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Introduction: Voter Turnout Bias in Switzerland

Source: Own calculations based on the most recent VOX dataset.
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Introduction: Research Questions

- What are the mechanisms that lead to the observed turnout bias in Swiss voting and election studies?
- How much do the different mechanisms contribute to the total bias?
- Is it possible to reduce the bias by special questioning techniques or weighting schemes?
Introduction: Types of Biases

- **Undercoverage**
  - Sampling frames typically do not cover the whole population.
  - Political participation is likely to be lower among uncovered subpopulations (e.g. young people without landline) than among covered subpopulations, leading to a positive bias in survey estimates of voter turnout (Mokrzycki, Keeter und Kennedy 2009, Blumberg und Luke 2007)

- **Nonresponse**
  - Participation in surveys correlates with political interest and political participation (Voogt und Saris 2003, Jackman 1999, Brehm 1993).

- **Misreporting**
  - Due to social desirability (Tourangeau und Yan 2007) and recall errors (Belli et al. 1999), respondents tend to overreport their participation behavior.
Introduction: Types of Biases

Measurement
- Construct
- Measurement
- Response
- Edited response
- Survey estimate

Representation
- Target population
- Sampling frame
- Sample
- Respondents
- Postsurvey adjustments

Errors:
- Coverage error
- Sampling error
- Nonresponse error
- Adjustment error

Validity
- Measurement error
- Processing error

(Source: Groves et al. 2009:48)
Our Study

- Voter turnout validation study comparing survey data to polling cards at a small municipality in Switzerland.

- Polling cards
  - Federal votes of September 22 and June 9, 2013.
  - Citizens who took part in the votes can be identified from the collected polling cards.

- Survey
  - Gross sample of 2000 citizens from the municipality’s register.
  - Net sample of 1696 (84.8%) citizens whose households could be found in the telephone register.
  - CATI survey between September 23 and October 20 with 893 respondents (52.7% of net sample).
  - Questions on: political interest, participation the votes, social desirability of voting, key indicators of political participation research, social demographics.
  - Wording experiment voting question.
Main Results: September 22 Vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Turnout (%)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>4559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross sample</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No telephone</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sample</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interview</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed sample</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Main Results: June 9 Vote

- Population: 49.8% (N=4459)
- Gross sample: 49.6% (N=1966)
- No telephone: 27.5% (N=289)
- Net sample: 53.3% (N=1677)
- No interview: 43.8% (N=792)
- Interviewed sample: 61.7% (N=885)
- Self-report: 80.6% (N=871)
### Over- and Underreporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>September 22</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polling cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– did not vote</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– voted</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 893)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 9</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>polling cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– did not vote</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– voted</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 864)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sociodemographic Profiles (September 22 Vote)

Average marginal effects from logistic regressions

Undercoverage (N=1946, $R^2_{MF}=.262$)
- Female
- Age (ref = 18 – 34)
  - 35 – 49
  - 50 – 64
  - 65 or older
- Marital status (ref = married)
  - single
  - divorced
  - widowed
- Household size (ref = 2)
  - 1 member
  - 3 members
  - 4 or more
- Single-family home
- Wealth (log/10)
- Income (log/10, equivalized)

Nonresponse (N=1661, $R^2_{MF}=.014$)

Overreporting (N=227, $R^2_{MF}=.044$)
Determinants of Overreporting (September 22 Vote)

Political interest (1–5)  
Party member  
Left–right (0–10)  
Voting is civic duty  
Internal political efficacy (1–5)  
External political efficacy (1–5)  
Most people in own circle vote  
People in own circle would not like it if I don't vote  
Female  
Tertiary education  
Age (ref = 18 – 34):     35 – 49  
50 – 64  
65 or older

Average marginal effects (N=183, $R^2_{MF}=.139$)
Wording Experiment

- The sample was randomized into a control group and a treatment group.
- The control group received a standard voting question.
  - „How about you, did you vote or not?“
- The treatment group received a modified voting question intended to minimize social-desirability bias and recall errors.
  - „Please try to remember whether you read the voting documents and whether you voted in person or by mail. Which of the following statements does apply to you?“
    - ★ I did not vote.
    - ★ I thought about voting, but did not.
    - ★ I usually vote, but did not this time.
    - ★ I am sure I did vote.
Wording Experiment: Results

![Bar chart showing voter turnout for September 22 and June 9 votes with control and treatment groups for polling cards and self-report.

The chart illustrates the difference in voter turnout between control and treatment groups, with bars indicating polling cards and self-report. The results show a significant increase in turnout for the treatment group compared to the control group for both voting dates. The chart suggests that the wording of the survey has a substantial impact on voter turnout.]
Wording Experiment: Results

September 22 vote

- Control
- Treatment

June 9 vote

- Control
- Treatment

Bias, overreporting, underreporting
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Summary and Conclusions

- Undercoverage, nonresponse, and overreporting jointly contribute to the participation bias in survey data; contribution of overreporting increases over time.

- Undercoverage, nonresponse, and overreporting have differential sociodemographic profiles.

- The errors potentially affect associations and regression models estimated from survey data. Overreporting appears particularly problematic.

- Alternative wording to minimize social-desirability bias and recall errors did not lead to substantial improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept 22 PP</th>
<th>Sept 22 %</th>
<th>June 9 PP</th>
<th>June 9 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling error</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>-.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undercoverage</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresponse</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overreporting</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total bias</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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