

**Prepared by: David Howell, ANES Director of Studies**

**Date: June 21, 2005**

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS  
Module 2: Sample Design and Data Collection Report**

August 23, 2004

**Country: United States of America**

**Date of Election: November 2, 2004**

Type of Election (e.g., presidential, parliamentary, legislative): presidential, legislative

Organization that conducted the survey field work:  
Survey Research Center, University of Michigan

**Investigators Responsible for Data Collection:**

<p>Name: American National Election Studies (ANES; <a href="http://www.umich.edu/~nes">www.umich.edu/~nes</a>)</p> <p>Affiliation: University of Michigan</p> <p>Address: Center for Political Studies Institute for Social Research 426 Thompson St. Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321 United States</p> <p>Fax: 734-764-3341 Phone: 734-764-5494 E-mail: <a href="mailto:nes@umich.edu">nes@umich.edu</a></p>	
<p>Name: Nancy Burns</p> <p>Affiliation: University of Michigan</p> <p>Address: Center for Political Studies Institute for Social Research 426 Thompson St. Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321 United States</p> <p>Fax: Phone: E-mail: <a href="mailto:nburns@umich.edu">nburns@umich.edu</a></p>	<p>Name: Donald R. Kinder</p> <p>Affiliation: University of Michigan</p> <p>Address: Center for Political Studies Institute for Social Research 426 Thompson St. Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321 United States</p> <p>Fax: Phone: E-mail: <a href="mailto:drkinder@umich.edu">drkinder@umich.edu</a></p>

**A. Study Design**

Post-Election Study

X Pre-/Post-Election Panel Study

Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: November 3, 2004

Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: December 20, 2004

*If Panel Study:*

Date Pre-Election Interviewing Began: September 7, 2004

Date Pre-Election Interviewing Ended: November 1, 2004

Mode of (post-election) interview:

X In person, face-to-face

Telephone

Mail or self-completion supplement

Language(s) used in questionnaire(s) (Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used, as well as a version translated in English, if applicable, as part of the Election Study Deposit):

English only

## **B. Sample Design and Sampling Procedures**

### 1. Eligibility Requirements

- a) Age: Minimum: 18 years of age as of Election Day (November 2, 2004)  
Maximum no maximum age
- b) Citizenship: Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Other requirements:

### 2. Sample Frame:

- a) Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, please explain:

The states of Alaska and Hawaii were excluded from the sample frame.

- b) Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

Please explain:

Institutional quarters, which were excluded, were defined as “those occupied or intended for occupancy by the persons for whom the facility is operated.” By this definition, institutional quarters were: patient quarters in hospitals; rest homes; nursing homes or mental institutions; quarters for the religious in cloistered convents or monasteries; student dormitories in schools or colleges, fraternities or sororities; and inmates' quarters in penal institutions.

- c) Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

Please explain:

Military personnel in on-base housing were excluded. Military personnel residing in households that were not located within restricted boundaries of a military base or reservation were included.

d) If interviews were conducted by telephone:

i. What is the estimated percentage of households without a phone: \_\_\_\_\_%

ii. Were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

iii. Were substitution methods used for unproductive sample points?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

e) Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

No  Yes\_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

f) Estimated total (a + b + c + d + e) percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame: 0.6% or more\_\_\_\_\_ %

a. The 2000 Census of the United States indicated that of the 281,421,906 persons residing in the United States at the time, 626,932 (0.2%) resided in Alaska and 1,211,537 (0.4%) resided in Hawaii.

b. We do not have a good estimate for the number of persons that were excluded because they resided in institutional quarters.

c. We do not have a good estimate of the proportion of United States military personnel stationed in the United States who live in on-base as opposed to off-base housing.

### 3. Sample Selection Procedures:

The area sample is based on a multi-stage area probability sample selected from the Survey Research Center's (SRC) 1990 National Sample design. Identification of the 2004 NES sample respondents was conducted using a four stage sampling process: a primary stage sampling of U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) or New England County Metropolitan Areas (NECMAs) and non-MSA counties, followed by a second stage sampling of area segments, a third stage sampling of housing units within sampled area segments and concluding with the random selection of a single respondent from selected housing units. A detailed documentation of the 1990 SRC National Sample, from which the 2004 NES sample was drawn, is provided in the SRC publication titled 1990 SRC National Sample: Design and Development.

The 2004 NES sample design called for an entirely new cross-section sample to be drawn from the 1990 SRC National Sample. The 1990 SRC National Sample is a multi-stage area probability sample. The 2004 NES sample was drawn from both the 1990 SRC National Sample strata (MSA PSUs) and the 1980 SRC National Sample strata (non-MSA PSUs). The modification of the 1990 design in which the 1980 strata definitions were used for the non-MSA counties fully represents the non-MSA domain of the 48 contiguous states. This modification was made for cost and interviewing efficiency reasons related to the availability of interviewers in these areas who work on some of SRC's large panel studies.

a) What were the primary sampling units?

(see description above)

b) Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

Please explain:

c) Were there further stages of selection?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

Please explain:

(see description above)

d) How were individual respondents identified?

A household listing was taken, eligibility for each of the household members was determined, and among the eligible respondents (if any) one person was selected using a random electronic seed as the respondent to be interviewed.

e) Under what circumstances was a sample line 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):

f) Were non-sample replacement methods used?

No  Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

g). For surveys conducted by telephone:

i. Was the sample a random digit dial (RDD) sample? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Was the sample a listed sample? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

iii. Was the sample a dual frame sample? No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, what % list frame \_\_\_\_\_ and what % RDD \_\_\_\_\_

h) For surveys conducted by mail:

Was the sample a listed sample?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

4. Compliance:

Prior to the study:

- a) Was a letter sent to respondent?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

(If yes, please include a copy of the letter in the Deposit)

A letter on University of Michigan letterhead, hand-signed by the Principal Investigator, was included in both the pre-election advance mailing and the post-election advance mailing.

- b) Was payment sent to respondent?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

If yes, please describe:

Households with complete, valid mailing addresses received a \$5 bill in their advance mailing for the pre-election study.

Respondents were offered \$20 for their pre-election interview, and then another \$20 for their post-election interview. Near the end of the pre-election study field period, eligible sample lines which had yet to be interviewed were offered \$50 for their interview; 228 persons received the \$50 incentive for their pre-election interview, and these same 228 persons were subsequently offered \$50 for their post-election interview. Pre-election interview payments were made by check mailed to the respondent's address. Post-election interview checks were delivered in person by the interviewers, at the time of interview.

- c) Was a token gift sent to respondent?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

If yes, please describe:

A small magnet with the Institute for Social Research seal was included in the advance mailing for the pre-election study.

d) Were any other incentives used?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

If yes, please describe:

An interviewer incentive program was in place to reward interviewers for various performance goals.

5. During the Field Period:

a) How many contacts were made with the household before declaring it **non-sample**?

Varied; there was no pre-established number.

b) How many contacts were made with the household before declaring it **non-interview**?

Varied; there was no pre-established number.

c) Maximum number of days over which a household was contacted?

There was no rule in place concerning a maximum number of days or contacts. Households were contacted as many times as necessary through the end of the field period.

d) Did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household? No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

Please describe:

Interviewers were instructed to vary the day and time of day in order to establish contact.

e) Refusal Conversion:

- i. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?  
No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

Please describe:

Interviewers were trained in refusal conversion techniques.

- ii. Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part?  
No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If so, please describe (in addition, please include a copy of the letter in the deposit):

Eligible respondents were sent a customized letter (hand-signed, on University of Michigan letterhead) that was intended to address their specific concern.

- iii. Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part?  
No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, how much?

As described previously, toward the end of the pre-election field period, sample lines eligible to be interviewed were offered an increased incentive of \$50 for their interview. This group includes respondents who were reluctant to take part. Respondents that received \$50 for their pre-election interview were then subsequently offered \$50 again for their post-election interview.

- iv. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

- v. What was the maximum number of re-contacts used to persuade respondent to be interviewed?

There was no rule in place concerning a maximum number of re-contacts.

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

No  Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

6. Response Rate:

(Note: if a panel study, please report response rate of the first wave)

Total number of sample lines issued:	2,374
Number of refusals:	429
Number never contacted (no-contact):	42
Other non-response:	150
Number of lines of non-sample:	541
Total number of completed interviews:	1,212
Response Rate:	66.1%

The response rate is calculated as the number of completed interviews (1,212) divided by the number of eligible sample lines (2,374 sample lines - 541 non-sample lines = 1,833 eligible sample lines).

7. Panel Attrition:

(Note: This only applies if CSES questionnaire is administered as part of a 2-wave panel study):

Total number of respondents in Wave I of the study:	1,212
Number of Wave I respondents re-interviewed in wave containing CSES Module:	1,066
Percent total panel attrition:	88.0% reinterview rate (12.0% attrition)

8. Panel attrition by age and education (given as percentages; please indicate whether numbers provided are % re-interviewed or % attrition):

<u>Age</u>		<u>Education</u>	
18-25	13.33%	None	0.00%
26-40	13.11%	Incomplete primary	26.67%
41-64	11.84%	Primary completed	9.09%
65 & over	10.10%	Incomplete secondary	10.96%
		Secondary completed	13.80%
		Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational	0.00%
		University incomplete	11.20%
		University degree	10.77%

Numbers provided above are percent attrition between the pre-election survey and the post-election survey. Please note that no attrition is indicated for Education categories “None” and “Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational” because these categories were not made use of in the election study.

## 9. Sample Weights

a) Are weights included in the data file?

No\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_\_

Please describe how the weights were constructed:

The 2004 NES data set includes a person-level analysis weight, which incorporates sampling, nonresponse and post-stratification factors.

>> CONSTRUCTION OF ANALYSIS WEIGHTS

Household Selection Weight Component

Each household selected for the 2004 NES had an equal probability of selection. The inverse of this probability results in an inflation factor of 38,832.4 for each household in the sample.

Person-Level Sample Selection Weight Component

Within sample households a single adult respondent is chosen at random to be interviewed. Since the number of eligible adults varies from one household to another, the random selection of a single adult introduces inequality into respondents' selection probabilities. In analysis, a respondent selection weight should be used to compensate for these unequal selection probabilities. The person-level selection weight is the product of the household selection weight and the within household selection weight. The within household selection weight is equal to the number of eligible persons in the household and is capped at 3. The use of the respondent selection weight is strongly encouraged, despite past evaluations that have shown these weights to have little significant impact on the values of NES estimates of descriptive statistics.

## Nonresponse Adjusted Selection Weight

The base weight equals the product of the selection weight and the household level nonresponse adjustment factors. Nonresponse adjustment cells for the 2004 NES sample were formed by crossing MSA status by the four Census regions. A nonresponse adjustment factor equal to the inverse of the response rate in each cell was applied to the interview cases. Table B below shows the response rates and nonresponse adjustment factors for the 2004 NES.

Table B.  
Computation of Nonresponse Adjustment Weights  
2004 NES Area Sample.

PSU TYPE	CENSUS REGION	RESPONSE RATE	NONRESP. ADJUSTMENT FACTOR
MSAs	Northeast	56.18	1.78
	Midwest	69.96	1.43
	South	65.86	1.52
	West	68.50	1.46
Non-MSAs	Northeast	66.44	1.51
	Midwest	77.08	1.30
	South	68.57	1.46
	West	65.64	1.52

## Post-stratification factor

The 2004 NES weights are post-stratified to 2004 CPS March Supplement proportions for six (6) ages by four (4) education categories. Table C shows the weighted estimates and proportions for the 24 cells for the 2004 CPS and the 2004 NES. The post-stratification adjustment is computed by dividing the CPS weighted total by the 2004 NES total weighted by the nonresponse adjusted selection weight. The final two columns show the NES weighted totals using the final post-stratified analysis weight and the resulting percents, which match the CPS percents.

## Final Analysis Weights

The final analysis weight is the product of the household level non-response adjustment factor, the number of eligible persons, and a person-level post-stratification factor. The final analysis weight for the 2004 NES sample is scaled to sum to 1212, the total number of respondents. This weight is trimmed at the 1st and 99th percentiles and then re-scaled to match the 2004 CPS proportions for the 24 age-by-education cells.

## Post-Election Attrition Weight

The 1,066 Post-Election cases were post-stratified to 2004 CPS March Supplement proportions for six (6) ages by four (4) education categories (the same categories used for post-stratifying the Pre-Election cases). The post-stratification compensates for differential non-response by age group and education level. Response rates for the Post-Election Study ranged from a high of 100 percent for persons 70 or older with some college to a low of 58 percent for persons age 30 - 39 who did not graduate from high school. The panel attrition weight for the Post-Election Study is the product of the Pre-Election final weight and the post-stratification factor formed by dividing the CPS proportion by the weighted NES proportion for each of the 24 age by education cells. The weight is scaled to sum to the number of cases, 1,066.

Table C.  
2004 NES Sample Weight: Post-stratification Factors

AGE GROUP	EDUCATION LEVEL	N	2004 CPS		PRELIM	POST-	NES	FINAL
			Est. in 000s[3]	CPS %	2004 NES WTD. EST IN 000s	STRAT ADJ.	WTD N	NES WTD. %
18-29	< High School Grad	17	6246.8	3.183	2107.7	2.964	38.58	3.183
	High School Grad	74	12310.9	6.274	10089.9	1.220	76.04	6.274
	Some College	97	15337.3	7.816	12556.4	1.221	94.73	7.816
30-39	College Grad	53	6950.8	3.542	6275.0	1.108	42.93	3.542
	< High School Grad	12	2844.8	1.450	1432.3	1.986	17.57	1.450
	High School Grad	45	10866.0	5.537	5309.0	2.047	67.11	5.537
40-49	Some College	72	10391.4	5.296	8536.8	1.217	64.18	5.296
	College Grad	69	11277.4	5.747	8168.7	1.381	69.95	5.747
	< High School Grad	15	3654.2	1.862	1751.5	2.086	22.57	1.862
50-69	High School Grad	66	13453.9	6.856	7767.5	1.732	83.10	6.856
	Some College	80	11737.5	5.982	9572.5	1.226	72.50	5.982
	College Grad	78	12124.4	6.179	8616.0	1.407	74.89	6.179
60-69	< High School Grad	12	3183.4	1.622	1634.8	1.947	19.66	1.622
	High School Grad	67	10523.7	5.363	8438.9	1.247	65.00	5.363
	Some College	70	9437.2	4.809	9110.4	1.036	58.29	4.809
70+	College Grad	82	10571.3	5.387	9854.1	1.073	65.29	5.387
	< High School Grad	21	3589.4	1.829	1972.7	1.820	22.17	1.829
	High School Grad	63	7807.9	3.979	7258.0	1.076	48.23	3.979
70+	Some College	36	4727.6	2.409	4367.0	1.083	29.20	2.409
	College Grad	52	5009.8	2.553	6766.7	0.740	30.94	2.553
	< High School Grad	22	6801.0	3.466	1975.7	3.442	42.01	3.466
70+	High School Grad	52	8761.4	4.465	5598.5	1.565	54.11	4.465
	Some College	29	4309.9	2.196	3072.6	1.403	26.62	2.197
	College Grad	28	4311.5	2.197	3243.8	1.329	26.63	2.192
-----								
TOTALS		1212	196229.7	100%	145476.6	100%	1212	100%

b) Are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection at the respondent/household level?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

Please describe:

(see description above)

c) Are the weights designed to match known demographic characteristics of the population?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

Please describe:

(see description above)

- d) Are the data weighted to correct for non-response?  
No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_X\_\_

Please describe:

(see description above)

10. a) Please describe the interviewers (e.g., age, level of education, years of experience):

Approximately one-third of interviewers for the study were new hires. The remaining two-thirds had worked previously as interviewers for the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center. Some persons had worked as interviewers for the American National Election Study (ANES) in prior data collection years.

- b) Please provide a description of interviewer training:

Interviewers were all trained and competent in General Interviewing Techniques (GIT) and received additional study-specific training.

Prior to the pre-election study, all interviewers completed multiple hours of self-study. Afterwards, new hires (and a few on-staff interviewers) received training as a group over multiple days at a facility in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Included was training on General Interviewing Techniques (GIT) and additional study-specific training. Rather than attend the in-person training, on-staff interviewers received their study-specific training on a multiple-hour telephone conference call. All interviewers had to pass a certification test using the pre-election survey before they were allowed to begin interviewing.

Prior to the post-election study, all interviewers received study-specific training on a multiple-hour telephone conference call. All interviewers had to pass a certification test using the post-election survey before they were allowed to begin interviewing.

## 11. Comparison of Sample to Population

Characteristic	<u>Population Estimates</u>	<u>Sample Estimates</u>	
		Unweighted	Weighted
<u>Age</u>			
18-25	14.77%	12.20%	13.77%
26-40	30.40%	24.86%	26.06%
41-64	38.10%	45.40%	43.27%
65 and over	16.73%	17.54%	16.89%
<u>Education</u>			
None		0.00%	0.00%
Incomplete Primary		1.03%	1.93%
Primary Completed		1.88%	2.44%
Incomplete Secondary		6.10%	10.00%
Secondary Completed		28.71%	31.55%
Post-Secondary Trade/ Vocational		0.00%	0.00%
Incomplete University		31.99%	28.44%
University Degree		30.30%	25.63%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	48.29%	47.56%	49.39%
Female	51.71%	52.44%	50.61%

The above Population Estimates were calculated using data from the 2000 Census of the United States. For age and gender, the percents indicated are out of the 209,128,094 persons that were aged 18 or older residing in the United States at the time of the 2000 Census (with no regard to citizenry status). Education statistics coded in a fashion comparable to the CSES standard were not readily available and thus are not presented here.

The above Sample Estimates were calculated using data from the post-election study. The Weighted category was calculated using the post-election weight variable present in the public dataset.