

Appendix

The European Representation Study

THE European Representation Study consists of four distinct survey operations: the European Election Study 1994, the European Candidates Study 1994, the Study of Members of the European Parliament 1996, and the European Members of Parliament Study. This appendix reports technical details of each of these surveys.

THE EUROPEAN ELECTION STUDY 1994 (EES94)

The European Election Study 1994 (EES'94) is a survey study of the electorates of the then twelve member states of the European Union. It essentially consists of a survey conducted immediately after the European Parliament election of June 1994 as a part of Eurobarometer 41.1. The study was prepared by an international group of scholars involving Pilar del Castillo (Madrid), Roland Cayrol (Paris), Cees van der Eijk (Amsterdam), Mark Franklin (Houston), Renato Mannheimer (Genoa), Michael Marsh (Dublin), Karlheinz Reif (Brussels), and Colette Ysmal (Paris). This group was co-ordinated by Hermann Schmitt and supplemented by a number of country specialists: Mario Baccalhau (Lisbon), Michael Guilljam (Göteborg), Ilias Nikolakopoulos (Athens), Lieven de Winter (Louvain), and Torben Worre (Copenhagen).

The survey has been made possible through grants from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) and the *Nederlandse Stichting voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek* (NWO). Additional support was given by the University of Amsterdam and the University of Mannheim. Fieldwork was carried out by INRA Europe (International Research Associates), a European network of market- and public opinion research agencies located in Brussels.

Like standard Eurobarometers the EES94 was based on national multi-stage probability samples. The universe in each country was the national resident population aged 15 years and older. Sampling points were drawn proportional to national population density. Face-to-face interviews were carried out in the respective language in respondents' homes. Fieldwork dates, sample sizes and return rates are given in table A.1. The data are available from the *Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung*, Cologne, Germany (Study Number 2865).

TABLE A.1. EES94: fieldwork period and number of interviews and return rates

	fieldwork period	number of interviews	return rate ^a
Belgium	13. 6. - 30. 6. 1994	1003	47
Denmark	11. 6. - 28. 6. 1994	1000	37
Germany East	13. 6. - 05. 7. 1994	1052	48
Germany West	13. 6. - 02. 7. 1994	1082	45
Greece	13. 6. - 30. 6. 1994	1002	50
Spain	13. 6. - 27. 6. 1994	1000	43
France	13. 6. - 27. 6. 1994	1000	47
Ireland	13. 6. - 08. 7. 1994	1000	53
Italy	14. 6. - 28. 6. 1994	1067	40
Luxemburg	13. 6. - 08. 7. 1994	502	43
The Netherlands	11. 6. - 02. 7. 1994	1005	39
Portugal	15. 6. - 04. 7. 1994	1000	51
Great Britain	13. 6. - 07. 7. 1994	1078	50
Northern Ireland	14. 6. - 30. 6. 1994	305	32

a = completed interviews in per cent of effective contacts.

The three elite components of the study to which we now turn were jointly prepared by a research group consisting of Richard Katz (Baltimore, MD), Pippa Norris (Cambridge, MA), Jacques Thomassen (Enschede), and Bernhard Wessels (Berlin). Herman Schmitt participated in most meetings of the group to ensure comparability with the voters study.

THE 1994 EUROPEAN CANDIDATES STUDY (ECS94)

The European Candidates Study 1994 was carried out by mail questionnaire, in the weeks ahead of the 1994 European Parliament election, in ten of the then twelve member-countries of the EU. It was coordinated by Jacques Thomassen and carried out by himself in the Netherlands, and by Tom Bryder in Denmark, Cecile Chavel in France, Irene Delgado and Lourdes Lopez Nieto in Spain, Louisa Gardella in Italy, Peter Linch in Great Britain, Michael Marsh in Ireland, Maria José Stock in Portugal, Bernhard Wessels and Achim Kielhorn in Germany, and Lieven de Winter in Belgium and Luxembourg. In the weeks preceding the 1995 European Parliament election in Sweden, the study was carried out there by Martin Brothen, Peter Esaiasson, and Sören Holmberg. Overhead funds were provided by the University of Twente. Table A.2 shows for each country the number of interviews and the return rate. The data are available from the *Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung*, Cologne, Germany (Study Number 3077).

TABLE A.2. ECS94: number of interviews and return rates

	number of interviews	return rate
Belgium	117	35
Britain	134	38
Denmark	105	57
France	104	13
Germany	395	34
Ireland	12	23
Italy	137	10
Luxembourg	33	55
Netherlands	125	51
Portugal	24	8
Spain	74	4
Sweden	514	86
overall	1726	35

THE 1996 MEP STUDY AND THE MNP STUDIES

The study among the members of the European Parliament was co-ordinated by Bernhard Wessels and funded by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*. Face-to-face interviews were conducted by INFRATEST BURKE. The study among the members of the national parliaments was co-ordinated by Bernhard Wessels and Jacques Thomassen. National study directors were Irene Delgado and Lourdes Lopez Nieto in Spain, Louisa Gardella in Italy, Sören Holmberg, Martin Brothen, and Peter Esaiasson in Sweden, Manina Kakepati in Greece, Christina Leston Bandeira in Portugal, Michael Marsh in Ireland, Bernhard Wessels and Achim Kielhorn in Germany, Lieven de Winter and Patrick Dumont in Belgium and Luxemburg, and Colette Ysmal in France. The MNP studies were administered as mail surveys. Overhead funds for this part of the study were provided by the universities of Mannheim and Twente and the *Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin*. Table A.3 informs about fieldwork period, number of interviews, return rates, and representativity of both the MEP Study and the MNP Studies.

Given the great variation in return rates, the question of representativity of these studies is of major importance. Representativity has been tested for party and gender and, where data were available, for age (and for the MEP study also for nation). The Duncan index of dissimilarity, measuring deviations between the original and the sample distributions, shows that altogether sample deviations from the real distributions are acceptably low in most studies. For both the MEP Study and the MNP studies, the deviation of party composition in the samples from their universes is about eight percentage points; it is about one for gender compositions and about three for age composition. For individual national studies the Duncan index is below ten in most cases except for party and age for some countries. A methodological caveat may remain for those countries with extreme low return rates. However, since most analyses reported in this book describe relations between variables rather than univariate distributions, this potential problem should be minimised.

The data of both studies are available from the *Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung*, Cologne, Germany (Study Numbers 3078 [MEP] and 3079 [MNP]).

TABLE A.3. MEP Study and MNP Studies: fieldwork period, number of interviews, return rates, and representativity

	fieldwork period	number of interviews	return rate	Duncan index of dissimilarity ^a regarding			
				party	gender	age	nation
MEP Study	20.05.- 21.6.1996	314	50	8	0	4	9
MNP Studies							
Belgium ^b	3. 6. 1996 - 28. 4. 1997	87	58	7	1	4	#
France	2. 7. 1996 - 10. 7. 1997	146	25	8	0	7	#
Germany	21 .5. - 6. 8. 1996	317	47	7	2	6	#
Greece	15. 4. - 31. 7. 1996	60	20	16	1	11	#
Ireland	9. 7. - 25. 10. 1996	71	43	3	0	-	#
Italy	June - October 1996	94	15	18	2	-	#
Luxembourg	12. 6. 1996 - 28. 2. 1997	28	47	14	3	-	#
Netherlands	29. 4. - 19. 7. 1996	65	43	11	4	-	#
Portugal	13. 6. - 4. 8. 1996	54	24	9	1	-	#
Spain	Autumn 1996	130	37	5	3	-	#
Sweden	5. 3. - 10. 12. 1996	315	90	2	1	1	#
MNP overall	29. 4. 1996 - 10. 7. 1997	1367	38	7	1	3	#

Notes: (a) The Duncan index measures the percentage point differences between the respective distribution in the universe and the sample. It ranges from 0 (no difference) to 100 (maximum difference). (b) House of Representatives. - = not available. # = not applicable.