Center for Political Studies University of Michigan • Institute for Social Research http://www.isr.umich.edu/cps	**Methodological Disclosure Document**

Date document last updated:
October 1, 2017

Document preparer(s) and contact information:
David Howell (dahowell@umich.edu)

Survey name:
ANES 2016 Time Series Study

Survey contact information/website:
American National Election Studies (ANES)
anes@electionstudies.org
http://www.electionstudies.org

Principal Investigators:
Vincent Hutchings (University of Michigan), Ted Brader (University of Michigan), Shanto Iyengar (Stanford University), Simon Jackman (Stanford University), Gary Segura (Stanford University)

1a. Sources of funding:
National Science Foundation
University of Michigan
Stanford University

1b. Organization(s) overseeing the study:
University of Michigan
Stanford University

1c. Additional organization(s) involved in the data collection:
Westat, Inc.

2. Questionnaire location(s):
http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/anes_timeseries_2016/anes_timeseries_2016.htm

3a. Population under study:

The study has two independently drawn probability samples that describe approximately the same population. The face-to-face mode study constitutes English-speaking or Spanish-speaking United States citizens of age 18 or older (at the time of recruitment) residing in the 48 coterminous states of the United States and the District of Columbia. The Internet mode study constitutes English-speaking or Spanish-speaking United States citizens of age 18 or older (at the time of recruitment) residing in the 50 states of United States and the District of Columbia.

3b. Sampling frame:
Face-to-face mode study. An initial PSU frame was formed from all counties in the 48 contiguous states plus DC. American Community Survey (ACS) 2010-2014 5-year tables were used to obtain population counts of adult citizens 18 years old or older by county, which was used as the measure of size in forming final PSUs. Additional information from the ACS was obtained for each county to determine stratification for final PSUs.

Internet mode study. The United States Postal Service Delivery Sequence File (DSF), excluding "drop point" addresses, was used for the Internet mode study.

4. Sample design:
Face-to-face mode study. The sample for in-person interviews was a multi-stage stratified cluster sample. Sixty primary sampling units (PSUs) were selected from across the 48 contiguous states and Washington DC. The PSUs were counties, or combinations of counties to form a minimum population of 50,000, or, in the case of Los Angeles County, half-counties (i.e. L.A. County was divided into two PSUs due to its large size). Counties were stratified by Census region, prevalence of poverty and members of minority groups, and population size, and then selected at random with probability proportional to the number of adult citizens, except that Cook County, IL, Harris County, TX, Maricopa County, AZ, and both halves of Los Angeles, CA, were selected with certainty. Within each PSU, four smaller areas were drawn (secondary sampling units, which were Census Block Groups), and households were selected at random from within these areas from the US Postal Service's computerized delivery sequence file (DSF). During the last two weeks of data collection, subsampling was performed in which half of the remaining eligible cases from the face-to-face were dropped from the study to focus field efforts on the other half.

Internet mode study. The sample for the Internet mode was a random draw from the United States Postal Service Delivery Sequence File (DSF), excluding "drop point" addresses, with all included residential addresses across the 50 states and Washington DC having equal probability of selection. Selected addresses were sent a series of letters to recruit one household member to go online to complete a survey. This online survey included a screening instrument to randomly select one person from among the adult U.S. citizens living at the address to complete the ANES questionnaire online.

5. Sample size(s), precision, interviews, and weighting:
1,181 face-to-face interviews and 3,090 Internet interviews were conducted during the pre-election period, for a total of 4,271 interviews. The AAPOR Response Rate 1 was 50% for the face-to-face component and 44% for the Internet component. The re-interview rate on the post-election survey was 90% for the face-to-face component and 84% for the Internet component.

Analyses intended to generalize to the target population should be weighted. The unweighted data are not representative of the target population, so unweighted estimates of percentages and means should not be assumed to be representative of the population. The study is not a simple random sample, so statistical procedures for complex sample designs must be used to obtain correct estimates of sampling errors and correct indications of statistical significance.

The data can be analyzed using the combined dual-mode sample, or using the face-to-face sample alone, or using the Internet sample alone. In the combined sample, the larger number of Internet sample cases makes that mode dominate the estimates by a ratio of about 3:1. Analysis should be weighted to accurately represent the population. Sampling error calculations should account for the complex sample design and the effects of weighting on variance.

To analyze the complete dataset (both web and face-to-face modes) using variables from the postelection survey only or from both the pre-election and post-election questionnaires, use the weight V160102. For analysis of the complete dataset using only the pre-election questionnaire data, use the weight V160101.

6. Sub-samples/oversamples:
Not applicable.

7a. Methods of data collection:
Field operations in face-to-face mode were conducted by trained interviewers using CAPI (Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing) software on laptop computers, normally in the respondent's homes, but were allowed to be conducted at any location that was convenient for the respondent. During a portion of the in-person interview, the respondent answered certain sensitive questions on the laptop computer directly, without the interviewer's participation (known as computer assisted self-interviewing).

Internet questionnaires could be completed anywhere the respondent had access to the Internet, on a computer or on a mobile device.

Respondents were only eligible to compete the survey in the mode for which they were sampled; no one sampled for the Internet study was interviewed by a live interviewer, and no one sampled for the face-to-face interview completed the study online.

7b. Dates of data collection:
Pre-election survey: September 7, 2016 – November 7, 2016
Post-election survey reinterview: November 9, 2016 – January 8, 2017

7c. Languages of data collection:
English and Spanish

Other methodological documents:
ANES 2016 Time Series study page, including user guide, codebooks, errata, and more:
http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/anes_timeseries_2016/anes_timeseries_2016.htm

Appendix:
Definitions from the AAPOR Transparency Initiative
http://www.aapor.org/Transparency_Initiative/

1. Who sponsored the TI Survey, who conducted it, and who funded it, including, to the extent known, all original sources of funding.

2. The exact wording and presentation of questions and response options whose results are reported.

3. A definition of the population under study, including its geographic location, and a description of the sampling frame used to identify the population. If the sampling frame was provided by a third party, the supplier shall be named. If no frame or list was utilized, this shall be indicated.

4. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected (or self-selected) and recruited, along with any quotas or additional sample selection criteria applied within the survey instrument or post-fielding. The description of the sampling frame and sample design will include sufficient detail to determine whether the respondents were selected using probability or non-probability methods.

5. Sample sizes and a discussion of the precision of the findings, including estimates of sampling error for probability samples and a description of the variables used in any weighting or estimation procedures. The discussion of the precision of the findings should state whether or not the reported margins of sampling error or statistical analyses have been adjusted for the design effect due to clustering and weighting, if any.

6. Which results are based on parts of the sample, rather than on the total sample, and the size of such parts.

7. Method and dates of data collection, including the languages in which the data collection was administered.