

**Comparative Study of Electoral Systems**  
**Description of Sample and Data Collection**

I. Country: **Israel**

II. Type of Election: **PM + parliamentary**

III. Date of Election: **29/5/96**

IV. Organization that conducted the Survey fieldwork: **Machshov**

V. Investigators Responsible for Data Collection

Name:	<b>Asher Arian</b>	Name:	<b>Michal Shamir</b>
Affiliation:	<b>Haifa University</b>	Affiliation:	<b>Tel-Aviv University</b>
Address:	<b>Political Science Dept. Haifa 31905 Israel</b>	Address:	<b>Political Science Dept. Tel-Aviv 69978 Israel</b>
Fax:	<b>972-4-8257785</b>	Fax:	<b>972-3-6409515</b>
Phone:	<b>972-4-8253786</b>	Phone:	<b>972-3-6409743</b>
E-mail:	<b>crgaa-2@idt.net</b>	E-mail:	<b>m3600@post.tau.ac.il</b>

VI. Study Design (check one)

**Post-Election Study**

VII. Dates of Interviewing

Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: **13/07/96**

Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: **07/08/96**

VIII. Mode of interview (check one)

**Telephone**

IX. Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

1. Eligibility Requirements

a) Age: **18**

b) Citizenship: **No**

c) other: **Citizenship not probed**

2. Persons Excluded From the Sample Frame

a) Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame? **No**

b) Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample? **Yes**

c) Were military personnel excluded from the sample? **No, but soldiers on active duty are under-represented**

d) (If telephone interview) Estimated percentage of households without a phone: **Jews 3%      Arabs 18%**

e) (If telephone interview) Were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled? **No**

f) Other persons excluded from the sample frame:

g) Estimated total (a+b+c+d+e+f) percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: **15%**

### 3.2 Sampling Method (if telephone)

a) Describe how the sample was drawn based on telephone listings, 2 samples were drawn – a general sample and an Arabic sample, 3 separate alternative lists were prepared for each sample (with 1200 potential interviewees on each general list and 220 on the Arab list). First, only people from the first list were interviewed (3 tries), when the first list was “used”, the second list was interviewed by the same procedure, when it was “finished”, the third list was interviewed. In the Arab sample the response rates were better than in the Jewish and Russian sub-samples. List 3 was not used on the Arab sample.

b) Was the sample

A random digit dial sample? **No**

Listed sample? **Yes**

Dual frame? **No**

c) Was a selection table used to select the respondent within the household? **No** if no, describe:

d) Criteria for designating a sample line non-sample. (Check all that applies)

✓ All members of household ineligible - **Yes**

✓ Non-residential phone - **Yes**

✓ No answer (if so), after how many calls to number? **3**

✓ Non-working number - **Yes**

e) Were non-sample replacement methods used? **No**

### 4. Compliance

a) Pre-Study Strategies: Prior to the study was

A letter sent to respondent? **No**

Payment sent to respondent? **No**

A token gift sent to respondent? **No**

Any other incentives used? **No**

b) During the Field Period

Maximum number of contacts with the household before declaring it non-sample: **3**

Maximum number of contacts with the household before declaring it non-interview: **3**

Maximum number of days over which a household was contacted: **3**

Did interviewers vary the time of day at which they recontacted the household? **Yes**

c) Refusal Conversion

Was an effort made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed? **Yes**

Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part? **No**

Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part? **No**

Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer? **No**

Maximum number of recontacts used to persuade respondent to be interviewed: **1**

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

a) Total number of sample lines issued:	<b>3895</b>
b) Total number of completed interviews:	<b>1091</b>
c) Number of refusals:	<b>1900</b>
d) Number never contacted (no-contact):	<b>904</b>
e) Other non-response:	<b>information not available</b>
f) Number of lines of non-sample:	<b>information not available</b>
g) Response Rate: $(b/(a-f))*100$ :	<b>28%</b>

XII. Sample Weight

a) Are the data weighted? **No**

XIII. Description of interviewers (age, level of education, and years of experience): **the interviews were conducted in three languages-Hebrew, Arabic and Russian, by a total of 20 interviewers.**

**The Hebrew speaking interviewers: were 50% undergraduate students, 25% high-school graduates and 25% housewives or teachers; 90% experiences interviewers and 10% inexperienced (first time employed as interviewers).**

**The Arabic speaking interviewers (two): both were undergraduate students and experienced interviewers.**

**The Russian speaking interviewers (four): all were undergraduate students and experienced interviewers.**

Description of interviewer training: **information not available**

XIV. Comparison of Sample to Population

Characteristic	Population Estimates <sup>1</sup>		Sample Estimates Unweighted	Weighted
Age				
18-25	21.3%		28.7%	%
26-40	31.1%		35.0%	%
41-66	33.0%		27.2%	%
65 and over	14.6%		8.2%	%
Education	(#education years)			
None		%	0.5%	%
Incomplete primary	0-4	11.9%	2.8%	%
Primary completed	5-8	11.9%	7.7%	%
Incomplete secondary	9-10	13.1%	16.5%	%
Secondary completed	11-12	35.3%	29.9%	%
Post-secondary trade / vocational school	13-15	} 19.4%	13.9%	%
Incomplete university			7.1%	%
University degree	16+	14.2%	20.9%	%
Gender				
Male	49.5%		45.0%	%
Female	50.5%		54.9%	%

XV. Languages used in the interviews. List: Hebrew, Arabic, Russian

<sup>1</sup>Government of Israel, National statistical agency, 1997 yearbook, no. 48. (data estimation of the end of 1996)