

**Prepared by: Hawang, Shioh-duan**

**Date: October, 2006**

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS  
Module 2: Sample Design and Data Collection Report**

August 23, 2004

**Country: Taiwan (Republic of China)**

**Date of Election: March 20 , 2004**

Type of Election (e.g., presidential, parliamentary, legislative): presidential

Organization that conducted the survey field work: The Committee of the Taiwan's Election and Democratization Study

**Investigators Responsible for Data Collection:**

Name: Chi Huang

Name: Shioh-Duan Hawang

Affiliation:  
Department of Political Science,  
National Chengchi University

Affiliation:  
Department of Political Science,  
Soochow University

Address: No. 64 Sec. 2 Zhi-Nan Rd.,  
Wenshan, Taipei City 116, Taiwan

Address: 70, Lin-hsi Rd., Shihlin, Taipei  
City 111, Taiwan

Fax: 886-2-29371120

Fax: 886-2-28812437

Phone: 886-2-29384514

Phone: 886-2-28819471 ext.6275

E-mail: chihuang@nccu.edu.tw

E-mail: sowd@scu.edu.tw

Name:

Name:

Affiliation:

Affiliation:

Address:

Address:

Fax:

Fax:

Phone:

Phone:

E-mail:

E-mail:

**A. Study Design**

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

Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: June 2004

Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: September 2004

*If Panel Study:*

Date Pre-Election Interviewing Began:

Date Pre-Election Interviewing Ended:

Mode of (post-election) interview:

- In person, face-to-face
- Telephone
- Mail or self-completion supplement

Language(s) used in questionnaire(s) (Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used, as well as a version translated in English, if applicable, as part of the Election Study Deposit):

## **B. Sample Design and Sampling Procedures**

### 1. Eligibility Requirements

a) Age: Minimum 20 Maximum \_\_\_\_\_

b) Citizenship: Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

c) Other requirements:

### 2. Sample Frame:

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

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, please explain: Kimmen County and Lienchiang County (Mastsu) which are two small off-shore island.

b) Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

Please explain: Those who are not eligible to vote.

c) Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

No  Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

d) If interviews were conducted by telephone:

i. What is the estimated percentage of households without a phone: \_\_\_\_\_%

ii. Were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

iii. Were substitution methods used for unproductive sample points?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

e) Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

No  Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

f) Estimated total (a + b + c + d + e) percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: 2 %

3. Sample Selection Procedures:

a) What were the primary sampling units?

at the township-level

b) Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

Please explain:

c) Were there further stages of selection?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

Please explain: Based on the official information provided by the Interior Department, we employ cluster analysis to divide the 359 township-level units into 9 strata. Subsequently, according to the probabilities proportional to size (PPS), we randomly select approximately 2 to 14 township from each strata, then further select 4 to 28 borough or villages from each selected township, finally, 10 to 16 respondents were sampled from every selected borough or village.

d) How were individual respondents identified?

Systematic sampling

e) Under what circumstances was a sample line 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 3 callbacks
- Other (Please explain):

f) Were non-sample replacement methods used?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_■\_\_\_\_\_

Please describe: After 3 visits without success, the sampled respondent was replaced by the supplement sample according to the identical socio-demographic characteristic (i.e., area, sex, and age) of the first-sampled respondent.

g). For surveys conducted by telephone:

i. Was the sample a random digit dial (RDD) sample? Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_

ii. Was the sample a listed sample? Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_

iii. Was the sample a dual frame sample? No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_

If yes, what % list frame\_\_\_\_\_ and what % RDD\_\_\_\_\_

h) For surveys conducted by mail:

Was the sample a listed sample?

Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

4. Compliance:

Prior to the study:

- a) Was a letter sent to respondent?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_\_

(If yes, please include a copy of the letter in the Deposit)

- b) Was payment sent to respondent?

No\_\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

- c) Was a token gift sent to respondent?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe: Beauty Kit (about NT\$ 100.00, orUS\$ 3.00)

- d) Were any other incentives used?

No\_\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

5. During the Field Period:

- a) How many contacts were made with the household before declaring it **non-sample?** 3 times

- b) How many contacts were made with the household before declaring it **non-interview?** 3 times

- c) Maximum number of days over which a household was contacted?  
3 times

- d) Did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household? No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes  \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe: According to the information provided by the family members or neighbors, the interviewers tried to re-contact the respondent.

- e) Refusal Conversion:

- i. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

No  \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

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

No  \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

If so, please describe (in addition, please include a copy of the letter in the deposit):

- iii. Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part?

No  \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, how much?

- iv. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer? Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_
- v. What was the maximum number of re-contacts used to persuade respondent to be interviewed? 3
- vi. Were any other methods used to persuade respondents reluctant to be interviewed to take part?  
No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

Please describe: When interviewers indicated that respondents were slightly, even moderately, reluctant to be interviewed, then supervisors of interviewers will try to persuade the respondents.

6. Response Rate:

(Note: if a panel study, please report response rate of the first wave)

Total number of sample lines issued:	6698
Number of refusals:	1755
Number never contacted (no-contact):	840
Other non-response:	1131
Number of lines of non-sample:	1149
Total number of completed interviews:	1823
Response Rate:	27.2%

Note: Total number of planned interviews based on the PPS sampling: 1744

7. Panel Attrition:

(Note: This only applies if CSES questionnaire is administered as part of a 2-wave panel study):

Total number of respondents in Wave I of the study: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Wave I respondents re-interviewed in wave containing CSES Module: \_\_\_\_\_

Percent total panel attrition: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Panel attrition by age and education (given as percentages; please indicate whether numbers provided are % re-interviewed or % attrition):



**Age**

18-25 \_\_\_\_\_ %  
26-40 \_\_\_\_\_ %  
41-65 \_\_\_\_\_ %  
65 & over \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Education**

None \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Incomplete primary \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Primary completed \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Incomplete secondary \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Secondary completed \_\_\_\_\_ %  
University incomplete \_\_\_\_\_ %  
University degree \_\_\_\_\_ %

9. Sample Weights

a) Are weights included in the data file?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

Please describe how the weights were constructed:

The data-file is weighted by the factors of gender, age, education level, and area (based on the level of socio-economic development).

b) Are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection at the respondent/household level?

No  Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

c) Are the weights designed to match known demographic characteristics of the population?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

Please describe: The aggregative indexes of gender, age, and socio-economic development are based on the official documents released by the Interior Department. In addition, since the information of education released by the official document might be underestimated, the index of education comes from the adjusted estimations of Professor Yung-tai Hung of Political Science, National Taiwan University.

d) Are the data weighted to correct for non-response?

No  Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

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

Interviewers: College and graduate students from social science department.

Supervisor: Experienced interviewers, most of them graduate students, from Soochow University, National Cheng-Chi University, National Chung-Cheng University, and National Sun Yat-Sen University.

- b) Please provide a description of interviewer training:

One full-day training session for interviewers and on-site practice.

11. Comparison of Sample to Population

Characteristic	<u>Population Estimates</u>	<u>Sample Estimates</u>	
		Unweighted	Weighted
<u>Age</u>			
20-29	23.54%	21.1%	22.6%
30-39	22.53%	20.2%	22.3%
40-49	22.24%	25.3%	22.4%
50-59	14.10%	15.2%	14.4%
60 and over	17.59%	18.2%	18.2%
<u>Education</u>			
Primary school and below	23.32%	25.2%	23.3%
Junior high school	15.47%	12.7%	15.4%
High or vocational school	30.11%	27.3%	30.0%
Technical college	14.63%	15.6%	14.6%
University degree and over	16.47%	18.9%	16.4%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	50.54%	50.3%	50.5%
Female	49.46%	49.7%	49.5%