Asian Barometer Survey 2006
TECHNICAL REPORT
(TAIWAN)

1. Location

The 2006 Asian Barometer Survey covered the area of Taiwan Province, including two metropolises -- Taipei City and Kaoshiung City.

2. Timetable

Project: April 1, 2005 – March 31, 2007

Fieldwork: January 14, 2006 – February 15, 2006

3. Respondents

Data was gathered through face-to-face interviews of voting-age adults (20 years old and above), who had registered in the household system in Taiwan Province. The baseline information and addresses were drawn from the household information compiled by the Ministry of Interior and excluded residents in military organizations, hospitals, medical care centers, schools, vocational training centers, dormitories, detention centers, and prisons.

4. Sampling Procedure

Sample Sizes and Error Margins. An indicator of data quality is the standard error of the estimate, on which the margin for sampling error is based. As survey statistics are mostly proportions, the key measure of data precision is the standard error of a proportion taken from a sample. It is computed as follows:

$$\pm Z * \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$$

Where *Z*, at 95% confidence level is 1.96; *p* is the sample proportion estimate and *n* is the sample size. The overall sample size of 1,500 voting-age adults gives a maximum error margin of ± 2.83 % at the 95% confidence level, assuming a simple random sampling design.

The sampling method applied to the Survey involves two sets of samples; one is the main sample that was selected according to cluster analysis and PPS. The other is an extension sample that compensated for the unsuccessful cases in the main

sample to fulfill the required number of cases that can fully represent the population.

(1) Sampling Method and Procedure for the Main Sample

Step 1: Identify Demographic Variables

For the first stage, level of modernization is the key criterion that helped stratify the survey areas, without considering political inclination or party identification in each administration district. The baseline information was based on the 2004 census statistics supplied by county/city governments. Among the demographic variables, fourteen were selected as determinants for stratification.[1]

Since some counties/cities only presented the figures as a whole, the mean was used to compensate for the missing information. For those counties/cities which did not have the latest statistics, the next available data was used.

Step 2: Factor Analysis

In order to simplify the 14 variables, Factor Analysis was used to extract the common characteristics among the variables. The Principal Component Analysis method was applied such that every value of the variables was transformed into a standard value.

After a Factor Analysis based on Kasiser method, 4 factors were extracted from the original 14 selected variables, as shown below.

---

[1] Sources of information were from the latest publications on demographic statistics complied by county/city governments. The demographic variables include population density, college graduates (and beyond) population ratio, fishery and farm household ratio, number of registered factories, tap water in the household ratio, tax revenue per capita, public expenditure per capita, education expenditure per capita, population per doctor, elderly age (65+) population ratio, immigrant population ratio, emigrant population ratio, population mobility rate (immigrant + emigrant/total population), and youth (20 to 39 years old) population ratio.

Table 1: Correlation Matrix

Variable	Factor			
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Population density	.039	-.004	-.002	.375
% of College graduates	-.233	.357	.377	.617
% of Fishery and farm household	-.073	.077	-.040	-.585
No. of factories	-.191	.095	.588	.348
% of tap water	-.214	.200	.051	.672
Tax revenue per capita	.958	.177	.013	-.026
Public expenditure per capita	.967	.098	.030	.079
Education expenditure per capita	.936	.148	.070	.103
Population per doctor	-.125	.031	-.398	-.443
Old age population ratio	-.063	-.096	-.921	-.161
Immigrant population ratio	.015	.912	.060	.191
Emigrant population ratio	.334	.804	.060	-.147
Population mobility rate	.162	.975	.067	.060
Youth population ratio	.149	.025	.881	-.159

From the Correlation Matrix, it shows that the first factor has significant correlation with tax revenue per capita, public expenditure per capita, and education expenditure per capita as the values are more than 0.936, but it does not have much correlation with other variables. Thus, the first factor is closely related to government finance since the eigenvalue of Factor 1 is the highest (3.722), and the percent of variance is 26.941%. Therefore, we call Factor 1 the "Government Finance Factor". The second factor, on the other hand, has positive correlation with immigrant population ratio, emigrant population ratio, and population mobility rate as all eigenvalues are up to 0.804. Thus, we name the second factor the "Population Mobility Factor". The third factor is closely related to youth population ratio and thus Factor 3 is called the "Labor Force Factor". The last factor has positive correlation with college graduates population ratio and access to clean water. Therefore, it is closely related to urbanization and is called the "Urbanization Factor". The total cumulative

percent of variance of the four factors is 69.928% and thus the four factors are adequate for substitution of the original 14 variables and also represent their common characteristics.

Step 3: Cluster Analysis

After extracting "Government Finance Factor", "Population Mobility Factor", "Labor Force Factor", and "Urbanization Factor", it is more convenient to conduct Cluster Analysis. The main purpose of Cluster Analysis is to clearly specify the sampling unit of population based on the differences in economic and social situations in order to place each sampling unit into its appropriate stratum. Stratified sampling was used because stratification can produce a smaller bound on the error of estimation than would be produced by a simple random sampling.（Floyd J. Flower, Jr.,1993）

Due to differences in modernization and urbanization, the two metropolises – Taipei City and Kaoshiung City – were excluded from the rest of sampling units (township, city, and district). As a result, there were in total 328 sampling units scrutinized in the Cluster Analysis. The variables used by the analysis were the above-mentioned four factors. After quick cluster, the sampling units were separated into 13 to 15 groups; and considering sample distribution and dispersion, the groups with few units were incorporated into other groups and finally 8 groups were created.

Adding Taipei City (Group 9) and Kaoshiung City (Group 10), the total sampling units in Taiwan Province were separated into 10 groups. To take geography into account, the units in each group were compared based on their location (Taiwan is divided into 6 large regions) and the voting age population ratio in order to select the most appropriate combination of sampling units that can best reflect the real geographic distribution along with its population ratio.

Using PPS (Probability Proportional to Size), the number of samples in each group was decided such that each selected unit would have 8-14 respondents and thus based on the population ratio in each stratum, the number of units that should be selected was decided as well. Systematic sampling was then conducted separately on each stratum in order to get Primary Sampling Unit (PSU), categorized by the percentage of votes that the ruling party received in the last election. The same procedure was also applied to get the Secondary Sampling Unit (SSU). After getting SSU, the third stage was to randomly

choose respondents in each SSU. The sampling procedure for Taipei City and Kaoshiung City was a little bit different in that two stages of sampling were used instead of three -- Li (village) was selected first and then its respondents. Following the PPS procedure and taking the possible failure rate into account, there were in total 4,478 respondents selected for the main sample[2].

Table 2: Sampling Framework

Stratum	Total no. of admin. area	Electorate	% of electorate	No. of samples	No. of selected PSU	No. of selected SSU	No. of samples in each SSU	Adjusted by failure rate	Total
1	58	4244034	25.8	387	16	2	12	36	1152
2	19	604275	3.7	55	2	2	14	42	168
3	37	2735003	16.6	249	12	2	10	30	720
4	36	348616	2.1	32	2	2	8	24	96
5	24	436008	2.6	40	2	2	10	30	120
6	68	1760624	10.7	160	6	2	13	39	468
7	43	643342	3.9	59	4	2	8	24	192
8	43	694589	4.2	63	4	2	8	24	192
9	18	3628805	22.1	331		28	12	36	1008
10	12	1359791	8.3	124		10	12	36	360
Total	358	16455087	100.0	1500					4476

The information for testing the representativeness was the 2004 Census supplied by the Ministry of Interior. Table 6 shows how the selected samples represent the population.

---

[2] According to previous experiences, two of three interviews failed for different reasons. Thus, the final number of respondents was expanded to 3 times more than the original sample size.

Table 3: Representativeness of the Main Sample

Item	Category	No. of samples	Expectation	Chi Square	p-value
Gender					
	Male	2237	2258.7	0.421	0.517
	Female	2239	2217.3		
Age Group					
	20-29	1003	1014.9	0.702	0.951
	30-39	954	958.9		
	40-49	990	983.1		
	50-59	697	705.1		
	60+	832	814.0		
Gender * Age Group					
	M 0-29	506	519.0	3.626	0.934
	M 30-39	494	485.2		
	M 40-49	480	496.3		
	M 50-59	352	352.0		
	M 60+	405	406.2		
	F 20-29	497	495.9		
	F 30-39	460	473.8		
	F 40-49	510	486.7		
	F 50-59	345	353.1		
	F 60+	427	407.8		

(2) Sampling Procedure for the Extension Sample

Although the main sample already took failure rate into account, the success rate was extremely low in some areas and thus another set of samples were selected to compensate for the losses. In the end, there were 1,587 successful samples, exceeding the anticipated sample size of 1,492.

(3) Sampling Procedure for Re-test

In order to secure the reliability and validity of the responses, one fifth of interviewees were selected for a re-test. Systematic sampling was applied in the sampling procedure for the re-test to draw out the interviewees from each SSU.

It was required that the re-test should be conducted according to the respondent sequence arranged by the systematic sampling. However, considering that interviewees might refuse to be interviewed again, the interviewers were allowed to take the next respondent on the list to complete the required number of re-tests.

5. Research Methodology

Preparation

A. Questionnaire

The Chinese-version questionnaire was designed based on the module questionnaire developed by the Asian Barometer Survey. In order to deliver the definitive message in the questionnaire, several meetings were held among the team members to discuss the questions and indicators that would accurately evaluate and explore the citizens' attitudes toward democracy.

B. Pre-testing and Finalizing the Questionnaire

In order to narrow down the perception gap between the questionnaire designers and the respondents, a pre-test was needed so that problems, such as unclear wording, conceptually vague sentences, recording difficulties etc., could be corrected before the fieldwork began. The team also received feedback about the questionnaire from field supervisors and interviewers after they conducted the pre-test. The pre-test has helped determine the following things:

-- The length of interviews (about 40 min. to 1 hour)
-- Wording of questions
-- Adding new items or eliminating less significant questions
-- Question sequence
-- Translation
-- Coding system

-- Questionnaire instructions

-- Conception and idea of questions

C. Training

（1）Training for Supervisor

Two one-day trainings were held to allow the field supervisors to become familiar with the questionnaire and survey procedure. They were instructed on how to supervise their field interviewers and check the questionnaires returned by the field interviewers. The supervisors were asked to conduct a pre-test before the second training. In the second training, the problems that the supervisors found during the pre-test were discussed together with the national team members and they were also instructed on how to deal with real situations encountered in fieldwork.

（2）Training for Interviewers

The training for field interviewers were conducted in Taipei City (north) and Tainan City (south) respectively. In the training, the interviewers were given instruction on interview skills and coding. Moreover, they learned to become familiar with questionnaire by reading the questions in both Mandarin and Taiwanese, the dialect the majority of people speak in Taiwan, in order to deliver the exact meaning that the questions want to convey. The interviewers were asked to conduct pre-test before going to field and the supervisors were asked to assist their field interviewers when needed.

Field work

(1) Workers on Hand

For the survey, a total of 212 field staff was deployed:

Keelung/Taipei City/Taipei County Area	Field Supervisor = 10
	Field Interviewer = 46
Taoyuan/Hsinchu/Miaoli Area	Field Supervisor = 7
	Field Interviewer = 30

Taichung/Changhua/Nantou Area	Field Supervisor = 8
	Field Interviewer = 30
Yunlin/Chiayi/Tainan Area	Field Supervisor = 5
	Field Interviewer = 26
Kaohsiung City/Kaohsiung County/Pingtung Area	Field Supervisor = 6
	Field Interviewer = 36
Yilan/Hualien/Taitung Area	Field Supervisor = 2
	Field Interviewer = 6

(2) Supervision

Supervisors reported to the project manager who monitored the progress and quality of the survey full-time. Supervisors would accompany the interviewers to conduct one or two interviews in the beginning to observe the interviewers and instruct them on how to improve their skills and avoid refusal from respondents. They also followed up and checked on the field interviewers as well as ensured that field logistics were received promptly and administered properly.

(3) Spot-checking

Supervisors were responsible for investigating the failure or success of a case and spot-check in order to retain the survey quality. Supervisors either visited the respondent or called the respondent to ensure that the questionnaire was properly conducted and that the respondent was the one selected on the list. By doing so, any incomplete or inconsistent answer was verified by the supervisors.

(4) Re-testing

One fifth of respondents were selected for re-test. The questions in the re-test questionnaires were far fewer and the same interviewer was not allowed to interview the same respondent he/she interviewed in the previous fieldwork.

Field Editing and Data Processing

The supervisors went over the interviewers' work to check for consistency after

the interview and the office editors conducted final consistency checks on all interviews prior to coding. The team members also gathered to discuss the coding problem in open questions and decided the new codes. Data was then verified and the consistency of the encoded data was checked before data tables were generated.

6. Weighting Procedure

To yield representative figures at the national level, census-based population weights are applied to the survey data. The census data is from the 2005 Census released by the Ministry of Interior.

Table 4:   Gender (before weighting)

	Sample		Population	Result
	Frequency	Percent	Percent	
Male	797	50.2	50.3	Chi square=0.004
Female	790	49.8	49.7	p>0.05
Total	1587	100.0	100.0	consistent with the population

Table 5: Age Group（before weighting）

	Sample		Population	Result
	Frequency	Percent	Percent	
20 – 29	327	20.6	22.9	Chi Square=13.453
30 – 39	318	20.0	21.6	
40 – 49	346	21.8	22.1	p<0.05
50 – 59	274	17.3	15.8	
60 and above	322	20.3	17.7	Not consistent with
Total	1587	100.0	100.0	the population

Table 6: Education Attainment（before weighting）

	Sample		Population	Result
	Frequency	Percent	Percent	
Elementary and less	394	24.9	23.0	Chi Square=11.112
Junior High School	216	13.6	16.5	
Senior High School	513	32.4	32.6	p<0.05
Vocational	208	13.1	12.6	Not consistent with the population
College and above	254	16.0	15.3	
Total	1585	100.0	100.0	

Table 7: Geography Distribution（before weighting）

	Sample		Population	Result
	Frequency	Percent	Percent	
Keelung/Taipei City/Taipei County Area	458	28.9	32.2	Chi Square=47.042
Taoyuan/Hsinchu/Miaoli Area	293	18.5	14.1	
Taichung/Changhua/Nantou Area	346	21.8	19.0	p<0.05
Yunlin/Chiayi/Tainan Area	227	14.3	15.3	Not consistent with the population
Kaohsiung City/Kaohsiung County/Pingtung Area	242	15.2	16.8	
Yilan/Hualien/Taitung Area	21	1.3	2.6	
Total	1587	100.0	100.0	

From Table 4 to Table 7, the figures show that only gender distribution has good representativeness to the population. Others, such as age group, education and geographic distribution, do not reflect the population. Therefore, raking is used to generate better goodness of fit as shown below.

Table 8: Gender（after weighting）

	Sample		Population	Result
	Frequency	Percent	Percent	
Make	809	50.3	50.3	Chi Square=0.000
Female	799	49.7	49.7	p>0.05
Total	1608	100.0	100.0	Consistent with the population

Table 9: : Age Group（after weighting）

	Sample		Population	Result
	Frequency	Percent	Percent	
20 -- 29	351	22.4	22.9	Chi Square=0.305
30 – 39	338	21.5	21.6	
40 – 49	353	22.5	22.1	p>0.05
50 -- 59	248	15.8	15.8	
60 and above	280	17.8	17.7	Consistent with the population
Total	1570	100.0	100.0	

Table 10: Education Attainment（after weighting）

	Sample		Population	Result
	Frequency	Percent	Percent	
Elementary and less	361	22.8	23.0	
Junior High School	268	17.0	16.5	Chi Square=0.387
Senior High School	513	32.4	32.6	p>0.05
Vocational	194	12.3	12.6	Consistent with the population
College and above	245	15.5	15.3	
Total	1581	100.0	100.0	

Table 11: Geography Distribution（after weighting）

	Sample		Population	Result
	Frequency	Percent	Percent	
Keelung/Taipei City/Taipei County Area	504	31.6	32.2	Chi Square=1.359 p>0.05 Consistent with the population
Taoyuan/Hsinchu/Miaoli Area	236	14.8	14.1	
Taichung/Changhua/Nantou Area	313	19.6	19.0	
Yunlin/Chiayi/Tainan Area	238	14.9	15.3	
Kaohsiung City/Kaohsiung County/Pingtung Area	264	16.6	16.8	
Yilan/Hualien/Taitung Area	40	2.5	2.6	
Total	1595	100.0	100.0	

Appendix: List of Selected PSU and SSU

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
1	**0402 Zhudong Township** HsinchuCounty	10004020019	Erchong Li	36	
		10004020010	Zhudong Li	36	
	0302 Zhongli City Taoyuan County	10003020008	Ziqiang Li	36	12
		10003020069	Deyi Li	36	12
	0110 Danshui Township Taipei County	10001100018	Zhuwei Li	36	
		10001100021	Ganzhen Li	36	12
	0803 Caotun Township Nantou County	10008030002	Yanfeng Li	36	
		10008030009	Bifeng Li	36	
	0701 Changhua City Changhua County	10007010047	Yanping Li	36	
		10007010043	Xian Li	36	
	0201 Yilan City Yilan County	10002010038	Siyuan Li	36	
		10002010022	Caiyuan Li	36	

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
	0604 Qingshui Township Taichung County	10006040012	Linjing Li	36	
		10006040027	Qiaotou Li	36	
	2102 South District Tainan City	10021020029	Dalin Li	36	12
		10021020033	Zaixing Li	36	12
	0309 Longtan Township Taoyuan County	10003090030	Jianlin Village	36	
		10003090001	Huang-tang Village	36	12
	0308 Bade City Taoyuan County	10003080025	Dahua Li	36	12
		10003080034	Dazhu Li	36	
	0301 Taoyuan City Taoyuan County	10003010049	Zhong-ning Li	36	12
		10003010019	Ximen Li	36	12
	0710 Yuanlin Township Changhua County	10007100018	Sanhe Li	36	
		10007100010	Huilai Li	36	
	0609 Tanzi Township Taichung County	10006090004	Furen Village	36	

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
		10006090011	Jiaren Village	36	
	0901 Douliu City Yunlin County	10009010033	Zhenxi Li	36	12
		10009010025	Hushan Li	36	12
	0715 Puxin Township Changhua County	10007150019	Pixia Village	36	
		10007150008	Taiping Village	36	
	1218 Ziguan Township Kaohsiung County	10012180016	Dianbao Village	36	12
		10012180012	Dashe Village	36	12
2	**1705 Zhongshan District** Keelung City	10017050014	Xiandong Li	42	42
		10017050011	Tongming Li	42	42
	1803 Xiangshan District Hsinchu City	10018030011	Xiangcun Li	42	42
		10018030002	Hushan Li	42	42
3	**1801 East District** Hsinchu City	10018010040	Qianjia Li	30	
		10018010038	Qianxi Li	30	10
	1905 North District	10019050039	Jinxiang Li	30	

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
	Taichung City				
		10019050032	Jianxing Li	30	10
	1907 Nantun District Taichung City	10019070026	Sanyi Li	30	
		10019070016	Datong Li	30	10
	2101 East District Tainan City	10021010042	Chongde Li	30	
		10021010050	Chongxin Li	30	
	2104 North District Tainan City	10021040013	Daren Li	30	
		10021040020	Yanping Li	30	
	1207 Niaosong Township Kaohsiung County	10012070003	Dahua Village	30	
		10012070007	Huamei Village	30	
	0310 Pingzhen City Taoyuan County	10003100017	Longen Li	30	
		10003100034	Guangren Li	30	
	1908 Beitun District Taichung City	10019080025	Shinping Li	30	
		10019080033	Songyong Li	30	

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
	1904 West District Taichung City	10019040028	Tuku Li	30	
		10019040030	Gongyi Li	30	
	2001 East District Chiayi City	10020010036	Hou-zhuang Li	30	
		10020010032	Shennong Li	30	10
	1203 Daliao Township Kaohsiung County	10012030024	Guangwu Village	30	
		10012030009	Zhong- zhuang Village	30	
	1120 Xinshi Township Tainan County	10011200002	Xinhe Village	30	
		10011200010	Gangqian Village	30	
4	**1330 Laiyi Township** Pingtung County	10013300006	Wangjia Village	24	
		10013300007	Nanhe Village	24	
	0709 Fenyuan Township Changhua County	10007090002	Dapu Village	24	
		10007090007	Fenyuan Village	24	
5	**1704 Renai District**	10017040029	Guanghua Li	30	

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
	Keelung City				
		10017040013	Jiren Li	30	10
	1111 Danei Township Tainan County	10011110008	Huanhu Village	30	
		10011110003	Shicheng Village	30	
6	**0513 Sanyi Township** Miaoli County	10005130001	Guang-cheng Village	39	
		10005130004	Sheng-xing Village	39	
	0802 Puli Township Nantou County	10008020033	Taian Li	39	
		10008020003	Ximen Li	39	13
	0503 Tongziao Township Miaoli County	10005030002	Tongxi Li	39	13
		10005030003	Pingyuan Li	39	
	0804 Zhushan Township Nantou County	10008040004	Yunlin Li	39	
		10008040015	Shan-chong Li	39	
	1219 Qishan Township Kaohsiung County	10012190025	Guangfu Li	39	
		10012190019	Sanxie Li	39	

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
	0908 Dapi Township Yunlin County	10009080001	Beihe Village	39	13
		10009080004	Songzhu Village	39	
7	**1508 Fengbin Township** Hualien County	10015080003	Jiqi Village	24	
		10015080001	Fengbin Village	24	
	0403 Xinpu Township Hsinchu County	10004030008	Xinpu Li	24	
		10004030001	Neili Li	24	
	1325 Fangshan Township Pingtung County	10013250001	Fangshan Village	24	8
		10013250002	Jialu Village	24	8
	0209 Wujie Township Yilan County	10002090009	Daji Village	24	
		10002090010	Xiehe Village	24	
8	**0508 Dahu Township** Miaoli County	10005080006	Daliao Village	24	8
		10005080011	Lilin Village	24	8
	0808 Chongliao Township Nantou County	10008080006	Yongping Village	24	

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
		10008080007	Fuxing Village	24	8
	1002 Pozi City Chiayi County	10010020017	Dage Li	24	
		10010020022	Kanhou Li	24	
	1007 Xingang Township Chiay County	10010070017	Zhong-yang Village	24	8
		10010070021	Nangang Village	24	8
9	**6311 Shilin District** Taipei City	63000110004	Fude Li	36	36
		63000110003	Fulin Li	36	36
		63000110034	Lanya Li	36	36
	6306 Datong District Taipei City	63000060004	Jiantai Li	36	36
	6303 Da-an District Taipei City	63000030037	qunying Li	36	36
		63000030053	Dunhuang Li	36	36
	6304 Zhongshan District Taipei City	63000040027	Xiapi Li	36	12
	6305 Zhongzheng District Taipei City	63000050014	Zhongqin Li	36	36

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
	6310 Neihu District Taipei City	63000100020	Ruiyang Li	36	12
		63000100011	Zixing Li	36	12
	6301 Songshan District Taipei City	63000010008	Futai Li	36	36
	6302 Xinyi District Taipei City	63000020036	Shuanghe Li	36	
	6307 Wanhua District Taipei City	63000070007	Fumin Li	36	36
	6312 Beitao District Taipei City	63000120022	Zhong-yang Li	36	12
	0102 Sanchong City Taipei County	10001020007	Cheng-gong Li	36	12
		10001020116	Lide Li	36	12
	0103 Zhonghe City Taipei County	10001030051	Jingwen Li	36	
		10001030063	Ruisui Li	36	12
		10001030090	Guansui Li	36	12
	0104 Yonghe City Taipei County	10001040008	Minzhi Li	36	36

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
		10001040053	Zheng-xing Li	36	12
	0101 Banqiao City Taipei County	10001010115	Minan Li	36	12
		10001010110	Houpu Li	36	
		10001010119	Jianguo Li	36	12
		10001010062	Yongan Li	36	12
	0106 Xindian City Taipei County	10001060058	Paofu Li	36	36
	0105 Xinzhung City Taipei County	10001050033	Minan Li	36	12
		10001050051	LongfengLi	36	36
10	**6405 Sanmin District** Kaohsiung City	64000052042	Ankang Li	36	12
		64000052018	Paotai Li	36	
	6411 Xiaogang District Kaohsiung City	64000110012	Erling Li	36	
		64000110033	Fengming Li	36	
	6408 Lingya District Kaohsiung City	64000080061	Zhengda Li	36	12
		64000080047	Linjing Li	36	12

Stratum	Selected PSU (township, city, district)	ID No.	Selected SSU (village, Li)	Sample	Extended to
	6404 Nanzi District Kaohsiung City	64000040028	Qing-chang Li	36	
	6402 Gushan District Kaohsiung City	64000020014	Huosheng Li	36	12
		64000020010	Longjing Li	36	12
	1201 Fengshan City Kaohsiung County	10012011042	Caogong Li	36	12