Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)
Module 3: Sample Design and Data Collection Report
June 05, 2006

Country: Japan
Date of Election: 29 July, 2008

Prepared by: Ken'ichi Ikeda & Kazunori Inamasu
Date of Preparation: August 20, 2008

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: Ken'ichi Ikeda Title: Professor Organization: The University of Tokyo Address: Hongo,Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033 Japan Telephone: +81-3-5841-3868 Fax: +81-3-3815-6673 E-Mail: ikeken@l.u-tokyo.ac.jp Website: http://www-socpsy.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/ikeda/englishv.htm	Name: Masahiro Yamada Title: Professor Organization: Kwansei-Gakuin University Address: 1-1-155 Uegahara, Nishinomiya, 662-8501 Japan Telephone: +81-798-54-6415 Fax: +81-798-54-6415 E-Mail: myamada@kwansei.ac.jp Website: http://www.kwansei.ac.jp/Contents_3999_0_14_0_4.html
Name: Yoshitaka Nishizawa Title: Professor Organization: Doshisha University Address: Imadegawa-dori, Kamigyo-ku, Kyoto, 2-8580 Japan Telephone: +81-75-251-3120 Fax: E-Mail: ynishiza@mail.doshisha.ac.jp Website: http://www1. doshisha.ac.jp/~ynishiza/	Name: Kazunori Inamasu Title: Research Associate Organization: The University of Tokyo Address: Hongo,Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033 Japan Telephone: +81-3-5841-3868 Fax: +81-3-3815-6673 E-Mail: k-inamasu@poppy.ocn.ne.jp Website:

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: CRS(Central Research Service: Chuou Chosa Co

Address: 6-16-12 Ginza, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan 104-0061

Telephone: +81 3 3549 3121
Fax: +81 3 3549 3126
E-Mail: office@crs.or.jp
Website: http://www.crs.or.jp/ehome.htm

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Address: 6 Ichibancho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-8471 Telephone: +81-3-3263-0964 Fax: +81-3-3263-9005 E-Mail: kikaku@jsps.go.jp Website: http://www.jsps.go.jp/english/index.html
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: Information Center for Social Science Research on Japan: ICSSRJ,
Institute of Social Science, The University of Tokyo
Address: Hongo, bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 113-0033, Japan

Telephone: +81-3-5841-4942
Fax: +81-3-5841-4905
E-Mail: ssjda@iss.u-tokyo.ac.jp
Website: http://ssjda.iss.u-tokyo.ac.jp/en/index.html

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive:
  To be released Spring 2009

Study Design

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:
        [X] Post-Election Study
        [ ] Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: 31 July, 2007

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: 13 August, 2007

3. Mode of (post-election) interview:
        [X] In person, face-to-face
        [ ] Telephone
        [ ] Mail or self-completion supplement
        [ ] Internet

4a. Was the survey part of a panel study?
        [X] 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:
 The survey including CSES 3 module was the 2nd wave panel data.
 The first wave survey was on Asian Barometer Survey 2, which started 23 February, 2007, and ended 12 March, 2007.

<u>Translation</u>

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?
        [X] 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:

Japanese

7a. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?
        [ ] Yes, by group discussion
        [ ] Yes, an expert checked it
        [X] Yes, by back translation
        [ ] Other; please specify: _____
        [ ] No
        [ ] Not applicable

7b. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?
        [ ] Yes
        [X] No
        [ ] Not applicable

7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?
        [ ] Yes
        [X] 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 the Japanese voters

Eligibility Requirements

9a. Must a person be a certain age to be interviewed?
     [X] Yes
     [ ] No

     If yes, what ages could be interviewed? 20 years old and older

9b. Must a person be a citizen to be interviewed?
     [X] Yes
     [ ] No

9c. Must a person be registered to vote to be interviewed?
     [X] Yes
     [ ] No

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

None

Sample Frame

10a. Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?
      [ ] Yes
      [X] 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
      [X] No

      If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

      If yes, please explain:

10c. Were military personnel excluded from the sample?
      [ ] Yes
      [X] No

      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
[X] 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: ____0___ %

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.

As the post-Election survey including CSES3 module was the second wave of a panel, the sample consisted of 2 parts.

Those who were interviewed again from the 1st wave: n=1006
Those who were sampled newly from the same PSU in the 1st wave: 1494
Total Sample was 2500.
The final N was 1373 (response rate was 54.9%)

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

 Electoral district's "*chiten*" (comparable to precinct in USA) is the PSU.

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

 Based on the population in the table of 11 region by 9 stratified city size, each "*chiten*" was randomly selected (its probability to be selected was weighted by the population in the cell of the table above).

12c. Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?
 [X] Yes
 [ ] No

 Please explain how the units were randomly selected.
 The *chiten* (precincts) were selected by PPS selection mechanism, where the probabilities of the particular *chiten*'s selection are proportional to the relative size of the *chiten*.

13. Were there further stages of selection?
 [X] Yes
 [ ] No

13a. If there were further stages of selection, what were the sampling units at each of the additional stages?

 From each *chiten*, about 8-14 samples (based on the population in each *chiten*. The average size was 13) were selected with systematic selection, as all the eligible sample are contained in the list, systematic selection of sample resulted in epsem sample from each PSU.
 Individual respondents identified as follows: The voting registry contains all the eligible voters over 20 years old, their name, gender, date of birth are listed in the frame. Once the samples are selected, their contact address along with names, gender and age were copied in the sample master file.

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
      [X] 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?

14b. Could more than one respondent be interviewed from a single household?
      [ ] Yes
      [X] No

      If yes, please explain:

15. Did the sample design include clustering at any stage?
      [ ] Yes
      [X] 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.

    [X] Yes
    [ ] No

    If yes, please describe (please include the list of characteristics used for stratification):
    Stratified based on the population in the table of 11 region by 9 stratified city size

17. Was quota sampling used at any stage of selection?
    [ ] Yes
    [X] No

    If yes, please describe:

18. Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of the selection process or during fieldwork?
    [ ] Yes
    [X] 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):

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?
    [X] Yes
    [ ] No

    Please describe:
    This was done only for the 1st wave of the survey. So the 2nd wave which includes CSES3 module, this was not done. The 1st wave survey had 1,067 valid cases from an original sample of 2,500 cases. We did additional sub-sampling which will be used for the valid cases. Including the additional cases, the sample size was 3,111 and the response rate was 34.3% (we used 611 of these as a substitute sample, if the original target was inaccessible due to a change of address, death, or long-term absence).

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?
> [X] Yes
> [ ] No

> (If yes, please provide a copy of the letter.)

24b. Prior to the study, was a payment sent to the respondent?
> [ ] Yes
> [X] No

> If yes, please describe (including amount of payment):

24c. Prior to the study, was a token gift sent to the respondent?
> [ ] Yes
> [X] 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.)
> [X] Yes
> [ ] No

> If yes, please describe (including amount of payment): 1,000 yen (about 9 US dollars)

24e. Were any other incentives used?
> [ ] Yes
> [X] No

> If yes, please describe:

Interviewers

25. Please describe the interviewers (e.g., age, level of education, years of experience):
        Though there is no general information on the educational level, we see no problem on
        this. Interviewers are generally in the age of 50s (40%) and 60s (30%). They are
        dominated by females (84%) with long experience on the average (28% have experience
        of more than 15 years, 17% more than 10 years. 5-10 years were 23%, 1-5 years 28% and
        less than 1 year was 4%).

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:
        In every year, interviewers are asked to be re-trained in every branch of the survey
        company. The purpose of retraining is on improving skills in interviews, lecturing about
        general social environmental changes relevant to social surveys, etc. In addition to this
        occasion, every interviewer receives newsletters 4 times a year which discusses new
        issues in interviewing and which gives a forum to exchange of opinions on surveys.
        Also before this survey, interviewers were asked to attend a lecture on this specific
        survey and were instructed for each of the questions.

Contacts

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

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

27c. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring
it a **non-sample?**
        From 1 to 6 times (average number is 3.25 times)

28d. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring
it a **non-interview?**
        From 1 to 6 times (average number is 4.73 times)

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

28f. During the field period, did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the
household?
        [X] Yes
        [ ] No

        If yes, please describe: In the instruction meeting, we asked the interviewers to do so.
        Also the time of the contact was recorded.

Refusal Conversion

29a. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?
[X] Yes
[ ] No

Please describe:

29b. Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part?
[ ] Yes
[X] 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
[X] No

If yes, how much?

29d. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer?
[ ] Yes
[X] 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
[X] 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?

      [X] Yes

      [ ] No

      If yes, please describe the method(s) used:

          Thirty percents of the respondents were re-contacted by mails to verify they were appropriately interviewed (as this mail contact was not within the reach of the interviewer, we were able to detect if the interview had any problem).

      If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: _100_ %

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.)

The 1st wave survey had 1,067 valid cases from an original sample of 2,500 cases. Including the additional cases, the sample size was 3,111. Then the response rate was 34.3% (we used 611 of these as a substitute sample, if the original target was inaccessible due to a change of address, death, or long-term absence).
The response rate for the second wave including CSES3 was 58.5% (76.9% for the panel sample and 45.3% for the newly recruited sample). N was 1,373

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: 2,500

        B. Number of valid households: 2,349
        C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households: 151
        D. Number of households of unknown validity: 0

        E. Number of completed interviews: 1,373
        F. Number of partial interviews: 0
        G. Number of refusals and break-offs: 660
        H. Number non-contact (never contacted):   284
        I. Other non-response: 32

        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 that zero (0), please describe what cases fall into this category:
        Respondents are too old to be able to be face-to-face interviewed, in bad health including dementia, or dead recently.

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

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.
 From the total of 1,067 respondents in the first wave, 67 showed a clear refusal for the re-interview in the future when they finished. Then 1,006 respondents were tried to contact again. However, 28 of them judged non-sample due to their inaccessible by a change of address or long-term absence. The final respondents who were successfully re-interviewed were 752. The response rate for this panel was 76.9% (752/978). The attrition rate is 23.1%.

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:
 The total sample was 1,373 (the sample who have both of the 1st and 2nd wave data is 752. The other 621 was newly recruited sample).

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.

Age	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
18-25	3.2%	4.3%
26-40	20.5%	18.1%
41-64	44.6%	46.7%
65 and over	31.7%	31.0%

Education	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
None	0.1%	0.0%
Incomplete primary	2.5%	0.4%
Primary completed	16.8%	16.9%
Incomplete secondary	1.9%	1.2%
Secondary completed	40.8%	44.9%
Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational	17.7%	17.3%
University incomplete	0.6%	2.1%
University degree	19.7%	17.3%

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

37. Are weights necessary to make the sample representative of the populated being studied?
    [X] Yes
    [ ] No

    If yes, please explain:
            As stated above, the response rate in the first wave was not high and we used
    newly recruited sample. Low response rate caused bias in demographic factors and the
    entry of new sample skewed probability of selection. Therefore, weights are required to
    compensate for the biases.

38. Are weights included in the data file?
    [X] Yes
    [ ] No

39. If weights are included in the data file, please describe in detail how the weights were
constructed:
            First, we made strata by 6 layers of age (20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, 60s, and over 70) and
    gender. Then, we constructed the weight by raking marginal distributions of the strata, 5
    city size layers (ordinance-designated cities, cities with more than 200000 citizens, cities
    with more than 100000 citizens, cities with lower than 100000 citizens, towns and
    villages), and 6 area (Hokkaido, Kanto, Chubu, Kinki, Chugoku Shikoku, and Kyusyu).

40a. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to compensate for
disproportionate probability of selection?
    [X] Yes
    [ ] No

    If yes, please describe:
            Since original sample were selected with equal probability design, sample weights
    were not required for the first wave. However, due to the disproportionate attrition by
    PSU, the entry of new sample in the latter wave caused non-equal probability sample.
    Therefore, we compensate for the disproportionate probability of selection using the
    weight with the variable which shows PSU.

40b. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to match known
demographic characteristics of the population?
    [X] Yes
    [ ] No

    If yes, please describe:

We use post-strata of age and gender using 2005 Population Census of Japan to construct the weight. Therefore it is designed to match the variables to estimates in the census.

40c. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct for non-response?
[X] Yes
[ ] No

If yes, please describe:
There is a strong relation between attrition in panel survey and city size in Japan, therefore we use the weight constructed by city size and regional distribution to treat disproportionate response rate of regions.

40d. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct to the official election results?
[] Yes
[X] No

41. Comparison of Completed Interviews to Population (please provide as percentages of the total):

Characteristic	Population Estimates	Completed Interviews	
		Unweighted Distribution	Weighted Distribution
Age			
18-25	10.1%	4.3%	7.8%
26-40	25.5%	18.1%	25.7%
41-64	37.6%	46.7%	39.8%
65 and over	26.8%	31.0%	26.7%
Education			
None	1.6%	0.4%	0.4%
Incomplete Primary			
Primary Completed	24.46%	18.1%	15.4%
Incomplete Secondary			
Secondary Completed	45.84%	44.9%	41.9%
Post-Secondary Trade/ Vocational	12.17%	19.4%	22.0%
University Incomplete			
University Degree	14.89%	17.3%	20.2%
Gender			
Male	48.8%	47.3%	48.2%
Female	51.2%	52.7%	51.8%

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.
     We used 2005 Population Census of Japan for population estimates of age and gender.
Since the survey does not have items of education, we used 2000 Population Census of Japan for estimate of education.
URL: http://www.stat.go.jp/english/data/kokusei/index.htm