

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

June 05, 2006

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Country: | Netherlands |
| Date of Election: | 9 June 2010 |
| Prepared by: | Henk van der Kolk |
| Date of Preparation: | 9-11-2012 (unfinished version 1) |

Collaborator(s):

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: Henk van der Kolk Title: Dr. Organization: University of Twente Address: PO Box 217 Telephone: ++ 31 53 4893281 E-Mail: h.vanderkolk@utwente.nl Website: http://www.utwente.nl/mb/pa/staff/kolk/ | Name: Kees Aarts Title: Prof. dr. Organization: University of Twente Address: PO Box 217 Telephone: ++ 31 53 4893251 E-Mail: c.w.a.m.aarts@utwente.nl Website: http://www.utwente.nl/mb/pa/staff/aarts/ |
| Both acted on behalf of Stichting Kiezersonderzoek Nederland (SKON) (Foundation for Dutch Electoral research See: www.dpes.nl | |

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

| |
|---|
| Organization: Statistic Netherlands Address: Office address: CBS-weg 11 6412 EX Heerlen Postal address: Postbus 4481, 6401 CZ Heerlen Telephone: +31 (0)45 570 60 00 Website: www.cbs.nl |
|---|

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

| |
|---|
| Organization: Statistic Netherlands Address: Office address: CBS-weg 11 6412 EX Heerlen Postal address: Postbus 4481, 6401 CZ Heerlen Telephone: +31 (0)45 570 60 00 Website: www.cbs.nl |
|---|

| |
|--|
| Organization: Ministry of the Interior Address: The Hague Website: http://www.government.nl/ministries/bzk |
|--|

| |
|---|
| Organization: Nederlands Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (Dutch Science Foundation) Gebouw Java: Laan van Nieuw Oost-Indië 300, Den Haag Gebouw Borneo: Anna van Saksenlaan 51, Den Haag PO Box 93138 - 2509 AC The Hague Tel +31 (0)70 344 06 40 – fax +31 (0)70 385 09 71 e-mail: nwo@nwo.nl |
|---|

| |
|---|
| Organization: University of Twente Address: PO Box 217 7500 AE Enschede Netherlands Telephone: +31 53 4893270 Fax: E-Mail: Website: www.utwente.nl |
|---|

Organization: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP)
Address: P.O. Box 16164
2500 BD The Hague
The Netherlands
Telephone: +31 70 340 7000
Fax:
E-Mail:
Website: www.scp.nl

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: Data Archiving and Network Services (DANS) PO box 93067 2509 AB The Hague Bezoekadres Anna van Saksenlaan 10 2593 HT The Hague T: 070 3446484 E: info@dans.knaw.nl |
|---|

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive: now (archived under number <https://easy.dans.knaw.nl/ui/datasets/id/easy-dataset:50534>)

Study Design

Please note that the study design is extensively discussed in: CBS (2011) *Verkiezingen: Participatie, Vertrouwen en Integratie*, CBS: Voorburg (in Dutch only)

See for a pdf version: <http://www.cbs.nl/NR/rdonlyres/920D38EF-DE95-45C0-8BF3-F54721BB2622/0/2011g62pub.pdf>

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:

10 June 2010

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

22 July 2010

3. Mode of (post-election) interview:

- In person, face-to-face (see under 4b)
- Telephone
- Mail or self-completion supplement
- Internet

4a. Was the survey part of a panel study?

- Yes
-

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.

Respondents were randomly approached before the elections of 2010. All respondents who in the pre-election interview had not objected to being re-approached were contacted again after the election (short term panel). After the post-election interview, a drop-off questionnaire has been left with the respondent to fill out and send to Statistics Netherlands.

Translation

Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used as part of the election study deposit. (questionnaires added as separate files) For questionnaires in a language other than English, please also provide a version of each translated back into English (none are available)

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:

Dutch

7a. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?

- Yes, by group discussion and as part of the larger pre-testing program of the Dutch Parliamentary Election Study
- 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, again, as part of the larger pre-testing program of the Dutch Parliamentary Election Study
- No
- Not applicable

7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

8. Please describe the population that your sample is meant to be representative of:

The Dutch Electorate of the 2010 elections

Eligibility Requirements

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

Yes

No, not in addition to eligibility requirements (being over 18)

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

Yes, because otherwise the person is not eligible

No

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

Yes, but voter registration is automatic, based on population records

No

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

People should not be institutionalized (hospitals, jails).

Sample Frame

10a. Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?

Yes

No, The Wadden isles in the North Sea have been excluded because of logistic problems of sending interviewers there. And some postal codes in South-Eastern Amsterdam have been excluded because these areas are not considered to be safe at every time of the day.

This is less than 0,01% of the population.

10b. Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

Yes, 1,5%

No

10c. Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

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

INAP, phone interviews were only conducted if interviewers were unable to contact people personally.

10e. If interviews were conducted by telephone, were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?

INAP, phone interviews were only conducted if interviewers were unable to contact people personally.

10f. Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

Yes, persons who had been approached for another study by Statistics Netherlands in the previous year.

No

In total less than 3,5 percent from the eligible population was excluded.

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.

Persons were selected on the basis of official population records, these are fairly accurate in The Netherlands. Most interviews were done face to face. Some individuals that we were unable to contact were contacted by phone or mail.

Selection was done in a two-step procedure. The first step selects primary sampling units (municipalities). Based on a set minimum number of successful interviews of 12, a desired net post-election sample size of at least 1,800, and an estimated response rate of 55 percent, municipalities were drawn with a weight proportional to the number of enfranchised voters. In the second step, a constant number of persons to be approached was drawn from the electoral registers in the selected municipalities. The product of these two steps ensured that the inclusion probability was the same for all enfranchised voters.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

Municipalities

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

4000

12c. Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

Yes

No, but with known probabilities

A two stage sampling procedure was used in which first some **municipalities** were selected with inclusion probabilities on the basis of population size (including three self-selecting municipalities; the biggest municipalities). Within the municipalities random selection of **persons** was used.

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?

Persons

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

See above – with probability inversely related to size of enfranchised population of municipality.

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.

From electoral register

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

Electoral register contains name, address, gender, age.

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

Yes – but quite unlikely. It is a persons' sample, so it is possible to end up with two persons from the same household.

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

Yes, in the selection of municipalities, however, in 2010 a cluster size of 1 was used, making it in effect a simple sample of persons (CBS, 2011, p. 40-41).

No

16. Did the sample design include stratification?

Yes, only for convenience purposes, first municipalities were selected.

No

17. Was quota sampling used at any stage of selection?

Yes

No

18. Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of the selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes

No

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): it was not a sample of households. Persons were not selected if no Dutch citizenship; part of another Statistics Netherlands sample in past year; incomplete information from register; area outside the sample (see above); institutionalized persons; surplus addresses

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?

Yes

No

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, some received a set of the most commonly used stamps, value €4.00, others a gift certificate. Response differences were not significantly different between the two groups.

No

24d. Did respondent receive an additional payment after their participation? (Do not include any payment made prior to the study.)

Yes

No

24e. Were any other incentives used?

Yes

No

Interviewers

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

Mostly female, above 40, experienced and well trained by the fieldwork organization

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

Extensive interviewer training sessions, in five separate days on five locations all over the country. Interviewers received an electronic questionnaire prior to the training so that they could practice the interview. They also received extensive paper documentation on the Dutch Parliamentary Election Study. During the training days, all interviewers had to participate in 4 “stations”, each taking circa 50 minutes. The “stations” covered the topics: getting respondent cooperation; quiz and questions (on the election study); norms and values; practicing the interview.

Contacts

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

Maximum of 6

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

Unknown

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

?

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

6

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

In the first wave (before the elections) 6 weeks.
In the second wave (after the elections) also 6 weeks

28f. During the field period, did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household?

Yes, interviewers were stimulated to contact sample units at different moments during the day.

No

Refusal Conversion

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

Yes (see CBS 2011, p. 24).

No

29b. Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part?

Yes, they were contacted either with a mail questionnaire, or, if the telephone number was available, by CATI.

No

29c. Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part?

Yes

No

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?

Non-respondents were contacted by mail or by telephone.

29f. Were any other methods used to persuade respondents reluctant to be interviewed to take part?

Yes

No

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:

It was a person based sample. The interviewers knew address, gender and day of birth and marital status. These were checked with a series of questions at the beginning of the interview. This means the interviewer verified whether the correct person was interviewed. The fieldwork organization checked whether the interviews took place (no additional information available).

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 most conservative estimate of the response levels is 62,4 percent (first wave), 53,8% (first *and* second wave) and 41,7% (first, second wave and questionnaire). A more positive view on response in the first wave (excluding errors in the sampling frame and including all CAPI, CATI and PAPI and aborted interviews) is 65,9%.

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.)

| <i>FACE TO FACE</i> | First wave | | Second wave | | Drop off questionnaire | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Sample | 4.000 | 100,0% | 2494 | 100,0% | 2.089 | 100,0% | |
| Refusals right after interview | | | 97 | 3,9% | 64 | 3,1% | |
| Error in sample | | | | | | | |
| Died | 6 | 0,2% | | | | | |
| Moved abroad | 8 | 0,2% | | | | | |
| Unknown | 16 | 0,4% | | | | | |
| Institution/elderly home | 27 | 0,7% | 1 | 0,0% | | | |
| Other reasons | 0 | 0,0% | | | | | |
| <i>Total</i> | 57 | 1,4% | | | | | |
| Effective sample | 3.943 | 100,0% | | | | | |
| Administrative Non-response | | | | | | | |
| Language barrier | 65 | 1,6% | 1,6% | 1 | 0,0% | | |
| Returned | 30 | 0,8% | 0,8% | 18 | 0,7% | | |
| Moved in the Netherlands | 95 | 2,4% | 2,4% | 4 | 0,2% | | |
| <i>Total</i> | 190 | 4,8% | 4,8% | | | | |
| Non-response | | | | | | | |
| Refusal | 804 | 20,1% | 20,4% | 89 | 3,6% | | |
| No contact | 180 | 4,5% | 4,6% | 31 | 1,2% | | |
| No opportunity during field work period | 254 | 6,4% | 6,4% | 93 | 3,7% | | |
| <i>Total</i> | 1.238 | | | | | 419 20,1% | |
| Response | | | | | | | |
| Complete | 2.494 | 62,4% | 63,3% | 2.153 | 86,3% | 1.668 | 79,8% |
| Aborted | 21 | 0,5% | 0,5% | 7 | 0,3% | 2 | 0,1% |
| <i>Total</i> | 2.515 | 62,9% | 63,8% | 2.160 | 86,6% | 1.670 | 79,9% |

Complete response of initial sample **62,4%** **53,8%** **41,7%**

CATI and PAPI

| | | | |
|---|-----|-------------|----------------|
| Total refusal and no contact (initial sample) | 984 | | |
| contacted PAPI or CATI | 548 | | |
| Additional response first wave | 83 | 2,1% | 2,1% |
| Contacted PAPI and CATI 2nd wave | | | 61 INAP |
| Additional response second wave | | | 54 INAP |
| Total refusal and no contact (second wave) | | | 120 |
| | | | 51 |
| | | | 17 0,7% |

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

CSES questions were predominantly, but not exclusively asked in the second 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.

(see table)

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:

(see table)

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.

An extensive analysis of response by background characteristics can be found in (CBS, 2011, p. 50-61). Population data are available (the sampling frame is pretty good) so we know how the first wave deviates from the population. Differences between first and second wave seem to strengthen some of the found deviations (country of origin), weaken others (gender) and did not affect for example age differences.

Since I guess the tables the CSES team asked for were merely meant to get some insights in possible differences between population/sampling frame and actual interviewed sample, I copied and translated the table. This one did not include education. Those that want to know the effect of panel attrition on education (of which we do not have adequate population data) are invited to consult the original data.

Table: response percentages for several groups

| | First, pre election wave | Second, post- election wave |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Response (CAPI only) | 63,2 | 54,6 |
| Age | | |
| 18–24 | 60,5 | 52,5 |
| 25–34 | 62,4 | 52,5 |
| 35–44 | 63,2 | 55,9 |
| 45–54 | 65,8 | 57,1 |
| 55–64 | 68,2 | 58,6 |
| 65–74 | 64,9 | 55,6 |
| 75 up | 50,9 | 43,1 |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 65,5 | 57,9 |
| Female | 61,1 | 51,5 |
| Marital status | | |
| Not married | 60,1 | 52,1 |
| Married | 67,1 | 58 |
| Widowed | 53,8 | 45,7 |
| Divorced | 56,5 | 48,4 |
| Urbanization | | |

| | | |
|------------|------|------|
| Very large | 60,1 | 35,6 |
| Large | 62 | 54,1 |
| Medium | 64,7 | 54,1 |
| Some | 66,6 | 59,2 |
| Not | 66,3 | 57,9 |

Region

| | | |
|-------|------|------|
| North | 63,7 | 55,3 |
| East | 67,2 | 56,7 |
| West | 59,5 | 51,2 |
| South | 66,8 | 59,3 |

Origin

| | | |
|-------------|------|------|
| Autochton | 64,8 | 57 |
| Western | 63,2 | 51,7 |
| Non-western | 45,6 | 30,5 |

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please explain: several weights are provided to correct for selective response. In the original data file, they have the names wgt1 wgt2 wgt3 wgt4 wgt5 wgt6 wgt7 and wgt8.

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:

Using population data and a multiplicative weighting procedure. Weights are explained in the datafile.

40a. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection?

- Yes
 No, it was a sample of individuals

40b. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to match known demographic characteristics of the population?

Yes (see datafile)
 No

40c. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct for non-response?

Yes
 No

40d. If weights are included in the data file, are the weights designed to correct to the official election results?

Yes, some weights are
 No

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

Since several weights were included in the original data file, we will not discuss weighted distributions. The previous table gives some insight in differences between the response and the population, although it does not give the actual size of the various groups. In (CBS, 2011, p. 66-76) consequences of weighting have been discussed, including deviations with regard to the outcome of the election (showing that deviations are small, although support for the PVV is substantially underestimated: 12% in the file 16% in the population). Population data on education are not available (at least, not that I know of).

| | population | first wave, CAPI only | second wave, CAPI only |
|---|------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| gender | | | |
| men | 49,5 | 49,9 | 51 |
| women | 50,5 | 50,1 | 49 |
| age groups | | | |
| 18-25 | 12,5 | 10,9 | 11 |
| 26-40 | 24,6 | 23,5 | 23,4 |
| 41-64 | 43,3 | 46,2 | 46,4 |
| 65 and over | 19,6 | 19,3 | 19 |
| education | | | |
| Elementary | N.A. | 6,5 | 5,3 |
| Lower vocational | N.A. | 15,7 | 15,1 |
| Secondary | N.A. | 7,7 | 8 |
| Middle level vocational/Higher level secondary | N.A. | 40,6 | 41 |
| Higher level vocational/University | N.A. | 29,6 | 30,7 |

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.

Population estimates can be found on <http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/default.aspx>