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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.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Bernhard Wessels</th>
<th>Name: Hans Rattinger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title: Prof., Dr.</td>
<td>Title: Prof. Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization: WZB (Social Science Research Center)</td>
<td>Organization: Universität Mannheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: Reichpietschufer 50, 10785 Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>Address: Lehrstuhl für Vergleichende Politische Verhaltensforschung Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften Universität Mannheim A5, 6 D-68131 Mannheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: xx49-30-25491-315</td>
<td>Telephone: 0049-(0)621-181-3556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 0049-30-25491-345</td>
<td>Fax: 0049-(0)621-181-3556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:wessels@wz-berlin.de">wessels@wz-berlin.de</a></td>
<td>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:hans.rattinger@uni-mannheim.de">hans.rattinger@uni-mannheim.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website:</td>
<td>Website: <a href="http://lsvpv.uni-mannheim.de/lehrstuhlteam/prof_dr_hans_rattinger/index.html">http://lsvpv.uni-mannheim.de/lehrstuhlteam/prof_dr_hans_rattinger/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Sigrid Roßteutscher</td>
<td>Name: Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Prof. Dr.</td>
<td>Title: Prof. Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Organization:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universität Frankfurt</td>
<td>Universität Mannheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert-Mayer-Straße 5</td>
<td>Lehrstuhl für Vergleichende Politische Verhaltensforschung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60054 Frankfurt am Main</td>
<td>Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raum: AfE 3032</td>
<td>Universität Mannheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 0049 69 798 - 22050</td>
<td>A5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>D-68131 Mannheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:rossteutscher@soz.uni-frankfurt.de">rossteutscher@soz.uni-frankfurt.de</a></td>
<td>Telephone: Tel.: 0049-(0)621-181-2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website:</td>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.gesellschaftswissenschaften.uni-frankfurt.de/srossteutscher">http://www.gesellschaftswissenschaften.uni-frankfurt.de/srossteutscher</a></td>
<td>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:schmitt-beck@uni-mannheim.de">schmitt-beck@uni-mannheim.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www2.sowi.uni-mannheim.de/lspol1/?page_id=8">http://www2.sowi.uni-mannheim.de/lspol1/?page_id=8</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Data Collection Organization:**

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: BIK MARPLAN Intermedia GmbH
Address:
Marktplatz 9
63065 Offenbach
Stadtteile: Offenbach Innenstadt, Offenbach Mitte, Offenbach Zentrum

Telephone: 0049 (0)69 80590
Fax:
E-Mail:
Website:

**Funding Organization(s):**

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft e. V. (DFG)
Address:
Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft
Kennedyallee 40
53175 Bonn
Telephone: 0049 (228) 885-1
Fax:
E-Mail: postmaster@dfg.de
Website:
http://www.dfg.de/service/kontakt_impressum/besucherinformation/index.html

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: GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften in Bonn
Address: Lennéstraße 30
53113 Bonn

Telephone: 0049 228/2281-0
Fax:
E-Mail:
Website: http://www.gesis.org/

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:
   [ X] Post-Election Study
   [ ] Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:
   September 28th 2009

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:
   November 23rd 2009

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?
   [ ] Yes
   [X] 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:

**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?
   [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:
   German

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
   [X] Other; please specify:

   Most questions exist in English versions and have been taken from there; new questions have been discussed in the group and with the survey company. Back-translation was not regarded as necessary because most questions have a long tradition in (comparative) survey and election research.
   [ ] No
   [ ] Not applicable

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

7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?
   [ ] Yes
   [X] No
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:

Respondents must be at least 16 years old and eligible to vote or if under 18 years theoretical eligible to vote.

Eligibility Requirements

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

   If yes, what ages could be interviewed?
   16
   (Please note that we deleted all observations under 18 within the CSES Dataset)

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

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

9d. Please list any other interviewing requirements or filters used:
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?
   [ X] Yes
   [ ] No

   If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? __4___ %

   If yes, please explain:
   Because the sample just included persons living in private households.

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

   (Military personnel with telephone in private households is vast majority in Germany, no professional army)

   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: ____4____ %

**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.

The sample was applied on the ADM-Design. The ADM-Design is a three-step random-design. The Basic Population are all private households in Germany. The ADM-Design is a face to face area sample, which includes the whole populated area of Germany. It is based on a municipality -structure, which is lodged with data of communal statistics, and with the regional divisions prepared for the navigation systems. On the base of this data 53.000 areas are electronically defined, which include at least 350 and on average 700 private households.

The Sampling Points and the Households to be questioned have been already extracted, using the Adress-Random-Methode, for the Pre-Election Study Component of the GLES. The institute extracted by chance twelve households out of the remaining addresses and transmitted them to
the interviewer. The interviewer had to contact all the twelve addresses and should absolve at least six interviews within these addresses.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?
See 16

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?
See 16

12c. Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?
[ X] 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.
See 16

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?
See 16
13b. If there were further stages of selection, how were the sampling units selected at each of the additional stages? See 16

13c. If there were further stages of selection, were units at each of these stages randomly selected?
   [ X] 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. See 16

14a. How were individual respondents identified and selected in the final stage? Kish-Selection-Grid

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):

There is an oversampling of the “Bundeslaender” of East Germany.

The Sampling Points had been already stratified for the Pre-Election Study Component of the GLES using the ADM Sample Design. They have been stratified first by the population of Germany over 16 years and per municipality. This has been done using an allocation table, which crosses the distribution of the interviews (round about five per Sampling Point) within the stratification “Bundesland” with the ten “BIK-Gemeindegroessenklassen”, indicating the integration context of a municipality. This allocation table has been made separately for the “Bundeslaender” of the former GDR, to over represent the citizens of the new Laender. Berlin was separated in Berlin West and Berlin East on the basis of the district divisions of the State Statistical Office of Berlin Brandenburg.

A total of 250 points in the West with 1,400 interviews drawn to be implemented and 150 Points in the East with a realizable number of 700 interviews has been extracted. After defining the number of points to extract for each Stratification-Cell, the points have been arranged in descending sequence using the so called meaning-weight, within this units a random starting point has been selected. Following the step length, if more than one point had to be selected out of the cell, the extraction had been made. The step length is defined by the quotient of the number of households with the Stratification-Cell at large/number of Sampling Points to be extracted. This is done to take into account the different numbers of households per Sampling-Point. The extraction was made within the folded Face-to-Face Sample Nets which are available at Marplan.

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:
   [ X] Non-residential sample point
   [ X] All members of household are ineligible
   [ X] Housing unit is vacant
   [ X] No answer at housing unit after ___ callbacks
   [X ] Other (Please explain): Language problems, Interviewer didn’t use it.

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?
    [ ] Yes
    [X ] 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:

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?
   [ ] Yes
   [ X] 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.)
   [ ] Yes
   [ X] No

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

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):

199 Interviewers, who had experiences with the used program; the education of the interviewers took part in written form.

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

Contacts

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

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

1.6

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

5

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

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

The whole period: September 28th 2009 to November 23rd 2009 (57 days)

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:
Refusal Conversion

29a. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?
   [ ] Yes
   [X ] 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:

   Respondents have been asked per mail, if the interview took place.

   If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: ___20___%

**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.)

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: 4668
   B. Number of valid households: 4118
   C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households: 52
   D. Number of households of unknown validity: 498
   E. Number of completed interviews: 2117
   F. Number of partial interviews: 71
   G. Number of refusals and break-offs: 1348
   H. Number non-contact (never contacted): 392
   I. Other non-response: 190

   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?

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First wave of study</th>
<th>Wave that included CSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-64</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>First wave of study</th>
<th>Wave that included CSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete primary</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary completed</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete secondary</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary completed</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University incomplete</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:

   See 39

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:

   **Households and Household Members (transformation)**

   In order to produce a representative population sample, the achieved sample is mathematically transformed retrospectively in order to ensure that each individual in the universe has theoretically the same probability of selection (in general by using the inverse of the household size as weighting factor). This was based on the specified size of the household. Only those household members have been taken into account, who could be respondents of the study, meaning only persons who are over 16 and German Citizens.
**Weighting by Age, Sex and Education**

As a final step, the total sample is weighted to match the population distribution by Federal State, age groups and sex, based on a target matrix defined by population census data. In case of the post Election study, education has been introduced into the weighting scheme.

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:

The new Länder (East Germany) have been oversampled. Survey includes 700 respondents from East Germany, 1400 from West Germany. The Sample can be analysed separately for East and West, or, if accordingly weighted, for Germany as a whole.

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:

See 39

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

[ ] Yes
[X] 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
[X] No

If yes, please describe:

41. Comparison of Completed Interviews to Population (please provide as percentages of the total):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Population Estimates (Statistical Office)</th>
<th>Completed Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unweighted Distribution</td>
<td>Weighted Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9,63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>22,4%</td>
<td>23,13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-64</td>
<td>43,11%</td>
<td>38,87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>24,5%</td>
<td>28,37 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3,9%</td>
<td>1,58 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Secondary ISCED 2</td>
<td>70,6%</td>
<td>76,37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Secondary ISCED 3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10,60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Trade/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>7,4%</td>
<td>10,98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48,5%</td>
<td>47,11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51,5%</td>
<td>52,89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.