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

Version: December 2022

Country/territory: Germany Date of election: February 23rd, 2025 Prepared by: GLES project team (GESIS) Date of preparation: February 2026

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.

Name: Sigrid Roßteutscher Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main Address: Goethe Universität, Frankfurt a. M. FB 03 Hauspostfach 15 Theodor-W.-Adorno-Platz 6 D-60323 Frankfurt am Main, Germany Telephone: +49 69-798-36628 Fax:	Name: Harald Schoen Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: University of Mannheim Address: Lehrstuhl für Politische Wissenschaft, Politische Psychologie Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften Universität Mannheim, A5, 6 D-68131 Mannheim, Germany Telephone: +49 621-181-2088 Fax: +49 621-181-2059

E-Mail: rossteutscher@soz.uni-frankfurt.de Website: http://www2.uni-frankfurt.de/47263960/srossteutscher	E-Mail: harald.schoen@uni-mannheim.de Website: http://lspwpp.sowi.uni-mannheim.de/english/team/chair_representation/
Name: Thorsten Faas Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: Freie Universität Berlin Address: Arbeitsstelle Politische Soziologie der Bundesrepublik Deutschland Otto-Suhr-Institut für Politikwissenschaft Freie Universität Berlin Ihnestraße 21, Raum 103, 14195 Berlin Telephone: +49 30 838 64131 Fax: +49 30 838 54960 E-Mail: thorsten.faas@fu-berlin.de Website: https://www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de/polwiss/forschung/systeme/empsoz/team/Faas.html	Name: Marc Debus Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: University of Mannheim Address: Lehrstuhl für Politik-wissenschaft, Vergleichende Regierungs-lehre Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften Universität Mannheim, A5, 6 D-68131 Mannheim, Germany Telephone: +49 621 181–2081 Fax: +49 621 181–2080 E-Mail: polwiss3@uni-mannheim.de Website: https://www.sowi.uni-mannheim.de/debus/
Name: Reinhard Pollak Title: Prof. Dr. Organization: GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences Address: Postfach 12 21 55, 68072 Mannheim, Germany Telephone: +49 621-1246-153 Fax: +49 621-1246-100 E-Mail: reinhard.pollak@gesis.org Website: https://www.gesis.org/institut/mitarbeiterverzeichnis/person/reinhard.pollak	

Section A2. Data Collection Organization

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection…

Organization name: Verian
Website: https://www.veriangroup.com/de/

Section A3. Funding Organization(s)

Organization(s) that funded the data collection…

Organization name: GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences
Website: https://www.gesis.org/home

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 archived.

Organization name: GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences
Website: https://www.gesis.org/home

Section B. Study Design

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:
    [X] 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: February 26th, 2025

The date that interviewing ended: April 23rd, 2025

The number of days between the date of the election and when interviewing began:
3

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

[X] 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?
7337

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?
[X] Yes
[ ] No

Section C. Sample frame, selection, and eligibility

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

German voting population plus 16- and 17-year-olds who will become eligible to vote in the next election.

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)?

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.

- At least 16 years old
- German citizenship & permanent primary residence in Germany

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

The sampling was designed as a multi-stage register sample, which also aimed to achieve oversampling for eastern Germany, as this was the only way to enable systematic comparisons between eastern and western German citizens. In this context, the first stage was to draw a municipal sample based on 300 sample points. Of these, 200 sample points were allocated to western Germany and 100 to eastern Germany. A sample point comprises a specified number of personal addresses, which were drawn from municipal registers in a second selection step. The majority of sample points correspond to a single municipality, although large municipalities can also be represented by several sample points.

In a second step, the municipalities selected were asked to provide a random sample of individuals belonging to the population. Municipalities with multiple sample points had to provide a correspondingly larger number of addresses. In the third stage of the sampling process,

the institute conducting the survey drew the sample of individuals from the addresses provided by the municipalities.

Given the short notice of the early federal election, many municipalities were burdened with additional organizational work, so that not all municipalities were able to process our request. Of the 300 sample points targeted, the survey institute Verian was able to obtain the addresses for 247 sample points from the residents' registration offices, which corresponds to a share of 82.3 percent. In order to be able to conduct surveys in all randomly selected municipalities, Verian used Deutsche Post Direkt GmbH (hereinafter: “Post Direkt”) for the missing municipalities. This is a service provided by Deutsche Post. Deutsche Post offers survey institutes the option of contacting randomly selected addresses. More information can be found here: https://service.postdirekt.de/portal/

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: _____

    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.

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.

The selection population comprises all municipalities in the Federal Republic of Germany as of November 30, 2025 (territorial status). In accordance with the specifications, the municipal sample was allocated as an area sample using a four-dimensional matrix (federal state * REGBEZ * district * BIK), with the number of German persons aged 16 and over serving as the stratum weight. The sample was implemented as a stratified, multi-stage random selection. For this purpose, all municipalities in the study area were divided into strata according to regional criteria.

The first-stage sampling units are the municipalities. Each municipality was assigned to exactly one stratum according to regional criteria. Two groups of characteristics were used to form the strata: 1) spatial units and 2) BIK municipality types.

Spatial units
State Federal state of the Federal Republic of Germany

District Administrative district, even where abolished but still present in the municipality code
County Rural or urban county

On this basis, a total of 10 BIK types can be differentiated, which are defined on the one hand by their population and on the other hand by how close these regional units are to the city center, at least in the case of cities with a large population (see Table 1: BIK types). The BIK municipality type better reflects the degree of urbanization in terms of the urban-rural division of a region than the political municipality size class. It distinguishes between ten characteristics that define urban-rural relationships at the municipal level for conurbations, urban regions, medium-sized centers, and sub-centers.

Table 1: BIK types

BIK-Typ	BIK-Typ (entsprechend BIK-Stadtregionen)
0	500.000 or more inhabitants (structural type 1)
1	500.000 or more inhabitants (structural type 2,3,4)
2	100.000 to less than 500.000 inhabitants (structural type 1)
3	100.000 to less than 500.000 inhabitants (structural type 2,3,4)
4	50.000 to less than 100.000 inhabitants (structural type 1)
5	50.000 to less than 100.000 inhabitants (structural type 2,3,4)
6	20.000 to less than 50.000 inhabitants
7	5.000 to less than 20.000 inhabitants
8	2.000 to less than 5.000 inhabitants
9	less than 2.000 inhabitants

Structure type 1: Core area of the BIK region
Structure type 2: Densely populated area of the BIK region
Structure type 3: Transition area of the BIK region
Structure type 4: Peripheral area

The four-dimensional draw was technically implemented using the following algorithm in four steps:

1) First, the margin distribution was determined according to BIK municipality type, without taking other regional units into account. The target values were first rounded randomly and then rounded to compensate for rounding errors. The rounded result for the BIK municipality type was not changed in the subsequent steps.
2) The matrix (federal state * BIK municipality type) was then processed. This means that internal values were rounded randomly and the margins were then balanced so that the absolute deviation be-tween the marginal totals and the internal values was always less than one. The BIK margin from step 1) remained unchanged. During rounding compensation, care was taken to ensure that rounding errors that were already small (less than 0.3) remained unchanged. If there was no solution, random rounding was performed again and the threshold value of 0.3 was reduced slightly, but this was only necessary in exceptional cases. The rounded result (federal state * BIK municipality type) was not changed in the subsequent steps.
3) For each federal state, the matrix (administrative district * BIK municipality type) was processed in the same way as in step 2), with the margin federal state * BIK municipality type

(result from step 2) being retained. The rounded result (administrative district * BIK municipality type) was not changed in the subsequent steps.
4) For each administrative district, the matrix (county * BIK municipality type) was processed in the same way as in step 2).
The procedure can therefore be described as starting with a margin to which the sample is to be adjusted, and then gradually adding further margins, while always keeping the previous, coarser margin constant.

Due to the disproportionate approach between West and East, the allocation was calculated separately for West and East. This allocation was based on the population update as of December 31, 2022 (factual data status) and the territorial structure as of December 31, 2024 (territorial status, also BIK type), whereby the separation of the figures for Berlin into West and East was based on an estimate proportional to the number of residents registered as of December 31, 2023. The sample points (200 in the West, 100 in the East) were distributed across the stratification tables in proportion to the determined weighting. As already mentioned, a sample point defines the number of addresses that were drawn from the register of residents in the second selection stage. The allocation was carried out according to an algorithm by Cox(1987).

Municipality selection

Following the allocation calculation, the municipality selection was carried out as a systematic draw with a random start for each individual stratum. Restrictions at the municipal level due to inaccessibility for the selection population were taken into account. If a municipality was selected multiple times (i.e., more than one sample point fell on this municipality), a correspondingly larger number of addresses were selected in this municipality. A total of 185 municipalities were drawn for the west and 81 for the east, with Berlin counted for both the west and the east.

Synthetic sample points and municipalities with multiple sample points

Twelve sample points were so-called synthetic sample points, comprising a total of 33 municipalities. Synthetic sample points are formed when the significance weight (i.e., the number of persons in the population in the municipality) is so small that this could potentially lead to difficulties in sampling and fieldwork. For this survey, it was determined that the number of persons in the population in a municipality should be at least eight times the order quantity of n = 125 addresses. This means that synthetic sample points were formed when the significance weight of the municipality was less than 1,000. This was achieved by combining the selected municipality with a (regionally neighboring) municipality of similar size from the same selection cell. In seven cases, one additional municipality was added, and in three cases, two additional municipalities had to be added. In one case each, synthesis involving three and five additional municipalities was necessary.

In strata for which a value of at least 1 was calculated in the allocation calculation in the step of distributing the 300 sample points to the allocation table before rounding, one or two sample points are drawn for a value between 1 and 2, two or three sample points for a value between 2 and 3,

etc. In many cases, several sample points are allocated to the same municipalities, as independent cities each form their own stratum. The following table shows the municipalities that are included in the GLES 2025 sample with several sample points in the sample.

Table xx1: Municipalities with multiple sample points

Municipality	County	BIK type	State	German pers. 16 years and older	Number of sample points
Hamburg	02000	0	02	1.289.571	5
Bremen	04011	0	04	386.109	2
Düsseldorf	05111	0	05	415.948	2
Köln	05315	0	05	736.545	3
Dortmund	05913	0	05	399.315	2
München	09162	0	09	912.821	3
Berlin (West)	11100	0	11	1.421.812	5
Berlin (Ost)	11200	0	11	1.032.084	10
Potsdam	12054	0	12	138.339	2
Rostock	13003	2	13	168.138	2
Chemnitz	14511	2	14	187.897	2
Dresden	14612	0	14	425.608	4
Leipzig	14713	0	14	457.739	4
Magdeburg	15003	2	15	179.453	2

Adress procurement and preparation

For each sample point, 125 addresses were requested from the residents' registration office of the randomly selected municipality. Since 14 municipalities had more than one sample point, they were asked to provide two to ten times the number of addresses. When requesting the addresses, the municipalities were provided with information on which to base the selection process for determining the addresses. Fewer addresses were requested for the twelve synthetic sample points in accordance with their significance weighting.

In the course of obtaining addresses, a total of nine sample points had to be exchanged because the local authorities gave irrefutable reasons for refusal or because no further extensions were possible towards the end of the processing period. This included two smaller municipalities that were combined in a synthetic sample point and had to be replaced. Only municipalities with GKPOL 1 to 4 were affected by the municipality replacement. At 3.6 percent, the proportion of sample points affected by a municipality replacement is at the level that the survey institute conducting the survey would expect based on experience from comparable surveys. Experience shows that this proportion is less than 5 percent. However, the values are not directly comparable, as the GLES "aborted" the address procurement after approximately two months and the addresses for the remaining open municipalities (17.7% of the sample points) were obtained via Post Direkt. In view of the early federal elections, during which a large amount of the registration offices' capacity was tied up with the official task of preparing for the elections—capacity that was then lacking for processing group information—this is a very good result.

Tighter scheduling and adress procurement via Post Direkt

The schedule allowed for a relatively short period of time for the sampling process (municipal sample, address procurement, personal sample). Instead of the five to six months that are usual for

comparable surveys, the sample for the post-election cross-section had to be compiled in less than three months. The problem here is not the large proportion of municipalities that respond more or less quickly to address requests, but the few municipalities that repeatedly delay delivery for a variety of reasons.

After the municipalities had been selected, letters were sent out on November 29, 2024, requesting the provision of addresses. For municipalities that had not yet provided addresses by February 4, 2025, the alternative address procurement method via Post Direkt was used. By the end of 2024, Verian had already received addresses for 49% of the municipalities. Another 31% of the municipalities followed by mid-February 2025. This meant that the addresses from the residents' registration offices were available for 247 sample points before the random sample was drawn. A total of 82.3% of the sample points were thus covered by the register.

For the 53 sample points for which the municipality was unable to provide addresses within the available time frame, the alternative procedure via Post Direkt had to be used. Since the selection basis of Post Direkt is skewed in terms of age structure (young adults are underrepresented), n = 5,000 addresses per sample point were ordered from Post Direkt for the corresponding municipalities. This provided a sufficient number of addresses to create a sample that corresponded to the structures of the population, and the disproportionate selection basis was compensated for when drawing the sample of individuals with the corresponding margin specification. In this first stage, Verian did not receive any real names or street and house numbers, but rather, on a case-by-case basis, the available personal characteristics of age (by age group) and gender, as well as an associated ID, for the requested 5,000 addresses. Due to the higher number of cases, new synthesizations of the sample points were necessary for the deliveries from Post Direkt.
Verian drew a sample of individuals from the “addresses” (age group and gender) supplied (see section “Quantity structure of Post Direkt sample” in the chapter on samples of individuals). The IDs of the addresses drawn (target individuals to be written to) were sent back to Post Direkt for address enrichment. As an exception, a way was found to provide Verian with the postal addresses for mailing purposes using real names, so that the target persons could be contacted in the same design as persons from the municipality sample (mailing of the invitation letter including the prepaid incentives).

Initial verification of the adresses provided

All addresses provided by the residents' registration offices were subjected to a formal check. This involved checking the completeness of the required characteristics, membership of the target group, and geographical concentration, for example in a few streets. In addition, any anomalies in the distribution matrix, such as a disproportionate distribution in the age * gender matrix, were discussed with the supplying municipalities and, in individual cases, corrected by the authorities in the form of corrective deliveries. Finally, a duplicate check was carried out to determine whether households had been identified more than once in the sample. If this was the case, the duplicate households were randomly eliminated from the selection basis. The additional characteristics of gender and age were obtained for almost all municipalities. Two Bavarian municipalities did not provide any additional characteristics, so this information on age was not available for 376 addresses. However, according to these municipalities, there were seven cases classified as “minors.”

A total of 608 addresses of minors were provided by the residents' registration offices, which were taken into account separately when sending the letters, as according to the specifications, they had to be contacted via their parents.

Personal sample

In accordance with the sampling design for the GLES Cross-Section with two different methods of address procurement, different numbers of addresses per sample point had to be drawn for the field samples depending on the origin of the addresses. The personal sample was drawn separately for the two procurement methods, as the sampling procedures differed. Based on Verian's experience with mixed-mode projects such as GLES 2021, ALLBUS 2021 and 2023, ISSP, and EVS, and the fieldwork process for these studies, Verian based the GLES Cross-Section's quantity structure on certain assumptions and estimates so that a final case count of = 7,000 valid net cases could be achieved. It should be noted that with this approach—in contrast to study designs that allow for intervention during the field period and thus "control"—no net case number could be guaranteed; instead, the gross address to be used was determined.

Quantity structure of the register sample

In order to obtain a sufficient net number of cases, an expected response rate of 25% was assumed for the register addresses, which meant a total of 23,218 addresses, or 94 addresses per sample point. For the register addresses, the personal sample was drawn by simple random sampling from the address database provided by the municipalities and cleaned up by Verian.

Quantity structure of the Post Direkt sample

The situation was different for addresses from Post Direkt: it was known from other projects using Post Direkt as the address source that the selection population was skewed in terms of age structure and that young people were underrepresented. It was therefore essential to stratify by age group (in contrast to a purely random selection from the register addresses. The expectation was that the age and gender distribution would vary between municipalities.
Furthermore, Post Direkt does not provide a clear representation of the population as a whole, and the addresses cannot be restricted to eligible voters, i.e., persons with German citizenship, as was the case with the residents' registration offices. The addresses had to be adjusted, mainly to compensate for letters sent to persons without German citizenship who were also invited to participate in the survey but did not belong to the population. It had to be taken into account that persons with non-German citizenship are not distributed evenly across the federal states and live in cities or rural areas with varying frequency.
The skewed age distribution and the necessary translation of addresses were taken into account when considering the sample design via Post Direkt. The sample points were divided into four categories: West-East crossed with the size of the municipality (large = gkpol 6 and 7, small = gkpol 1 to 5), i.e., each of the remaining sample points could be assigned to one of the four categories. A separate target was set for each category and different numbers of addresses were drawn for the sample.
A total of 5,562 addresses were drawn (i.e., an average of 105 addresses per sample point), using the following procedure:

- For the addresses from Post Direkt, a cell-level draw was conducted at the sample point level in seven age groups and two genders in order to compensate for any skewness in terms of age and gender. The structures differed between the west and east and between large municipalities (with 10,000 or more inhabitants) and small municipalities (with fewer than 10,000 inhabitants).
- For four sample point types (western metropolitan, western rural, eastern metropolitan, eastern rural), specifications were established for distribution by age group (1 to 7) and gender. This was based on the cumulative distribution of "similar sample points" in another survey. As a result, the addresses selected in the west tend to be younger in metropolitan communities, while those in the east tend to be older in rural sample points.
- In addition, the different proportions of expected foreigners in the draw were taken into account using different gross estimates: 99 addresses were drawn for rural sample points in the east (5.3% translation compared to the register), 108 addresses for urban sample points in the east and rural sample points in the west (14.9% translation) and 117 addresses were drawn for urban western sample points (24.5% translation).

Table xx: distribution of addresses by age group and gender for the four categories

	West, more than 100.000 inhabitants		**West, less than 100.000 inhabitants**		**East, more than 100.000 inhabitants**		**East, less than 100.000 inhabitants**	
age group	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
18 to 24 years	6	6	5	4	5	5	3	2
25 to 29 years	5	5	4	3	5	5	2	2
30 to 39 years	10	9	8	8	11	10	7	6
40 to 49 years	9	8	8	8	8	6	7	7
50 to 59 years	9	11	11	10	7	7	11	10
60 to 69 years	9	8	9	10	7	8	9	11
70 and older	9	13	9	11	10	14	9	13
Total	117		108		108		99	

Initial check of the addresses provided by Post Direkt

Verian received the addresses from Post Direkt after the random sample of individuals had been drawn (n= 5,562) and the corresponding IDs had been transmitted. The addresses received were first checked against Verian's block list to verify whether the individuals could be contacted. Four individuals were not permitted to be contacted by Verian and were not included in the subsequent processing steps.

For addresses provided by Post Direkt, gender information was available in all cases. For age, only information on the age group was available, but not the specific year of birth or age. The age was provided in the following categories: 18-24, 25-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, and 70 and above. The age groups thus differed between the register and Post Direkt. Minors are not included in the Post Direkt sample, nor is information on nationality.

Total sample

The GLES Cross-Section sample comprised a total of 28,780 addresses: 23,218 addresses in 247 sample points from the register sample and 5,562 addresses from the Post Direkt sample in 53 sample points.

A supplementary sample, which could have been used later in the fieldwork if the expected response rates had not been achieved, was not planned due to the project design and was not needed.

Table 2: gross sample of individuals by address origin and socio-demographic subgroups

socio-demographic characteristics	proportion register sample in percent	proportion Post Direk in percent
total	80,7	19,3
gender		
male	80,3	19,7
female	80,7	19,3
age groups		
minors	100	0
18 to 19 years	54	46
20 to 29 years	88,7	11,3
30 to 39 years	79,8	20,2
40 to 49 years	80,3	19,7
50 to 59 years	77,9	22,1
60 to 69 years	80,5	19,5
70 to 79 years	75,7	24,3
80 years and older	88,3	11,7
unknown	100	0
federal states		
Baden-Württemberg	92,7	7,3
Bayern	74,4	25,6
Berlin	100	0
Brandenburg	76,9	23,1
Bremen	100	0
Hamburg	100	0
Hessen	86,7	13,3
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	71,7	28,3
Niedersachsen	77,4	22,6
Nordrhein-Westfalen	84,4	15,6
Rheinland-Pfalz	100	0
Saarland	100	0
Sachsen	58	42
Sachsen-Anhalt	80,5	19,6
Schleswig-Holstein	87,4	12,6
Thüringen	65,1	34,9

The percentages have been rounded. Due to this rounding, the total may not add up to 100 percent.

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).

[X] Yes

[ ] 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.

[x] Stratification
[x] Cluster sampling
[x] 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.

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
[X] Self-completion: Paper (by mail, supplement, etc.)
[X] 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?

[X] Yes
[ ] No

If yes, please elaborate: The usage of smartphones / tablets / Desktop PCs etc. is still relatively low among older age groups. Thus, we decided to send paper questionnaires to the population aged 80 years or older right away.

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.

As stated above, respondents aged 80 years or older were given the opportunity to participate in the survey online or via paper questionnaire right away. Everybody else got the paper questionnaire together with the second reminder (if they had not already participated at that point).

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

[X] Assigned a mode after recruitment
[ ] Assigned a mode as part of the recruitment

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

[X] Yes, partially
[] No

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

[ ] Yes
[X] No

If yes, please provide details:

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

Older people tend to use the paper questionnaire more often. The cut-off age seems to be around 75 years.

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)? 5 - 10 %

It is hard to give a specific number, the German bureau of statistics cites this study among 16- to 74-year-olds: https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Einkommen-Konsum-Lebensbedingungen/IT-Nutzung/_inhalt.html

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

[X] Yes
[ ] No

If "Yes", please explain:
All respondents were given a paper questionnaire with the second 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
[X] 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
[X] 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)?
2.67 contact attempts per household

19. What was the maximum number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample (not just for survey completions)?
3

20. Did respondents receive incentive payments? Please mark all that apply.
[ ] Yes, during the screening process
[X] Yes, in advance of their interview
[X] Yes, after their interview
[ ] No

21. Were special efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?
[X] Yes
[ ] No

Section F: Interview/Survey Verification

22. Was interview/survey verification used?
[X] Yes
[ ] No

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

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

Target persons were verified by comparing the self-declared year of birth and gender with the information from the registration office. Only persons whose year of birth does not deviate from the information from the registration office (tolerance +/- 1 year) are published.

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

The following interviews are published for this release:

1) **Verified target person**
   Target persons were verified by comparing the self-declared year of birth and gender with the information from the registration office. Only persons whose year of birth does not deviate from the information from the registration office (tolerance +/- 1 year) are published.
2) **Interview completed before field end**

Questionnaires from the PAPI survey were accepted and scanned until April 23rd, 2025. All interviews where respondents indicated that they completed the interview after April 23rd, 2025 were removed from the sample subsequently.

3) **Most completed interview in case of multiple participations**
In the case of multiple participations of a person (after verification of the target person), the interview that contains more complete information (terminated later/fewer "no answer") is published.

4) **Complete and partial interviews**
Based on the recommendations of AAPOR (2016), interviews are classified as complete if more than 80 percent of all applicable questions are answered. Interviews in which between 50 and 80 percent of all applicable questions are answered are classified as partial interviews. Interviews in which less than 50 percent of the questions were answered are not published.

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 = 7 035
P. Partial interviews	P = 302
Non-interviews	
R. Refusals and break-offs	R = 21 439
NC. Non-Contact	NC = 4
O. Other	O = 0
Unknown Eligibility	
UH. Unknown if household/occupied household unit	UH = 0
UO. Unknown, other	UO = 0

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

$$RR2 = \frac{(7035 + 302)}{(7035 + 302) + (21439 + 4 + 0) + (0 + 0)}$$

= 0.254934

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?

[X] 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.

We added two types of weighting variables to the data set, each marked with the prefix "w_" for "weight."

The first type of weighting variable is East-West weight. Due to Germany's history and the current differences in political attitudes and voting behavior in the East and West, it is relevant for election researchers to look at these subgroups. In order to achieve a sufficiently large number of cases for the subgroups, the sample was set up disproportionately to the actual distributions. According to the Federal Statistical Office (as of 2023), the West German population accounts for approximately 79.67 percent of the total population, while the East German population accounts for approximately 20.33

percent. In the gross sample, these proportions were adjusted to a ratio of 2:1. The corresponding East-West weights account for this adjustment and thus readjust the ratio present in the population. The weights are also output separately for CAWI and PAPI (marked with the suffix "_c" and "_p") and with West Berlin assigned to East Germany and West Germany.

The second type are so-called design weights, which are intended to compensate for distortions in socio-structural characteristics. The following variables are taken into account: region (East/West), gender (male/female), age groups (16 to under 30, 30 to under 45, 45 to under 60, 60 and older), education (low, medium, high), degree of urbanization (high, medium, low).

We used the Stata function ifpweight to calculate the weights based on the distributions in the data set and the official data of the German Federal Bureau of Statistics (as of 2023).

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

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?
[X] 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

32. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated? Please mark all that apply.
[X] 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
[X] No
[ ] Not applicable

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

There were difficulties translating the Q25a-b scale. Specifically, the word "usually" was not easy to translate into German. We chose the translation "in der Regel" but alternatives would have been "meistens", "normalerweise" or "überlicherweise". In general, we think that the scale does not offer much differentiation for respondents, as there may not be a significant difference in perception between "always" and "usually". Furthermore, there is no option such as "the gender does not matter" which is not necessarily the same as "both equally".
Furthermore, we think that the meaning of "all groups in society" in question Q26a is unclear because the formulation is very generic. Respondents may find that some groups are treated fairly, and others are not. Combined with the scale, this may make it difficult for respondents to answer the question. This ambiguity was also noted by a translator, who pointed out that the term "all groups in society" is confusing because it can be interpreted as meaning that all groups are one entity rather than different groups. The translator therefore suggested using the term "different groups of society" instead.

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.