

Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)
Module 5: Design Report (Sample Design and Data Collection Report)

September 14, 2016

Country: Germany
Date of Election: September 24th, 2017

Prepared by: GLES project team (WZB)
Date of Preparation: April 2018

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.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Name: Bernhard Weßels Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: WZB (Berlin Social Science Center)</p> <p>Address: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung Reichpietschufer 50, D-10785 Berlin, Germany</p> <p>Telephone: +49 30-25491-315 Fax: +49 30-25491-345 E-Mail: bernhard.wessels@wzb.eu Website: http://www.wzb.eu/de/personen/bernhard-wessels</p> | <p>Name: Harald Schoen Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: University of Mannheim</p> <p>Address: Lehrstuhl für Politische Wissenschaft, Politische Psychologie Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften Universität Mannheim, A5, 6 D-68131 Mannheim, Germany</p> <p>Telephone: +49 621-181-2088 Fax: +49 621-181-2059 E-Mail: harald.schoen@uni-mannheim.de Website: http://lspwpp.sowi.uni-mannheim.de/english/team/chair_representation/</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Name: Sigrid Roßteutscher Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main</p> <p>Address: Goethe Universität, Frankfurt a. M. FB 03 Hauspostfach 15 Theodor-W.-Adorno-Platz 6 D-60323 Frankfurt am Main, Germany</p> <p>Telephone: +49 69-798-36628 Fax: E-Mail: rossteutscher@soz.uni-frankfurt.de Website: http://www2.uni-frankfurt.de/47263960/srossteutscher</p> | <p>Name: Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: University of Mannheim</p> <p>Address: Lehrstuhl für Politische Wissenschaft - Politische Soziologie Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften Universität Mannheim, A5, 6 D-68131 Mannheim, Germany</p> <p>Telephone: +49 621-181-2062 Fax: +49 621-181-2067 E-Mail: http://lspoll.sowi.uni-mannheim.de/englisch/Team/Prof.%20Dr.%20R%C3%BCdiger%20Schmitt-Beck/</p> |
| <p>Name: Wolf, Christof Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences</p> <p>Address: Postfach 12 21 55, 68072 Mannheim, Germany</p> <p>Telephone: +49 621-1246-149 Fax: +49 621-1246-100 E-Mail: christof.wolf@gesis.org Website: https://www.gesis.org/institut/mitarbeitervverzeichnis/person/?tx_gextstaffdir_staffdirectory%5Bemail%5D=christof.wolf%40gesis.org&tx_gextstaffdir_staffdirectory%5Baction%5D=details&tx_gextstaffdir_staffdirectory%5Bcontroller%5D=Index&hash=d46888cea93dea8c12299e11a97adc84</p> | |

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Organization: infratest dimap Gesellschaft für Trend- und Wahlforschung mbH
Address:
Moosdorfstraße 7-9
12435 Berlin, Germany

Telephone: +49 30-53322-110
Fax: +49 30-53322-122
E-Mail: indi@infratest-dimap.de
Website: <https://www.infratest-dimap.de/>

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft e.V. (DFG)
Address:
Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)
German Research Foundation
Kennedyallee 40
53175 Bonn, Germany

Telephone: +49-228-885-1
Fax: +49 228-885-2777
E-Mail: postmaster@dfg.de
Website: <http://www.dfg.de/>

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 Institute for the Social Sciences
Address:
Postfach 12 21 55,
68072 Mannheim, Germany

Telephone: +49 221-47694-506
Fax:
E-Mail: gles@gesis.org
Website: <http://www.gesis.org/>

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive:
Data is available since January 9th 2018 at:
<https://dbk.gesis.org/dbksearch/sdesc2.asp?no=6801&db=e&doi=10.4232/1.12991>

Study Design

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:

- ☒ Post-Election Study (with interviewing starting within 6 months after the election)
- ☐ Post-Election Study (with interviewing starting more than 6 months after the election)
- ☐ Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study
- ☐ Between Rounds

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:

September 25th, 2017

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

November 30th, 2017

3a. Mode of interviewing for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared:

(If multiple modes were used, please mark all that apply.)

- ☐ In person, face-to-face - using a questionnaire on paper
- ☒ In person, face-to-face - using an electronic/computerized questionnaire
- ☐ Telephone
- ☐ Mail or self-completion supplement
- ☐ Internet

3b. Was there a mode change *within* interviews (e.g., selected self-completion elements within the questionnaire)?

- ☒ No
- ☐ Yes; please provide details:

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:

4c. If the survey was entirely or partly conducted via the Internet, please indicate whether it was based on an access panel (i.e. respondents were selected from a group of pre-screened panelists):

☐ Yes

☐ No

4d. If the survey was based on an Internet access panel, please describe the access panel (company, population [does it include persons without initial access to the Internet and how are they interviewed], method of recruiting members, total size of access panel, method of selecting survey respondents from the panel):

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:

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
- ☐ Other; please specify: _____
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not applicable

7b. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ 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:

The target population comprises of all German citizens with registered residence in the Federal Republic of Germany aged 16 and older, who were (in principle if underage) eligible to vote in the German federal elections on September 24, 2017. The sample provided to CSES only includes 18-year-olds and above.

Note that this population excludes, for example, eligible voters living in foreign countries as well as adults under legal guardianship, who are excluded from suffrage in Germany.

Eligibility Requirements

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

16 years and older (CSES sample does not include <18-year olds)

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

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

Voter registration is not necessary in Germany. The Person must however be registered with the state resident register, which is mandated by law.

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? <0.1%

If yes, please explain:

Residents of islands without land connection were not included in the sampling procedure.

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? <0.2%

If yes, please explain:

Even though being institutionalized does not break the right to vote under all conditions, they were excluded from the survey to avoid disproportionate effort for the interviewers.

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:

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. If interviews were conducted via the Internet, what is the estimated percentage of households without access to the Internet? _____ %

10g. If interviews were conducted via the Internet, were provisions taken to include members of the population without access to the Internet? And if so, which?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If “Yes”, please explain:

If “No”, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

10h. 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? _____ %

If yes, please explain:

10i. Please estimate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: <0.3 %

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 and/or based on an Internet access panel, please also describe the original sample, from the beginning of the study.

The survey employed a two-stage sampling procedure that employed the state resident register instead of a random-route technique. This method has the advantage of being able to make use of certain demographic attributes known in advance in order to improve the representativeness of the sample. It is described in detail below.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

The primary sampling units are 162 randomly selected sampling points (108 in Western Germany, 54 in Eastern Germany). The sampling points correspond to a set number of addresses to be selected in the respective municipality during the second stage.

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

The first step comprised of the allocation of (selectable) sampling points to the municipalities following a Cox-algorithm. Because of the designed oversampling of Eastern Germans this was done separately between Eastern and Western Germany. The allocation procedure accounted for stratification along regional criteria. Larger Municipalities could be allocated multiple sampling points.

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.

After the allocation, the total number of 162 Sampling points was selected by a systematic drawing procedure with random start for each regional stratum. Where multiple sampling points were drawn in a municipality (possible in those that were allocated more than one sampling point), the number of addresses selected in that municipality during the second stage is increased accordingly.

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?

At the second stage, individual respondents were selected from the sampled municipalities.

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

The raw sample of respondents was drawn randomly from the preselected municipalities. The selection made use of the state resident register. Again, the procedure used stratification with an age-group \times gender-structure matrix.

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.

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

See above

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please explain:

Theoretically, more than one person from the same household could be randomly selected from the state resident register.

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please describe:

Large municipalities (100,000 inhabitants and above) selected in the first stage were divided into up to 12 spatial clusters. Out of those, 4 were randomly selected to be included in the individual sampling procedure of the second stage.

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, and in the case of multi-stage selection processes the stage[s] at which stratification occurred):

Stratification was used at both stages. Along regional criteria in stage one and along the criteria of age and gender in stage two. (see above)

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 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):

An individual was declared non-sample under the following circumstances: the address does not/no longer exist; the individual is deceased, the individual does no longer live at the address, the individual is institutionalized.

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 respondents self-select into the survey, at any stage?

☐ 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.)

See appendix

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

☒ 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):

For a complete interview, the respondents were usually offered a payment of 10€. Because of recent experience with low participation rates for certain social groups this payment was increased for persons under 50 years living in former East Germany, who received a total of 20€.

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):

To ensure quality, the project team requested that the institute conducting the interviews employ only experienced interviewers. Consequently, the interviewers working on this survey have been working at that institution for more than 11 years, on average. The level of education was mixed ranging from those with minimal public education to university graduates. Their age average was around 64 years, reflecting the fact that many were pensioners earning a side income.

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training. If possible please differentiate between general interviewer training and study-specific components:

Every interviewer takes part in extensive initial training before being joined to the conducting institute's pool. It includes both practical exercises as well as online courses that provide training such as in contact skills, refusal avoidance and sampling procedures. Upon completion the interviewers are assigned a more experienced colleague as a mentor to guide them through their first projects.

Apart from this general training, the project team conducted survey-specific training workshops for all interviewers involved. It served both to draw the attention to some specific survey instruments as well as to convey the specific requirements regarding the subject matter and the close timing of the project.

26a. Please provide a description of the content, structure and time used for general training of interviewers:

See above

26b. Please provided a description of the content, structure and time used for training interviewers in the specifics of the study within which CSES was run:

See above

Contacts

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

With a total number of 26,662 contact attempts each address was contacted 3.4 times, on average.

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

This information is currently not available.

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

n/a

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

Interviewers were required to make at least four attempts at personal contact. This minimum is higher if the address was entered into the conversion sample. There was no set limit on the number of contacts.

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

This information is currently not available.

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:

The interviewers were asked to vary the time of day and the weekday of their contacts as well as to spread their contacts for any one address over several weeks.

Refusal Conversion

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please describe:

Respondents from the base sample where an interview could not be realized were eligible to be re-entered into the survey within a conversion-sample under certain conditions.

These were persons with non-permanent reasons for their initial refusal and cases in which no personal contact had been established, as long as there was no other information that would rule out any further efforts.

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:

A new letter was sent to reassert the importance of a person's

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, how much?

The total payment offered for taking part was raised from 10€ to 20€ for all individuals within the conversion sample.

29d. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer?

☒ Yes

☐ No

In some cases

29e. What was the maximum number of re-contacts used to persuade respondents to be interviewed?

Six

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:

All completed interviews were subject to a number of verification measures. These included matching the responses against data on sociodemographic attributes from the state register (18 irregularities) and evaluating the time and timing of the interviews. Interviewees were also sent a letter asking them to verify the interview and to fill out a quality questionnaire. The response rate in this case was 63% and produced 93 irregularities.

Those interviews where irregularities had been detected were subjected to further scrutiny, e.g. by contacting the respective interviewer for clarification. As a result of the verification procedures most irregularities could be cleared while a total of 5 interviews were declared unusable.

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: __100 %

Response Rate

Note: If multiple modes of interviewing were used for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared, please repeat the following questions as appropriate for each of the modes used.

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.)

$$RR1=2121/6409=0.33$$

Please not for all following information that households were not sampled. Instead, where the questions ask about “household” it should read “individual”.

32. Please provide the following statistics for the survey that the CSES Module appeared in. (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: | 7776 |
| B. Number of valid households: | 6409 |
| C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households: | 581 |
| D. Number of households of unknown validity: | 786 |
| E. Number of completed interviews: | 2121 |
| F. Number of partial interviews: | 0 |
| G. Number of refusals and break-offs: | 3392 |
| H. Number non-contact (never contacted): | 230 |
| I. Other non-response: | 666 |

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:

Estimating from the percentage of

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:

This category includes individuals that were permanently unable to take part in the survey due to impeded health (368), due to difficulties to communicate (55) or due to absence for the whole duration of the fieldwork period (243).

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.

| Age | First wave of study | Wave that included CSES |
|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 18-25 | % | % |
| 26-40 | % | % |
| 41-64 | % | % |
| 65 and over | % | % |

| Education | First wave of study | Wave that included CSES |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| None | % | % |
| Incomplete primary | % | % |
| Primary completed | % | % |
| Incomplete secondary | % | % |
| Secondary completed | % | % |
| Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational | % | % |
| University incomplete | % | % |
| University degree | % | % |

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please explain:

Even though great effort was made to draw a representative sample, this aim could not be reached to complete satisfaction. As a way to improve inferences, weights are provided to correct for some of the shortcomings.

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:

The sampling weight is designed to account for the oversampling of Eastern Germans within this survey. The demographic weight further takes into consideration demographic attributes.

Because of the difficulties that arise from constructing weights simultaneously with multiple attributes, the calculation was done through iterative proportional fitting (IPF). Here the weighting factors calculated at each step are used as the basis for respective following steps. Excessively large individual weighting factors were avoided by trimming to a set maximum after each step.

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please describe:

Because of the oversampling of Eastern Germans it is essential that all calculations referring to Germany as a whole weigh the data with either of the weight variables to correct for the resulting disproportionate probability of selection.

A compensation for household size was not necessary because households were not sampled at any stage.

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:

The demographic weight was calculated to make the sample representative by considering population distributions of gender, age, educational attainment, functional regional centrality/periphery, and residence in Eastern or Western Germany.

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

☐ Yes

☒ 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

☒ No

If yes, please describe:

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

Important note: *The figures represent the distributions in the CSES-Sample which excludes under 18-year-olds.*

The reporting template was modified to provide a more complete overview of the respective weighting attributes:

Age categories from which the weights were calculated are different: 18-29; 30-44; 45-59; 60 and over.

Categories of educational attainment from which the weights were calculated are different (see below).

Two regional variables were added.

| Characteristic | <u>Population Estimates</u> | <u>Completed Interviews</u> | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | <u>Unweighted Distribution</u> | <u>Weighted Distribution</u> |
| <u>Age</u> | | | |
| 18-29 | 17.7% | 16.34% | 16.12% |
| 30-44 | 20.1% | 20.42% | 20.58% |
| 45-59 | 28.2% | 28.69% | 28.76% |
| 60 and over | 34.0% | 34.55% | 34.54% |
| <u>Education</u> | | | |
| Lower Secondary or less | 37.7% | 23.62% | 36.79% |
| Intermediate Secondary (graduated ~year 10) | 30.4% | 33.35% | 30.77% |
| Upper Secondary (University entrance Qualification) | 31.9% | 43.03% | 32.45% |
| <u>Gender</u> | | | |
| Male | 48.7% | 52.07% | 48.65% |
| Female | 51.3% | 47.93% | 51.35% |
| <u>Region</u> | | | |
| East | 20.7% | 32.68% | 19.64% |
| West | 79.3% | 67.32% | 80.36% |
| <u>BIK (district structure class)</u> | | | |
| < 50000 inhabitants | 24.4% | % | % |
| > 50000 inhabitants + structural domain type 2/3/4 | 33.5% | % | % |
| > 50000 inhabitants + structural domain type 1 | 42.1% | % | % |

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.

https://www.bundeswahlleiter.de/dam/jcr/e0d2b01f-32ff-40f0-ba9f-50b5f761bb22/btw17_heft4.pdf

<https://www.destatis.de/EN/FactsFigures/SocietyState/Population/CurrentPopulation/CurrentPopulation.html>

APPENDIX: Letter informing respondents about their participation



Juli 2017

Herrn
Dr. Thomas Mustermann
Verdistraße 25
99999 Musterhausen

Was denken Wähler und Nichtwähler zur Bundestagswahl?
Die Deutsche Wahlstudie will es wissen!

Sehr geehrter Herr Dr. Mustermann,

die Deutsche Wahlstudie (GLES – German Longitudinal Election Study) ist die zentrale wissenschaftliche Umfrage der akademischen Wahlforschung. Sie will erfahren, warum jemand zur Bundestagswahl eine Partei wählt oder warum jemand gar nicht an der Wahl teilnimmt.

Mit solchen Studien können die Sozial- und Politikwissenschaften unabhängig und seriös Aussagen zu gesellschaftlichen Entwicklungen in Deutschland treffen. Wichtig ist, dass sich möglichst alle ausgewählten Personen beteiligen. Nur so können verschiedene Meinungen und Einstellungen von Jungen und Alten, Armen und Reichen, politisch Interessierten und Nicht-Interessierten ermittelt werden. Deshalb möchten wir Sie herzlich bitten, an unserer Befragung teilzunehmen. Ihre Teilnahme ist freiwillig und selbstverständlich werden alle Datenschutzbestimmungen eingehalten.

Die Durchführung unserer Befragung übernimmt Kantar Public/infratest dimap. In den nächsten Tagen wird sich ein Interviewer bei Ihnen dazu melden. Gerne können Sie ihn nach seinem Interviewerausweis fragen. Für Ihren Beitrag zur Studie erhalten Sie 10 Euro direkt nach der Befragung bar von unserem Interviewer.

Für Rückfragen haben wir für Sie die kostenlose Telefonnummer 0800 – 100 1425 eingerichtet, unter der Sie dem Projektteam von Kantar von Montag bis Freitag zwischen 9 und 16 Uhr gerne Ihre Fragen stellen können.

Wir würden uns freuen, wenn Sie an dieser wichtigen Befragung teilnehmen und möchten uns schon im Voraus herzlich für Ihre Unterstützung bedanken.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Prof. Dr. Sigrid Roßteutscher
(Goethe-Universität Frankfurt)

Prof. Dr. Bernhard Weßels
(Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, WZB)

Prof. Dr. Christof Wolf
(GESIS, Mannheim)



WZB

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin
für Sozialforschung





Weitergehende Informationen zur Deutschen Wahlstudie

- Wer sind wir und worum geht es?

An der Deutschen Wahlstudie sind mehrere namhafte wissenschaftliche Einrichtungen beteiligt: die Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, das Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB), das Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften (GESIS) und die Universität Mannheim.

Kantar Public/infratest dimap führt diese Umfrage im Auftrag von GESIS durch. Bekannt ist der alte Name **„Infratest“ vor allem aus der Wahlberichterstattung in der ARD („infratest dimap“)**. Bei Kantar Public/infratest dimap werden seit mehr als 50 Jahren Umfragen dieser Art durchgeführt.

- **„Warum gerade ich?“ werden Sie sich vielleicht fragen**

Vielleicht haben Sie sich auch schon gewundert, wie in Meinungsumfragen mit wenigen Befragten Aussagen über die Meinungen und Einstellungen in der Bevölkerung getroffen werden können. Das funktioniert, weil Personen zufällig von den Einwohnermeldeämtern ausgewählt wurden, die stellvertretend für alle Menschen in Deutschland befragt werden. Nur wenn möglichst viele der ausgewählten Personen an der Umfrage teilnehmen, erhalten wir Ergebnisse, die für die gesamte Bevölkerung aussagekräftig sind.

Sie gehören zu diesen zufällig ausgewählten Personen. Ihre Teilnahme ist freiwillig. Ihre Meinung steht zusammen mit insgesamt deutschlandweit 4.200 weiteren Befragten für die Meinung aller 68 Millionen erwachsenen Menschen in Deutschland. Meinungen lassen sich nur über Umfragen abbilden. Es gibt keine amtlichen Statistiken dazu. Daher ist Ihre Teilnahme so wichtig.

- Worauf Sie sich verlassen können: Datenschutz

Selbstverständlich werden wir alle Datenschutzbestimmungen einhalten. Der beigefügten Erklärung zum Datenschutz können Sie entnehmen, dass mit dieser wissenschaftlichen Studie keinerlei gewerbliche Interessen verbunden sind und Sie auch keinerlei Verpflichtungen eingehen. Nur weil die gewissenhafte Einhaltung aller Datenschutzbestimmungen bei uns sichergestellt ist, sind die Einwohnermeldeämter nach §46 BMG berechtigt, uns Adressen für wissenschaftliche Studien zur Verfügung zu stellen.

Bei Fragen zum Projekt nutzen Sie bitte die kostenlose Telefonnummer 0800 – 100 1425, um das Projektteam von Kantar Public/infratest dimap zu sprechen. Unter www.tns-infratest.com/sofo/ und <http://gles.eu/wordpress/design/querschnitt/> können Sie sich einen Überblick über unsere Arbeit verschaffen.

APPENDIX: Letter sent prior to attempts at refusal conversion



September 2017

Herrn
Dr. Thomas Mustermann
Verdistraße 25
99999 Musterhausen

Was denken Sie über Politik und den aktuellen Wahlkampf?

Ihre Meinung ist uns wichtig! – Wir bedanken uns bei Ihnen mit 20 Euro!

Sehr geehrter Herr Dr. Mustermann,

im Juli haben wir Ihnen einen Brief geschrieben. Wir möchten gerne mit Ihnen ein Interview durchführen. Leider kam es bisher noch nicht dazu. Uns ist Ihre Teilnahme sehr wichtig! Wir möchten uns bei Ihnen mit 20 Euro für Ihre Teilnahme bedanken.

Ziel der Studie ist es, Informationen über die Politik und den aktuellen Wahlkampf von einem Querschnitt der Gesellschaft zu bekommen. Dabei ist es wichtig, dass möglichst alle zufällig ausgewählten Personen an der Umfrage teilnehmen. Es ist dagegen nicht wichtig, ob Sie Wähler oder Nichtwähler, politisch interessiert oder nicht interessiert, alt oder jung, arm oder reich sind.

In den nächsten Wochen wird unser Interviewer nochmals bei Ihnen vorbeikommen, um mit Ihnen ein Interview durchzuführen. Wir wären sehr dankbar, wenn Sie teilnehmen könnten und damit unser Projekt unterstützen. Wir bedanken uns mit 20 Euro bei Ihnen für Ihre Teilnahme. Das Geld erhalten Sie direkt nach der Befragung bar von unserem Interviewer. Selbstverständlich werden bei der Befragung alle Ihre Angaben streng vertraulich behandelt.

Anbei finden Sie weitere Informationen zum Datenschutz und Zielen der Befragung. Für Rückfragen steht die kostenlose Telefonnummer 0800 – 100 1425 von Montag bis Freitag zwischen 9 und 16 Uhr zur Verfügung. Wir würden uns sehr freuen, wenn wir Sie für die Teilnahme an dieser interessanten und wichtigen Umfrage doch noch gewinnen können.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Günter Steinacker
Projektleiter
Kantar Public

Roberto Heinrich
Projektleiter
Infratest dimap