

Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) Module 6 Design Report

Version: December 2022

Country/territory: Switzerland Date of election: 22 October 2023 Prepared by: Anke Tresch Date of preparation: 15 November 2024
--

The answers provided in this Design Report are used to create variables in the CSES dataset, enable the CSES Secretariat to evaluate the eligibility of election studies for inclusion in the cross-national dataset, and provide users with important information for their analyses.

Notes to collaborators...

- All sections of the Design Report must be filled in for an election study deposit to be considered complete. The CSES Secretariat is available to provide clarification and support.
- Where brackets [] appear, answer by placing an “X” within the appropriate bracket(s).
- If more space or iterations are required to answer any question, please lengthen the document and duplicate items as necessary.
- In your deposited dataset, please be sure to include any weight variables, as well a variable that indicates the mode of interview for each observation (respondent) that is included.
- If you have an existing methodology report for your study, we would appreciate receiving an electronic copy of it, to supplement the information in your completed Design Report. We will make both your Design Report and any supplemental methodological report available for download from the CSES website. We encourage you to cut-and-paste information from your existing methodology report into your answers below, as appropriate.

Section A1. Collaborator(s)

Collaborators are the contact persons for election studies that appear in CSES. Collaborators are not necessarily who collected the data. This collaborators list will appear on the CSES website.

Collaborator name: Tresch Anke
Affiliation: FORS / University of Lausanne
Email: ankedaniela.tresch@fors.unil.ch

Collaborator name: Rennwald Line
Affiliation: FORS
Email: line.rennwald@fors.unil.ch

Collaborator name: Lauener, Lukas
Affiliation: FORS
Email: Lukas.lauener@fors.unil.ch

Section A2. Data Collection Organization

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection...

Organization name: FORS
Website: www.forscenter.ch

Section A3. Funding Organization(s)

Organization(s) that funded the data collection...

Organization name: Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF)
Website: www.snf.ch

Organization name:
Website:

Section A4. 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 name: FORS
Website: www.forscenter.ch, the postelection survey (which includes the CSES module) can be accessed from the data archive SWISSUbase: <https://doi.org/10.48573/q99z-aa77>

Section B. Study Design

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

- Post-Election Study
- Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study
- Between Rounds
- Other, please specify: _____

2. For the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared, please provide the following three pieces of information...

The date that interviewing began: *23 October 2023*

The date that interviewing ended: *11 January 2024*

The number of days between the date of the election and when interviewing began: *1*

3. Was the survey that included the CSES Module part of a panel study?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please describe the design of the panel study, including the date at which interviewing for each prior wave began and ended:

4. How many respondents answered the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared? That is, how many records/observations are there in the CSES portion of your study?

N=5033

5. Did respondents give their consent to share their responses as part of the CSES dataset, in accordance with local human rights regulations and data protection laws?

Yes

No

Section C. Sample frame, selection, and eligibility

6. Please describe the population that your study is meant to be representative of.

All Swiss citizens residing in Switzerland who were at least 18 years old on Election Day (22 October 2023) and thus eligible to vote.

7. What steps were taken as part of the sampling and/or data collection process to ensure that the sample is representative of the target population? In what ways were those steps successful, and in what ways were they not (please provide evidence wherever possible)?

To maximize response rates and minimize sample biases, several measures were taken: an unconditional cash incentive (a 10 CHF bill) was included with the invitation letter; a paper questionnaire was offered as a second mode to encourage participation from individuals who may be less comfortable with online surveys; a prenotification letter and a flyer emphasized the importance of representing diverse opinions and individuals; up to three reminders were sent; and a hotline was offered for sample members. Importantly, we opted for a mixed-mode self-administered survey (online/paper), with a push-to-web design, to be able to include respondents who are least at ease with online questionnaires (notably, older respondents). The paper questionnaire brought an additional 5% response rate. In terms of sample composition, the paper questionnaire significantly increased the inclusion of female respondents, respondents from single-member households, older respondents (often widowed), respondents from the French-speaking region and those who are not working/part-time. Regarding the political variables of interests, respondents who filled in the paper questionnaire have lower political interest, more often reported a vote for the Swiss People's Party and less turnout than respondents who completed the online questionnaire. Thus, the paper questionnaire helped mitigate well-known biases in political surveys (overrepresentation of the politically interested and left-wing voters).

8. Please list the criteria for an individual to be eligible to be interviewed in your study. For example, minimum age, citizenship, voter registration, etc.

Swiss citizenship, minimum age (18 years), residence in the country

9. Please describe the sample frame, its type and source, and its coverage of the population.

Maintained by the Federal Statistical Office (FSO), the sample frame is based on data from cantonal and communal population registers. It is updated on a quarterly basis and covers all individuals residing in Switzerland. The coverage of the sampled population is thus almost 100%. Only Swiss citizens residing abroad are not included in the sample frame (see point 10).

10. Were any of the following excluded from the sample frame? Mark all that apply.

- Specific regions of the country
- Institutionalized persons
- Military personnel
- Other, please specify: _____ *Swiss citizens living abroad* _____

For each group that was excluded, please provide additional details about the exclusion (for instance, the regions excluded), why the exclusion, and what percent of the total eligible population was excluded from the sample frame in each instance. Please also indicate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame.

The sampling frame that is provided and maintained by the Swiss Federal Statistical Office covers all individuals (not households) resident in Switzerland. The coverage of the sampling frame is thus almost 100% for Swiss citizens living in Switzerland. Only Swiss citizens living abroad are not included in the sampling frame (4% or 222'889 out of 5'583'221 potential voters).

11. Please describe in detail how the sample for the study was selected from the sampling frame. For multi-stage samples, please sure to list all sampling stages, and describe the sampling units and selection methods at each stage. Furthermore, please describe how individual respondents were identified and selected in the final stage. If the survey is part of a panel study, please describe not just the current wave but also the original sample. For telephone samples, please indicate whether the sample was a random digit dial (RDD) sample, listed sample, or dual frame sample. For surveys conducted by mail, indicate whether a listed sample.

12. Were probability-based methods used for all stages of the selection process? That is, units were randomly selected throughout the process, including at initial recruitment (if a panel).

- Yes (*random selection based on Poisson distribution by the Federal Statistics Office*)
- No

If no, please describe all instances where non-probability methods were used and provide a justification for each as to why random selection was not used.

13. Did your sampling design make use of one or more of the following techniques? Please mark all that apply.

- Stratification
- Cluster sampling
- Quota sampling
- Interviewing more than one respondent from a single household
- Respondent or household substitution
- Non-sample replacement methods

Definitions:

- Stratification involves the division of the population into groups according to certain characteristics (for instance by demographic characteristics). Random selection then occurs within each of the groups that result to ensure their adequate inclusion.
- Cluster sampling divides the population into groups and then uses random selection to include some of the groups but not others. For example, a cluster sample might divide a large country into geographic areas and then select only some of the areas while excluding others, to avoid the need (and cost) of interviewer travel to all areas.
- In quota sampling, a respondent is sometimes selected based on demographic characteristics, rather than randomly, to ensure certain target distributions are met.
- Substitution is replacing one sampling unit with another when the first sampled unit is difficult to reach and/or interview.

Stratification by canton (=electoral districts). The sample size was adjusted to have a minimum of at least 80 respondents per canton in each of the 26 cantons (which implied an oversampling of small cantons) and to have a larger sample of individuals in two cantons with important regional parties – Geneva and Ticino – to allow for analyses on the cantonal level.

Section D1. Interviewing Mode(s)

14. Please indicate the mode(s) of interviewing for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared. Mark all that apply.

- Interviewer-administered: In person (sometimes called face-to-face)
- Interviewer-administered: Video
- Interviewer-administered: Telephone
- Self-completion: Paper (by mail, supplement, etc.)
- Self-completion: Internet
- Other, please specify: _____

Section D2. Interviewing Mode(s): Mixed-Mode

15. If the survey in which the CSES Module appeared was mixed-mode (that is, made use of more than one mode type)...

Was the mixed-mode design intended to address a particular problem or problems?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please elaborate:

Although Internet penetration is very high in Switzerland, some population groups may be less comfortable with online tools and therefore less likely to respond—such as older individuals, people from less urban areas, those living in smaller households, and people with an immigration background or limited integration into the labor market. Additionally, it is well known that (probability-based) online surveys tend to achieve lower response rates compared to other survey modes. To improve sample composition and increase response rates, we provided

respondents with the option to complete a paper questionnaire. However, this option was offered only with the second reminder (push-to-web design).

Were all modes available to respondents from the beginning, or was there a mode progression (that is, if the respondent did not respond by one mode, another mode was subsequently offered to them)? If the latter, please describe the mode progression.

No, we opted for a push-to-web design. The paper questionnaire was sent out with the 2nd reminder, to sample members who had not filled in the web questionnaire by then.

Were individuals assigned a mode after recruitment or was this part of the recruitment?

- Assigned a mode after recruitment
- Assigned a mode as part of the recruitment

Did respondents self-select the mode by which they would respond?

- Yes
- No

Paper was not initially offered at the time of recruitment/first invitation to the survey (push-to-web design). The paper questionnaire was sent out with the 2nd reminder. From then on, sample members could self-select into their preferred mode.

Did the design include a mode change *within* interviews (e.g., selected self-completion elements within the same questionnaire)?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide details:

If there were substantial differences in the distribution of key demographics across modes, please note them here.

See answer to #7 above and table in the Appendix.

Section D3. Interviewing Mode(s): Telephone

16. If the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared was entirely or partly conducted by telephone...

What is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? _____ %

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? _____ %

Section D4. Interviewing Mode(s): Internet

17. If the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared was entirely or partly conducted via the Internet...

What is the estimated percentage of households without access to the Internet (that is, the percent of the eligible population excluded due to lack of Internet access)? 0 %

Source: Federal Statistics Office, FSO number ind-d-30109

(<https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/kultur-medien-informationsgesellschaft-sport/informationsgesellschaft/gesamtindikatoren/haushalte-bevoelkerung/internetzugang-haushalte.assetdetail.31605923.html>)

Were provisions taken to include members of the population without access to the Internet?

Yes

No

If “Yes”, please explain: *Mixed-mode survey. A paper questionnaire was sent out with the 2nd reminder.*

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

Did the survey make use of an access panel (i.e. respondents were selected from a group of pre-screened panelists)?

Yes

No

If yes, 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):

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

Section E. Respondent Persuasion

18. What was the average number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample (not just for survey completions)? *Not applicable*

19. What was the maximum number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample (not just for survey completions)? *5 (prenotification, invitation, up to 3 reminders)*

20. Did respondents receive incentive payments? Please mark all that apply.

- Yes, during the screening process
- Yes, in advance of their interview
- Yes, after their interview
- No

21. Were special efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

- Yes
- No

Section F: Interview/Survey Verification

22. Was interview/survey verification used?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: 100 %

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

Access the online questionnaires was only possible with a personal login. For paper questionnaires, there was a code printed on the questionnaire to attribute the responses to the right person in the sample. Respondents whose year of birth and/or gender explicitly differed from the information in the sample frame provided by the Federal Statistical Office (e.g., a different birth year or a gender mismatch) were considered substitutions and systematically excluded from the final dataset. However, if either the year of birth or gender was missing while the other was correctly reported, the respondent was retained in the dataset.

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.

23. What steps, if any, were taken to ensure that respondents were providing truthful answers to the questions? Were any respondents removed from the final dataset (e.g. due to speeding, satisficing, completing multiple surveys, etc.)? Please provide details.

We removed likely substitution cases (reported age and/or sex did not correspond to information from the Federal Statistics Office, N=164) as well as invalid questionnaires (<50% of web questionnaire completed and/or web questionnaire completed in less than a third of the median duration, N=173).

Section G1. Response Rate

Notes to collaborators:

- 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 mode used.
- Standard definitions for the below items, as well as a helpful response rate calculator, can be accessed on the website of the American Association for Public Opinion Research at: <https://www.aapor.org/Communications/AAPOR-Journals/Standard-Definitions.aspx>

24. For each of the following categories, please indicate the number of cases/records from the sample that fall into each. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the numbers for the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

Interviews

I. Completed interviews I = 5014 _____
 P. Partial interviews P = 19 _____

Non-interviews

R. Refusals and break-offs R = 825 _____
 NC. Non-Contact NC = 105 _____
 O. Other O = 4432 _____

Unknown Eligibility

UH. Unknown if household/occupied household unit UH = _____
 UO. Unknown, other UO = _____

Note: N=4'512 respondents (89.4%) participated in the web survey, N=521 (10.4%) participated via the paper questionnaire.

25. Please calculate the response rate (RR2) by inserting the answers from Question 24 into the following formula.

$$RR2 = \frac{(I + P)}{(I + P) + (R + NC + O) + (UH + UO)}$$

= 48.4%

26. If the number of cases with unknown eligibility (UH and/or UO in Question 24) is greater than zero, please estimate what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible. Please indicate the basis, evidence, and any scientific justification for this estimate.

Section G2. Response Rate: Panel Studies

27. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study...

How many waves were conducted prior to the wave that included the CSES Module?

What was the response rate at the initial recruitment stage? Please show your calculations.

What percent of recruited respondents participated in the first wave of the study? Please show your calculations.

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.

If there were substantial differences in the distribution of key demographics (for example, age, gender, education, etc.) between the first wave of the study and the wave that included CSES, please note them here.

Please provide the number of completed interviews for the wave that included the CSES Module.

Section H. Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

28. Are weights included in the data file?

Yes

No

If No, please explain why no weights are provided:

If Yes, please describe in detail: their construction, what they correct for, and how their use makes the survey dataset more representative of the population.

A5_1. ORIGINAL WEIGHT: SAMPLE: This is the original Design Weight in the Swiss post-election survey data. Because of the fact that two cantons (GE and TI) were overrepresented in the sample as well as some small cantons in order to have enough respondents in each canton for subgroup analyses, sample-related biases occur in the original data. Applying the Design Weight corrects this cantonal oversampling. This weight was calculated as the quotient of the proportion of eligible voters in the population of each canton and the proportion of respondents in the sample that falls within the canton.

A5_3. ORIGINAL WEIGHT: POLITICAL: This is the original Total Weight in the Swiss post-election survey data. It corrects biases that result from oversampling, turnout and party choice in the data. The weight is calculated by multiplying three weights, namely the Design, Turnout and Party Choice Weights. The Design Weight corresponds to A5_1. The original Turnout Weight corrects respondents' overreporting of participation in the federal elections (according to the official election turnout), whereas the original Party Choice Weight corrects party choice biases in the survey (according to the official election results).

29. Were any other steps taken to mitigate the impact of non-response in the dataset? If so, how do the adjustments affect the survey results? *No other steps were taken*

Section I. Translation

Notes to collaborators...

- As part of your deposit, please provide the original questionnaire(s) in each language used.
- For questionnaires in a language other than English, if a back-translation to English happens to be available, we would appreciate receiving the back-translation, also.
- The below questions on translation are adapted from those developed for the ISSP.

30. 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

31. Please list all languages used for the fielded module.

German, French, Italian

32. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated? Please mark all that apply.

- Yes, a group worked together on it and reconciled their differences through discussion
- Yes, an expert checked it
- Yes, by back translation
- Other; please specify: _____
- No
- Not applicable

33. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

34. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

35. 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:

- Q07a-Q07g : Note a slight difference between the German and French/Italian translations. In German, “trust” was used as a verb in the question wording, with the answer categories: “not at all”, “not much”, “rather much”, “a lot”. In French and Italian, “trust” was used as a noun in the question wording, with answer categories ranging from “no trust”, “not much trust”, “some trust”, “a great deal of trust”.

- Q12: we had some difficulties translating the expression « variety of choice », especially in German (where “Auswahl” was used, whereas we stuck to “variété du choix” in French and “varietà dell’offerta politica” in Italian). In all three languages, we added « variety of parties and candidates in the federal elections ».
- Q15: In French, we opted for a slightly different wording (les élections ne changent rien - elections don’t make a difference).
- Q25a/b: in these questions, “usually” was translated as “rather” (eher – plutôt – tendenzialmente)
- Q27a: “how united society is” was rather difficult to translate. We opted for the wording “affected social cohesion” in all three languages.

Section J. Other

36. Please list any additional advice you have for analysts about how the survey should be used, and any remaining special considerations in that regard.

Appendix: Sample composition, Swiss post-election study 2023, according to survey mode (unweighted N, percentages design-weighted by A5_1)

	Paper	Web	Total	Test
N	521 (10.2%)	4'512 (89.8%)	5'033 (100.0%)	
<i>Socio-demographics</i>				
Man (dummy)	0.448 (0.498)	0.494 (0.500)	0.489 (0.500)	0.049
Household size				
1	120 (23.8%)	747 (16.4%)	867 (17.1%)	<0.001
2	220 (43.9%)	1'845 (43.2%)	2'065 (43.2%)	
3	80 (16.2%)	686 (14.4%)	736 (14.6%)	
4+	88 (16.2%)	1'173 (26.0%)	1'261 (25.0%)	
Swiss nationality at birth (dummy)	0.836 (0.371)	0.832 (0.374)	0.832 (0.374)	0.839
R's highest level of education (13-point scale)	8.785 (11.649)	8.353 (3.409)	8.387 (4.610)	0.080
Age in categories				
18-24	31 (6.1%)	381 (8.1%)	412 (7.9%)	<0.001
25-34	42 (7.8%)	609 (13.3%)	651 (12.7%)	
35-44	44 (8.8%)	680 (16.2%)	724 (15.4%)	
45-54	52 (9.2%)	758 (16.7%)	810 (15.9%)	
55-64	122 (23.5%)	904 (19.9%)	1'026 (20.3%)	
65-74	98 (19.6%)	745 (16.7%)	843 (17.0%)	
75+	127 (25.0%)	418 (9.2%)	545 (10.8%)	
Language of interview				
German	294 (66.3%)	2'782 (72.7%)	3'076 (72.1%)	0.005
French	158 (29.4%)	1'143 (22.9%)	1'301 (23.6%)	
Italian	69 (4.3%)	587 (4.3%)	656 (4.3%)	
Current marital status				
Married or in registered partnership	268 (53.0%)	2'434 (54.7%)	2'702 (54.5%)	<0.001
Widowed	49 (10.5%)	170 (3.7%)	219 (4.4%)	
Divorced or separated	81 (15.6%)	511 (11.4%)	592 (11.8%)	
Single	115 (20.9%)	1'362 (30.2%)	1'477 (29.2%)	
Fully employed (dummy)	0.241 (0.428)	0.363 (0.481)	0.351 (0.477)	<0.001
<i>Geographic origin</i>				
Big region of Switzerland (NUTS II) from FSO				
Lake Geneva (VD, VS, GE)	125 (22.3%)	913 (17.2%)	1'038 (17.7%)	0.012
Middleland (BE, FR, SO, NE, JU)	103 (26.6%)	763 (22.9%)	866 (23.3%)	
North-west Switzerland (BS, BL, AG)	44 (12.2%)	418 (13.6%)	462 (13.4%)	
Zurich	47 (14.6%)	501 (17.6%)	548 (17.2%)	
East Switzerland (GL, SH, AR, AI, SG, GR, TG)	72 (12.4%)	720 (14.3%)	792 (14.1%)	

Central Switzerland (LU, UR, SZ, OW, NW, ZG)	63 (8.0%)	593 (10.4%)	656 (10.1%)	
Ticino	67 (3.9%)	604 (4.1%)	671 (4.1%)	
Municipality size (8 categories, FSO 2022)				
> 100'000 Inhabitants	50 (9.9%)	502 (11.8%)	552 (11.6%)	0.296
50'000 - 99'999 Inhabitants	17 (3.1%)	137 (2.6%)	154 (2.7%)	
20'000 - 49'999 Inhabitants	64 (12.6%)	583 (12.0%)	647 (12.1%)	
10'000 - 19'999 Inhabitants	102 (20.0%)	806 (18.0%)	908 (18.2%)	
5'000 - 9'999 Inhabitants	124 (22.9%)	938 (20.4%)	1'062 (20.7%)	
2'000 - 4'999 Inhabitants	104 (19.8%)	917 (21.1%)	1'021 (20.9%)	
1'000 - 1'999 Inhabitants	39 (7.0%)	437 (9.7%)	476 (9.4%)	
< 1'000 Inhabitants	21 (4.7%)	192 (4.3%)	213 (4.3%)	
<i>Political variables of interest</i>				
Participation in the 2023 election (dummy)	0.621 (0.486)	0.673 (0.469)	0.668 (0.471)	0.020
Vote for SVP (dummy)	0.352 (0.478)	0.244 (0.429)	0.256 (0.435)	0.001
Political interest (4-point scale)	2.664 (0.777)	2.762 (0.808)	2.752 (0.805)	0.010