

Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)
Module 4: Design Report (Sample Design and Data Collection Report)
September 10, 2012

Country: United States of America
Date of Election: November 4, 2012

Prepared by: David Howell and Darrell Donakowski
Date of Preparation: December 3, 2014

NOTES TO COLLABORATORS:

- Where brackets [] appear, answer by placing an “X” within the appropriate bracket or brackets.
- If more space is needed to answer any question, please lengthen the document as necessary.

Collaborator(s):

Collaborators are the contact persons for election studies that appear in the CSES dataset - they are not necessarily the parties who collected the data. These collaborators and their contact information will be listed on the CSES website.

Name: Darrell Donakowski Title: Director of Studies Organization: American National Election Studies Address: Center for Political Studies Institute for Social Research 426 Thompson St. Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321 United States Telephone: 734-764-5494 Fax: 734-764-3341 E-Mail: anes@electionstudies.org Website: http://www.electionstudies.org	Name: Vincent Hutchings Title: Principal Investigator Organization: American National Election Studies Address: Center for Political Studies Institute for Social Research 426 Thompson St. Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321 United States Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: vincenth@umich.edu Website:
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Name: Simon Jackman Title: Principal Investigator Organization: American National Election Studies Address: Department of Political Science Encina Hall, Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305-6044 United States Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: jackman@stanford.edu Website:	Name: Gary Segura Title: Principal Investigator Organization: American National Election Studies Address: Department of Political Science Encina Hall, Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305-6044 United States Telephone: Fax: E-Mail: segura@stanford.edu Website:
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Data Collection Organization:

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection:

Face-to-face data collection:

Organization: Abt SRBI

Address:
275 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2700
New York, NY 10001
United States

Telephone: 212-779-7700
Fax: 212-779-7785
E-Mail: <http://www.srbi.com/Contact-Us/Email-Us.aspx>
Website: <http://www.srbi.com/>

Internet data collection:

Organization: GfK Knowledge Networks

Address:

Telephone:
Fax:
E-Mail: <http://www.gfk.com/us/Contact-Us/Pages/contact-us.aspx>
Website: <http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp/>
<http://www.gfk.com>

Funding Organization(s):

Organization(s) that funded the data collection:

Organization: National Science Foundation

Address:
4201 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22230
United States

Telephone: 703-292-5111
Fax:
E-Mail:
Website: <http://nsf.gov>

Organization: University of Michigan

Address:

The Regents of the University of Michigan
3003 South State St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1271
United States

Telephone:

Fax:

E-Mail: info@umich.edu

Website: <http://www.umich.edu>

Organization: Stanford University

Address:

Stanford University
340 Panama Street
Stanford, CA 94305-6203
United States

Telephone: 650-723-2300

Fax:

E-Mail:

Website: <http://www.stanford.edu>

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: American National Election Studies

Address:

Center for Political Studies
Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2321
United States

Telephone: 734-764-5494

Fax: 734-764-3341

E-Mail: anes@electionstudies.org

Website: <http://www.electionstudies.org>

Please indicate the date when the study is expected to be available at this archive:

Currently available

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

The ANES 2012 Times Series study features a dual-mode design combining the traditional ANES face-to-face interviewing with a separate sample interviewed on the Internet. CSES was includes in both modes.

2a. Date Post-Election Interviewing Began:

Face-to-face: November 7, 2012

Internet: November 29, 2012

2b. Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended:

Face-to-face: January 13, 2013

Internet: January 24, 2013

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

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

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

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

- Yes
- No

4b. If the survey was part of a panel study, please describe the design of the panel study, including the date at which interviewing for each prior wave began and ended:

The face-to-face sample was previously interviewed during a pre-election period from September 8, 2012 – November 5, 2012.

The Internet sample was previously interviewed during a pre-election period from October 11, 2012 – November 6, 2012. For the Internet mode, study participants were drawn from the KnowledgePanel, a panel of regular survey participants administered by GfK Knowledge Networks.

Translation

Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used as part of the election study deposit. For questionnaires in a language other than English, please also provide a version of each translated back into English. Note: Questions are based on those developed for the ISSP.

5. Was the questionnaire translated?

- Yes, translated by member(s) of research team
- Yes, by translation bureau
- Yes, by specially trained translator(s)
- No, not translated

6. Please list all languages used for the fielded module:
English and Spanish

7a. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?

- Yes, by group discussion
- Yes, an expert checked it
- Yes, by back translation
- Other; please specify: _____
- No
- Not applicable

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

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

7c. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

7d. If the questionnaire was translated, please provide a list of all questions which caused problems when translating. For each question listed, describe what problems were encountered and how they were solved:

Sample Design and Sampling Procedures

8. Please describe the population that your sample is meant to be representative of:

U.S. citizens age 18 or older as of election day (November 6, 2012).

Design criteria also included having sufficient numbers of black and Hispanic respondents to enable analysis of those subgroups.

Eligibility Requirements

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

- [X] Yes
[] No

If yes, what ages could be interviewed?

18 or older as of election day (November 6, 2012)

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

- [X] Yes
[] No

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

- [] Yes
[X] No

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

Sample Frame

The answers for Questions 10a-10f refer to the face-to-face mode. Information about the Internet mode is provided in the answer to Question 11.

10a. Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?

- Yes
 No

If yes, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? __ less than 1% __

If yes, please explain:

The states of Alaska (~ 0.23%) and Hawaii (~ 0.43%) were excluded from the sample frame.

10b. Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

- Yes
 No

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

If 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.

10c. Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

- Yes
 No

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

If 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.

10d. If interviews were conducted by telephone, what is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? _____ %

Please explain:

10e. If interviews were conducted by telephone, were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?

- [] Yes
[] No

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

10f. Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

- [X] Yes
[] No

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

If yes, please explain:

As the sample was based on a mailing address list, some addresses were mail is not delivered, for instance, were not in the sample frame. Some attempts were made to overcome this issue. Further information is provided in the answer to Question 11.

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

Sample Selection Procedures

11. Please describe, in your own words, how the sample for the study was selected. If the survey is part of a panel study, please also describe the original sample, from the beginning of the study.

Face-to-face mode:

The in-person (face-to-face) interviews were conducted using an address-based, stratified, multi-stage cluster sample in 125 census tracts. The sample includes a nationally-representative “main sample” and two “oversamples,” one of blacks and one of Hispanics.

The first stage of sampling consisted of stratifying the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia into nine regions corresponding to Census Divisions. Alaska and Hawaii were excluded as a cost-saving measure, and their small populations make this exclusion a fairly small source of bias. These Census Divisions constitute the study’s strata. Within each region, a number of census tracts was then randomly selected. The number of tracts selected per region was proportional to the region’s proportion of the U.S. adult population. For example, the New England region is home to about 5 percent of the U.S. adult population, so we drew five percent of the 125 tracts from New England, amounting to six tracts. Within each region, tracts were selected with “probability proportional to size,” meaning that tracts with larger populations had a higher probability of selection. This is a desirable method because it preserves similar selection probabilities for individuals all over the country.

The second stage of sampling consisted of the random selection of residential addresses within each tract. The sampling frame – that is, the list of every possible address from which we randomly drew our sample of addresses – consisted of the Delivery Sequence File (DSF) used by the United States Postal Service for the residential delivery of mail.

The DSF provides the best and most cost-effective list of residential addresses in the United States, but it is not perfect. There are areas where residential housing units are not included on the DSF because home delivery of mail is not available or for other reasons. To evaluate the extent to which the DSF appeared to adequately include all residential addresses, we compared the number of addresses on the DSF for a sampled census tract to the 2010 Decennial Census count of housing units in the tract. In tracts where the number of addresses on the DSF was less than 99% of the number of addresses on the Decennial Census, we took steps to assure that households not on the DSF had a chance to be included in the sample. Where this coverage ratio was less than 70% we discarded the DSF as inadequate and instead sent interviewers to visit the tract and make a list of all housing units. This was the case in 4 tracts. Where the coverage ratio was between 70% and 99%, we used the DSF to select addresses and then performed additional procedures to check for housing units missed (CHUM) and, if necessary, add missed housing units to the sample. This was the case in 59 tracts. These “CHUM” procedures will be fully described in a forthcoming methodology report for the study, but in brief they consisted of looking to see if houses near the sampled address were included on the DSF, and adding households to the sample if they were found to be missing from the DSF. In the remaining 62 tracts the coverage ratio was 99% or better and we relied solely on the DSF as the sampling frame.

Addresses for the black and Hispanic oversamples were selected from tracts with relatively high proportions of one or both of these populations. This design approach is a cost-saving measure, making it less expensive to find and recruit members of the oversample populations. The black oversample addresses were drawn from tracts (among the 125 already selected) where Census data indicated blacks were 15% or more of the population. The Hispanic oversample addresses were drawn from tracts where Census data indicated Hispanics were 20% or more of the population. There were 22 tracts meeting the criteria for black oversample and 29 meeting the criteria for Hispanic oversample. Four of these tracts met the criteria for both.

The third and final stage of sampling was the selection of one eligible person per household. As described in the Data Collection Procedures section below, screening was accomplished by sending an interviewer to the sampled address and completing a brief interview in which a household informant provided the first name, age, citizenship status, race, and ethnicity of all household members. The interviewer's computer then randomly selected one person from among those identified as eligible for the study. At the addresses drawn for the main sample, individuals were eligible if they were U.S. citizens, lived at the address as their main residence, and would be 18 years old on or before November 5, 2012. At the addresses drawn for the black and Hispanic oversamples, individuals were eligible if they were eligible by the main sample criteria and also were identified as black or Hispanic, respectively. The selection of individuals was made by the computer and enforced by the interviewer, and no substitutions were acceptable. If no eligible person lived in the household, no interview was conducted there.

Internet mode:

The following description of sampling for the KnowledgePanel is extracted from documentation provided by Knowledge Networks. Knowledge Networks initially selects households using random digit dialing (RDD) sampling and address-based sampling (ABS) methodology.

RDD Sampling Methodology

KnowledgePanel recruitment methodology uses the quality standards established by selected RDD surveys conducted for the Federal Government (such as the CDC-sponsored National Immunization Survey).

Knowledge Networks utilizes list-assisted RDD sampling techniques based on a sample frame of the U. S. residential landline telephone universe. For efficiency purposes, Knowledge Networks excludes only those banks of telephone numbers (a bank consists of 100 numbers) that have less than 2 directory listings. Additionally, an oversample is conducted among a stratum telephone exchanges that have high concentrations of African-American and Hispanic households based on Census data. Note that recruitment sampling is done without replacement, thus numbers already fielded do not get fielded again.

A telephone number for which a valid postal address can be matched occurs in about 70% of the sample. These address-matched cases are all mailed an advance letter informing them that they have been selected to participate in KnowledgePanel. For efficiency purposes, the unmatched numbers are under-sampled at a current rate of 0.75 relative to the matched numbers.

Both the oversampling mentioned above and this under-sampling of nonaddress households are adjusted appropriately in the panel's weighting procedures.

Following the mailings, the telephone recruitment begins for all sampled phone numbers using trained interviewer/recruiters. Cases sent to telephone interviewers are dialed for up to 90 days, with at least 14 dial attempts on cases where no one answers the phone, and on numbers known to be associated with households. Extensive refusal conversion is also performed. The recruitment interview, about 10 minutes long, begins with informing the household member that they have been selected to join KnowledgePanel. If the household does not have a computer and access to the Internet, they are told that in return for completing a short survey weekly, they will be provided with a laptop computer (previously a WebTV device was provided) and free monthly Internet access. All members in a household are then enumerated, and some initial demographic and background information on prior computer and Internet use are collected. Households that inform interviewers that they have a home computer and Internet access are asked to take their surveys using their own equipment and Internet connection. Incentive points per survey, redeemable for cash, are given to these "PC" respondents for completing their surveys. Panel members who were provided with either a WebTV earlier or currently a laptop computer (both with free Internet access) do not participate in this per survey points incentive program. However, all panel members do receive special incentive points for select surveys to improve response rates and for all longer surveys as a modest compensation for burden.

For those panel members receiving a laptop computer (as with the former WebTV), prior to shipment, each unit is custom configured with individual email accounts, so that it is ready for immediate use by the household. Most households are able to install the hardware without additional assistance, though Knowledge Networks maintains a telephone technical support line.

The Knowledge Networks Call Center contacts household members who do not respond to email and attempts to restore both contact and cooperation. PC panel members provide their own email addresses and we send their weekly surveys to that email account.

All new panel members are sent an initial survey to both welcome them as new panel members but also to familiarize them with how online survey questionnaires work. They also complete a separate profile survey that collects essential demographic information such as gender, age, race, income, and education to create a personal member profile. This information can be used to determine eligibility for specific studies, is used for weighting purposes, and operationally need not be gathered with each and every survey. This information is updated annually with each panel member. Once completed new member is "profiled," they are designated as "active" and ready to be sampled for client studies. [Note: Parental or legal guardian consent is also collected for conducting surveys with teenage panel members, ages 13-17.]

Once a household is contacted by phone—and additional household members recruited via their email address—panel members are sent surveys linked through a personalized email invitation (instead of by phone or mail). This permits surveys to be fielded quickly and economically, and also facilitates longitudinal research. In addition, this approach reduces the burden placed on

respondents, since email notification is less obtrusive than telephone calls, and allows research subjects to participate in research when it is convenient for them.

Address-Based Sampling (ABS) Methodology

When KN started KnowledgePanel panel recruitment in 1999, the state of the art in the industry was that probability-based sampling could be cost effectively carried out using a national random-digit dial (RDD) sample frame. The RDD landline frame at the time allowed access to 96% of the U.S. population. This is no longer the case. We introduced the ABS sample frame to rise to the well-chronicled changes in society and telephony in recent years. The following changes have reduced the long-term scientific viability of the landline RDD sampling methodology: declining respondent cooperation to telephone surveys; do not call lists; call screening, caller-ID devices and answering machines; dilution of the RDD sample frame as measured by the working telephone number rate; and finally, the emergence and exclusion of cell-phone-only households (CPOHH) because they have no landline phone.

According to the Center for Disease Control, approximately 25% of U.S. households cannot be contacted through RDD sampling: 22% as a result of CPOHH status and 3% because they have no phone service whatsoever. Among some segments of society, the sample noncoverage is substantial: more than one-third of young adults, ages 18-24, reside in CPOHHs.

After conducting an extensive pilot project in 2008, we made the decision to add an address-based sample (ABS) frame in response to the growing number of cell-phone only households that are outside of the RDD frame. Before conducting the ABS pilot, we also experimented with supplementing our RDD samples with cell-phone samples. However, this approach was not cost effective for you our clients and raised a number of other operational, data quality, and liability issues (e.g., calling people's cell phones while they were driving).

The key advantage of the ABS sample frame is that it allows sampling of almost all U.S. households. An estimated 98% of households are “covered” in sampling nomenclature. Regardless of household telephone status, they can be reached and contacted via the mail. Second, our ABS pilot project revealed some other advantages beyond the expected improvement in recruiting adults from CPOHHs:

Improved sample representativeness for minority racial and ethnic groups

Improved inclusion of lower educated and low income households

Exclusive inclusion of CPOHHs that have neither a landline telephone nor

Internet access (approximately 4% to 6% of US households).

ABS involves probability-based sampling of addresses from the U.S. Postal Service's Delivery Sequence File. Randomly sampled addresses are invited to join KnowledgePanel through a series of mailings and in some cases telephone follow-up calls to non-responders when a telephone number can be matched to the sampled address. Invited households can join the panel by one of

several means: by completing and mailing back a paper form in a postage-paid envelope; by calling a toll-free hotline maintained by Knowledge Networks; or by going to a designated KN web-site and completing an online recruitment form.

After initially accepting the invitation to join the panel, respondents are then “profiled” online answering key demographic questions about themselves. This profile is maintained using the same procedures established for the RDD-recruited research subjects. Respondents not having an Internet connection are provided a laptop computer and free Internet service.

Large-scale ABS sampling for our KnowledgePanel recruitment began in April, 2009. As a result, KnowledgePanel will be improving its sample coverage of CPOHHs and young adults.

Because we will have recruited panelists from two different sample frames – RDD and ABS – we are taking several technical steps to merge samples sourced from these frames. Our approach preserves the representative structure of the overall panel for the selection of individual client study samples. An advantage of mixing ABS frame panel members in any KnowledgePanel sample is a reduction in the variance of the weights. ABSsourced sample tends to align more true to the overall population demographic distributions and thus the associated adjustment weights are somewhat more uniform and less varied. This variance reduction efficaciously attenuates the sample’s design effect and confirms a real advantage for study samples drawn from KnowledgePanel with its dual frame construction.

12a. What were the primary sampling units?

(see above descriptions)

12b. How were the primary sampling units selected?

(see above descriptions)

12c. Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

[X] Yes

[] No

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

(see above descriptions)

13. Were there further stages of selection?

[] Yes

[] No

(see above descriptions)

13a. If there were further stages of selection, what were the sampling units at each of the additional stages?

(see above descriptions)

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

(see above descriptions)

13c. If there were further stages of selection, were units at each of these stages randomly selected?

- [X] Yes
[] No

Please explain how the units were randomly selected. If the units were not randomly selected, please provide a justification for why the units were not randomly selected.

(see above descriptions)

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

(see above descriptions)

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

- [] Yes
[X] No

If yes, please explain:

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

- [X] Yes
[] No

If yes, please describe:

The face-to-face mode used area sampling/geographical cluster sampling as part of its multi-stage probabilistic approach.

16. Did the sample design include stratification?

Definition: Stratification involves the division of the population of interest according to certain characteristics (for instance: geographic, political, or demographic). Random selection then occurs within each of the groups that result.

- Yes
 No

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

(see above descriptions)

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

19. Under what circumstances was a household designated non-sample? Please check all that apply:

- Non-residential sample point
 All members of household are ineligible
 Housing unit is vacant
 No answer at housing unit after _____ callbacks
 Other (Please explain):
Non-spanish/non-english speakers

20. Were non-sample replacement methods used?

- Yes
 No

Please describe:

21a. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a random digit dial (RDD) sample?

- Yes
- No

21b. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a listed sample?

- Yes
- No

21c. For surveys conducted by telephone, was the sample a dual frame sample?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what % list frame _____ and what % RDD_____

22. For surveys conducted by mail, was the sample a listed sample?

- Yes
- No

Please describe:

23. For surveys conducted on the Internet, did any respondents self-select into the survey?

- Yes
- No

Please explain:

See above description. The Internet panel was original selected using probability sampling.

Incentives

24a. Prior to the study, was a letter sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter.)

Face-to-face mode received an advance letter.

Internet mode received an advance email.

24b. Prior to the study, was a payment sent to the respondent?

Yes

No

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

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

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

24d. Did respondent receive an additional payment after their participation? (Do not include any payment made prior to the study.)

Yes

No

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

To encourage participation, Internet respondents were paid \$10 per survey plus an additional \$25 for completing all four, for a total of \$65. Face-to-face respondents were initially offered \$25 to complete the pre-election interview. The offered amounts were increased to \$50 on October 5th, \$75 on October 24th, and \$100 on October 26th. For the post-election survey, respondents who were paid \$25 or \$50 for the pre-election survey were initially offered \$50, and those who were paid \$75 or \$100 for the pre-election survey were initially offered \$100. These amounts were increased to \$75 and \$125, respectively, at the end of the field period.

24e. Were any other incentives used?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe:

Interviewers

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

In the face-to-face post-election study:

Age – 3.2% were 18-34, 28.4% were 35-50, 40.2% were 51-64, 5.4% were 65+, with the remainder as missing data or refused.

Education – 5.5% high school level, 76.6% college level, with the remainder as missing data or refused.

Gender – 15.4% were male, and 65.2% were female, with the remainder as missing data or refused.

Experience – 42.9% had 0-5 years of experience, 9.9% had 6-10 years, 29.7% had 11 or more years, with the remainder as missing data or refused.

26. Please provide a description of interviewer training:

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

Contacts

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

(not yet available)

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

(not yet available)

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

Unlimited

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

Unlimited

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

Respondents could be contacted throughout

28f. During the field period, did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household?

[X] Yes

[] No

If yes, please describe:

Interviewers were instructed to vary the re-contact attempts, especially time of day.

Refusal Conversion

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

- Yes
 No

Please describe:

Interviewers were trained in refusal conversion techniques.

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

- Yes

- No

(If yes, please provide a copy of the letter or letters.)

If yes, please describe:

Eligible respondents were sent a customized letter that was intended to address their specific concern.

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, how much?

(See answer to Question 24d.)

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

- Yes
 No

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

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

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:

Interview/Survey Verification

Definition: Interview/survey verification is the process of verifying that an interview was conducted and that the survey was administered to the correct respondent, for quality control purposes.

30. Was interview/survey verification used?

[X] Yes

[] No

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

A field supervisor would contact respondents and ask questions from the survey to see if those questions were familiar to the respondent. Audio transcripts were also used for verification purposes.

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: __ 10 __ %

Response Rate

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

31. What was the response rate of the survey that the CSES Module appeared in? Please show your calculations. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the response rate of the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

Using AAPOR Response Rate 1 (AAPOR RR 1):

Face-to-face mode:

Pre-election study = 38%

Post-election study re-interview rates = 94%

Cumulative post-election response rate = $38\% \times 94\% = 36\%$

Internet mode:

Pre-election study = 2%

Post-election study re-interview rates = 93%

Cumulative post-election response rate = $2\% \times 93\% = 2\%$

32. Please provide the following statistics for the survey that the CSES Module appeared in. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the statistics for the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

Face-to-face mode:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| A. Total number of households in sample: | 7298 | |
| B. Number of valid households: | 5380 | |
| C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households: | 1918 | |
| D. Number of households of unknown validity: | | |
| E. Number of completed interviews: | 2054 | |
| F. Number of partial interviews: | | |
| G. Number of refusals and break-offs: | | |
| H. Number non-contact (never contacted): | | |
| I. Other non-response: | | |

Households in category "C" were identified as ineligible because the address did not exist, it was outside of the sampled tract, it was not a permanently occupied residence, there was no adult U.S. citizen living there, or, for addresses sampled for the black and Hispanic oversamples, there was no black or Hispanic resident at the address.

Internet mode:

- A. Total number of households in sample:
B. Number of valid households:
C. Number of invalid (non-sample) households:
D. Number of households of unknown validity:
E. Number of completed interviews: 3860
F. Number of partial interviews:
G. Number of refusals and break-offs:
H. Number non-contact (never contacted):
I. Other non-response:

The sum of B+C+D should equal the value of A. If not, please describe why:

If statistic D (number of households of unknown validity) has a value greater than zero (0), please estimate the proportion of households of unknown validity that are valid:

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

If statistic I has a value greater than zero (0), please describe what cases fall into this category:

33. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, how many waves were conducted prior to the wave that included the CSES Module?

Face-to-face: one pre-election wave

Internet: respondents were part of an ongoing panel, but for the election study they participated in one pre-election wave

34. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, what was the total panel attrition between the first wave of the study and the wave that included the CSES Module? Please show your calculations.

In both the face-to-face and Internet modes, respondents who participated in the pre-election survey were eligible to also participate in the post-election survey.

As previously stated, the face-to-face post-election reinterview rate was 94% (attrition of 7% attrition) and the Internet post-election interview rate was 93% (attrition of 6%).

The Internet panel, while originally selected probabilistically, was also subject to additional unspecified attrition prior to the implementation of this specific election study.

35. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the number of completed interviews for the wave that included the CSES Module:

Face-to-face: 1,929

Internet: 3,581

36. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please provide the following statistics for panel attrition by age and education. In each cell, indicate the percent of all completed interviews in each category for the indicated wave.

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

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

Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

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

[X] Yes

[] No

If yes, please explain:

To be representative of the population the data must be weighted.

38. Are weights included in the data file?

[X] Yes

[] No

39. If weights are included in the data file, please describe in detail how the weights were constructed:

There are three weight variables on the file, intended for different purposes.

Variable “weight_ftf” is intended for analysis of the face-to-face sample alone. It may be used for pre-election or post-election variables, or a combination of the two. The effects of attrition in the face-to-face sample are negligible for most analyses we have examined, therefore just one weight may be satisfactory for analysis of the face-to-face sample alone.

Variable “weight_web” is intended for analysis of the Internet sample alone. As with the face-to-face sample, attrition effects are small, so this weight may be used for analysis of the pre-election variables alone, post-election variables alone, or the two in combination.

Variable “weight_full” is intended for the analysis of the combined samples. If you want to include all available cases, use this weight.

Each weight accounts for the probability of household selection, the probability of respondent selection within the household, nonresponse, and random sampling error. The weights are post-stratified to produce estimates that match known population proportions for selected characteristics. The Internet weight is poststratified on a cross-classification of race/ethnicity and educational attainment, a cross-classification of age and sex, metropolitan status, household internet access, income, marital status, and home ownership. The face-to-face weight is poststratified on age, a cross-classification of age and sex, race/ethnicity, a crossclassification of race/ethnicity and sex, educational attainment, a crossclassification of race/ethnicity and educational attainment, marital status, income, census region, home ownership, and nation of birth. The full sample weight simply combines the Internet and face-to-face weights into one variable. Additional information on the construction of the ANES 2012 Time Series weight variables will become available later this year. Because the weights are preliminary, they may be revised with a future data release.

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:
(see above description)

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:
(see above description)

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please describe:
(see above description)

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

- [] Yes
 [X] No

If yes, please describe:

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

Characteristic	<u>Population Estimates</u>	<u>Completed Interviews</u>	
		<u>Unweighted Distribution</u>	<u>Weighted Distribution</u>
<u>Age</u>			
18-25	%	%	%
26-40	%	%	%
41-64	%	%	%
65 and over	%	%	%
<u>Education</u>			
None	%	%	%
Incomplete Primary	%	%	%
Primary Completed	%	%	%
Incomplete Secondary	%	%	%
Secondary Completed	%	%	%
Post-Secondary Trade/ Vocational	%	%	%
University Incomplete	%	%	%
University Degree	%	%	%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	%	%	%
Female	%	%	%

42. Please indicate the source of the population estimates in the prior question. English language sources are especially helpful. Include website links or contact information if applicable.