

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

June 05, 2006

Country: Netherlands
Date of Election: 22 November, 2006

Prepared by: Kees Aarts/Henk van der Kolk
Date of Preparation: 3 February, 2011

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: Kees Aarts Title: Prof Organization: Dept of Political Science and Research Methods, University of Twente Address: PO Box 217 7500 AE Enschede Netherlands Telephone: +31 53 4893251 Fax: +31 53 489 2159 E-Mail: c.w.a.m.aarts@utwente.nl Website: www.utwente.nl/mb/polmt/	Name: Henk van der Kolk Title: Dr Organization: Dept of Political Science and Research Methods, University of Twente Address: PO Box 217 7500 AE Enschede Netherlands Telephone: +31 53 4893281 Fax: +31 53 489 2159 E-Mail: h.vanderkolk@utwente.nl Website: www.utwente.nl/mb/polmt/
---	---

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: Statistics Netherlands Address: PO Box 4481 6401 CZ Heerlen Netherlands Telephone: +31 (0)45 570 60 00 Fax: E-Mail: Website: www.cbs.nl
--

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) Address: PO Box 93138 2509 AC Den Haag Netherlands Telephone: +31 (0)70 344 06 40 Fax: E-Mail: Website: www.nwo.nl
Organization: Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations Address: PO Box 20011 2500 EA Den Haag Telephone: +31 (0) 70 4266426 Fax: E-Mail: Website: www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/bzk

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

Organization: Statistics Netherlands
Address: PO Box 4481
6401 CZ Heerlen
Netherlands

Telephone: +31 (0)45 570 60 00
Fax:
E-Mail:
Website: www.cbs.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 Networking Services (DANS)
Address: PO Box 93067
2509 AB Den Haag
Netherlands

Telephone: 070 - 3446 484
Fax:
E-Mail:
Website: www.dans.knaw.nl

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive: already available (persistent identifier: urn:nbn:nl:ui:13-4zd-x4e)

Study Design

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:

23 November, 2006

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

4 January, 2007

3. Mode of (post-election) interview:

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

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

- 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: Pre-election wave, interviews 10 October – 21 November 2006. Randomly approached in two steps (10-31 October, and 1-21 November), such that the two sets of pre-election respondents are comparable. The post-election interviews took place from 23 November 2006 until 4 January 2007. All respondents who in the pre-election interview had not objected to being re-approached, have been approached again. 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. 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?

- 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
- 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, 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

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:
Enfranchised Dutch citizens residing in the Netherlands.

Eligibility Requirements

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

Yes

No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed? 18 and older (eligible to vote)

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

Yes

No

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

Yes (but no action on the part of the person is required for registration)

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

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? <1.0 %

If yes, please explain: 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.

10b. Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? 1.5 %

If yes, please explain: these persons do not have their own household, as a result of which many questions in the DPES are not applicable.

10c. Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

Yes

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: n.a.

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

No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? __1.5__ %

If yes, please explain: persons who had been approached for another study by Statistics Netherlands in the previous year.

10g. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: __3.5__ %

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.

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.

The initial gross sample was then issued in two randomly selected waves of circa 2,000 persons each (the first from 1-31 October; the second from 1-21 November).

After the elections, respondents who had not objected to a second interview were approached for the post-election interview.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

Municipalities

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

See above: weighted proportional with size of electorate. In order to avoid inclusion probabilities > 1; the three largest cities Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague were automatically selected.

12c. Were the primary sampling units 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.

See above

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

No

If yes, please describe: in the selection of municipalities, a cluster size of 12 net has been used in order to minimize travel costs of interviewers.

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.

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe (please include the list of characteristics used for stratification):

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

19. Under what circumstances was a ~~household~~ person 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): 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

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

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): a set of the most commonly used stamps, value €4.00.

24c. Prior to the study, was a token gift sent to the respondent?

Yes

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

No

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

24e. Were any other incentives used?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Interviewers

25. Please describe the interviewers (e.g., age, level of education, years of experience): Statistics Netherlands employs circa 220 interviewers in the field and in addition circa 100 interviewers in a call center. About 210 field interviewers and about 10 telephone interviewers have contributed to the study. Most of these have extensive experience of many years. A majority is female.

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? N.a. A maximum of 3 visits at the house door, followed by 3 telephone calls was allowed (total of 6 contact efforts)

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

27c. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-sample**? Usually after one contact – with the selected respondent

28d. During the field period, how many contacts were made with the household before declaring it a **non-interview**? 6 contact attempts

28e. During the field period, what were the maximum number of days over which a household was contacted? 21 days (3 weeks)

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: over times of the day, and between weekdays and Saturday

Refusal Conversion

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

Yes

No

Please describe: each week, in both the pre- and the post-election waves, non-respondents with telephone were approached for cooperation in a short telephone interview.

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

Yes

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

No

If yes, how much?

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? 5 recontacts

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

Yes

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?

- Yes
- No

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

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

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.)

Gross sample: 3,920 persons

Response pre-election wave: 2,623

Response post-election wave: 2,359

Response rate pre-election wave: 66.9 percent

Response rate post-election wave: 60.2 per cent, or 89.9 per cent of pre-election response

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 persons in sample:	4,494
B. Number of valid households:	4,000
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:	494
D. Number of households of unknown validity:	80 (not issued)
E. Number of completed interviews:	2,623
F. Number of partial interviews:	183 (by telephone)
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:	G+H+I: 1,114
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):	_____
I. Other non-response:	_____

The sum of B+C+D should equal the value of A. If not, please describe why: 80 sample units have not been issued.

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: 95 per cent

The sum of E+F+G+H+I should equal the value of B. If not, please describe why: 80 units have not been issued.

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? One (pre-election)

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.

Gross sample: 3,920 persons

Response pre-election wave: 2,623

Response post-election wave: 2,359

Response rate pre-election wave: 66.9 percent

Response rate post-election wave: 60.2 per cent, or 89.9 per cent of pre-election response

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: 2,359 interviews

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. **Note: NL categories have been modified to suit available tables! Data for complete CAPIs only.**

Age	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
18-25	10.5%	10.0%
26-40	26.8%	26.9%
41-64	44.5%	45.1%
65+	18.2%	17.9%

Education	First wave of study	Wave that included CSES
Elementary	7.0%	6.1%
(lower) vocational	17.3%	16.6%
Secondary	9.5%	9.4%
Middle level vocational, higher level secondary	41.6%	42.3%
Higher level vocational, university	24.6%	25.6%

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: especially electoral turnout is underestimated in the study.

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: Various weights, constructed by Statistics Netherlands. For a hard correction on turnout, we recommend using a multiplicative weighting model including age, gender, marital status, urbanization, region, ethnicity, and turnout, calculated for all completed CAPI interviews in both waves (**wgt4** in original data set). Other variables are less dependent on weighting.

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

Yes

No (not necessary)

If yes,

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe: register data collected by Statistics Netherlands

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe: through various weighting models.

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe: only turnout.

41. Comparison of Completed Interviews to Population (please provide as percentages of the total): refer to Statistics Netherlands for this information (www.cbs.nl; 'statline' figures for 2006 are available) – data for second wave (post-election)

Characteristic	Population Estimates	Completed Interviews	
		Unweighted Distribution	Weighted Distribution
<u>Age</u>			
18-25	11.6%	10.0%	11.6%
26-40	27.8%	26.9%	27.8%
41-64	42.5%	45.1%	42.5%
65 and over	18.1%	17.9%	18.1%
<u>Education</u>			
Elementary	7.0%	6.1%	7.0%
(lower) vocational	17.3%	16.6%	17.3%
Secondary	9.8%	9.4%	9.8%
Middle level vocational, higher level secondary	42.0%	42.3%	42.0%
Higher level vocational, university	24.0%	25.6%	24.0%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	49.2%	49.9%	49.2%
Female	50.8%	50.1%	50.8%

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.