statistics Denmark. Those (presumably old people) who don't will normally have a landline phone.*

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:

*People unable to speak Danish.*

*People who were chronically ill and therefore unable to participate.*

10g. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: 2,6 % (*estimate from 2001*)

## 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.

### *Web-panel:*

*Of the 4.018 respondents 2.576 are from Gallup's internet panel Gallup@Forum (the data collection organization). Gallup@Forum consists of 45.000 Danes at the age of 15 and above. The sample was stratified by sex \* age, region, and education and consisted of 6.100 individuals.*

### *Main survey:*

*The remaining 1.442 respondents are from a sample consisting of a number of address clusters drawn from the Ministry of the Interior. These address clusters were divided based on the population density. Each cluster consists of 4-12 addresses. A total of approximately 600 addresses were drawn (sampling points). The addresses were merged with a database consisting of 2.5m landline phone numbers as well as 2.1m cell phone numbers. The merging of addresses and phone numbers had a success rate of approximately 70 percent. After this, the first eight addresses from each cluster were passed on to the phone department for the purpose of recruiting respondents. In cases where no phone number was found on one or more addresses in a cluster there were no additional addresses added to the cluster.*

*As the recruiting progressed more addresses were added to each cluster as a replacement for drop-outs such as language problems etc. When eight to nine interviews were reached from a cluster no further addresses were activated.*

*It was necessary to draw and add more clusters. For these, the same procedure was followed.*

*Addresses where no phone number was found were contacted by CAPI interviewers.*

*Addresses where a phone number was found were contacted by phone in order to recruit a respondent. These phone numbers were contacted up to 16 times at different times during the day and week. Respondents were chosen as the person in the household who latest had a birthday. Substitution within the household was not permitted.*

*When the right respondent was met the interviewer shortly explained the purpose of the survey and tried to arrange a personal interview.*

*Respondents that did not wish to participate in this were instead offered to complete the survey by postal or web questionnaire. After this, a paper questionnaire or an email with a link to an internet based questionnaire was send. Respondents that did not complete the questionnaire within the given time frame were given two reminders. Respondents opting for the postal questionnaires were given a reminder after the deadline and 14 days later. Respondents opting for the web questionnaire were given a reminder 4 days after receiving the questionnaire and 8 after the deadline. As the recruiting was an on-going process questionnaires and reminders were send on-going.*

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

*Please see section 11.*

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

*Please see section 11.*

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.

*Please see section 11.*

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?

*Please see section 11.*

14b. Could more than one respondent be interviewed from a single household?

- Yes  
 No

If yes, please explain:

*Please see section 11.*

15. Did the sample design include clustering at any stage?

- Yes  
 No

If yes, please describe:

*Please see section 11.*

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):

*Please see section 11.*

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 16 callbacks  
 Other (Please explain):

*Address is a company, institution or holiday house.*

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:

*Please see section 11*

23. For surveys conducted on the Internet, did any respondents self-select into the survey?

- Yes  
 No

Please explain:

*Respondents were chosen from Gallup's internet panel. The panel consists of respondents from previous surveys conducted by Gallup that have agreed to be a part of the panel.*

## 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:

*Incentives worth 30.000 DKR were given the web panel. These were distributed through a draw.*

*Respondents that completed the questionnaire in the main survey participated in a draw where 30 gift each cards worth 500 DKR were distributed.*

## Interviewers

25. Please describe the interviewers (e.g., age, level of education, years of experience):

*No information (interviewers for telephone interviews relatively young, interviewers for personal interviews typically older. But no precise information available).*

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

*No information.*

## Contacts

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

*No information.*

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

*No information.*

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

*No information.*

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

*16*

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

*No information. Potentially seven months (field period).*

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 time during the day and week*

### Refusal Conversion

29a. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

Yes

No

Please describe:

*Always a bit of persuasion, but no special arrangements.*

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?

*No re-contacts*

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 were contacted by phone to control the authenticity. This was done by asking if the interview had taken place as well as asking for the respondent's age and sex.*

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified:

*10 %*

**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.)

*Web panel:*  $2576 / (6100-93) = 42,9 \%$

*Main survey:*  $1442 / (4523-1055) = 41,6\%$

*Total:*  $4018 / 9475 = 42,4\%$

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:	5295
B. Number of valid households:	<u>4523</u>
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	<u>772</u>
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	<u>0</u>
E. Number of completed interviews:	<u>1442 (+Web panel: 2576)</u>
F. Number of partial interviews:	<u>13</u>
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	<u>2013</u>
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	<u>1055</u>
I. Other non-response:	<u>0</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?

*The “panel” is Gallup’s internet panel Gallup@Forum. N/A. Otherwise no panel study.*

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:

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:

*The weight is iterative and made to match on the known characteristics of the population:  
Region\*age\*sex, education, and election result.*

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: No disproportionate probability of selection

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 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</u>	<u>Completed Interviews</u>	
		<u>Unweighted Distribution</u>	<u>Weighted Distribution</u>
<u>Age</u>			
18-25	11,57 %	6,7 %	10,8 %
26-40	25,76 %	21,7 %	24,5 %
41-64	42,65 %	46,5 %	43,7 %
65 and over	20,02 %	25,1 %	21,0 %
<u>Education</u>			
None	N/A	N/A	N/A
Incomplete Primary	N/A	N/A	N/A
Primary Completed	32,03 %	15,3 %	34,5 %
Incomplete Secondary	N/A	N/A	N/A
Secondary Completed	8,61 %	4,4 %	8,3 %
Post-Secondary Trade/ Vocational	38,32 %	43,1 %	37,1 %
University Incomplete	N/A	N/A	N/A
University Degree	21,04 %	37,2 %	20,1 %
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	49,5 %	50,3 %	49,0 %
Female	50,5 %	49,7 %	51,0 %

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.

[www.statistikbanken.dk](http://www.statistikbanken.dk)