

CSES - INTERIM STUDY OUTLINE

14 Aug 1998

- I. Country**
Great Britain
- II. Type of election**
Parliamentary
- III. Date of election**
1st May 1997
- IV. Organisation that conducted the survey field work**
Social and Community Planning Research
- V. Investigators responsible for data collection**
Professor A Heath
Nuffield College
Oxford OX1 1NF
phone: +44 1865 278543
fax: +44 1865 278621
e-mail: anthony.heath@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

Professor R Jowell
Social and Community Planning Research
35 Northampton Square
London EC1V 0AX
phone: +44 171 250 1866
fax: +44 171 250 1524
e-mail: r.jowell@scpr.ac.uk

Professor J Curtice
Department of Government
University of Strathclyde
McCance Building
16 Richmond Street
Glasgow G1 1XQ
tel: +44 141 552 4400
fax: +44 141 552 5677
e-mail: chgs07@ccsun.strath.ac.uk

Dr P Norris
Institute of Politics
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
79 John F Kennedy Street
Cambridge, Mass. 02138
USA
tel: +1 617 495 1475
fax: +1 617 495 8696

e-mail: pippan@ksgrsch.harvard.edu

VI. Study design

Post-election study

VII. Dates of interviewing

The first interview in the CSES dataset is dated 1st May 1997 and the last interview is dated 29th July. (Dates refer to the date the self-completion booklet was completed since the CSES module was fielded on the self-completion).

VIII. Mode of interview

Self-completion supplement

IX. Sample design and sampling procedure

1. Eligibility requirements

- a. **Age:** 18+
- b. **Citizenship:** see c.
- c. **Other:** All persons resident in private households in Britain were eligible for interview. However, the interim file deposited on 14 Aug 1998 has been restricted to verified electors only. (*If this is not what you want, we can use a wider base when we deposit the final version of the file.*)

2. Persons excluded from the sample

- a. All regions in mainland Britain were included. (Note, however, that the coverage is not United Kingdom wide. E.g. Northern Ireland is not included).
- b. Institutionalised persons were excluded.
- c. Military personnel were not excluded.
- f. None
- g. *Not available at time of writing.*

3.1 Sampling method

Although the CSES questions were fielded in a self-completion supplement, this self-completion supplement was used at the end of a face-to-face interview. (All survey respondents were asked to fill in the self-completion). The sampling is therefore best treated under the face-to-face heading:

The sampling frame was the Small Users' Postcode Address File (a computerised file of delivery points (DPs) held by the Post Office).

- a. The primary sampling units were postal sectors. Any postal sectors with less than 500 DPs were grouped together. The list of (grouped) sectors was stratified on the basis of sub-region (32 for England/Wales and 5 for Scotland), population density and Socio-Economic Group profile (percentage of household heads who are employer/managers). 218 postal sectors were selected with probability proportional to DP count, treating England/Wales and Scotland separately. 164 sectors were selected in England and Wales and 54 in Scotland. (This represents a deliberate over-representation of Scotland - the 'Scottish boost').
- b. Yes

- c. 30 DPs were sampled systematically (with a random start) from throughout each sector, giving 6,540 *issued addresses* of which 4,920 were in England and Wales and 1,620 were in Scotland.
- d. Yes - in two stages:
- i. At each issued address, the interviewer established the number of occupied dwelling units (DUs) and, where there were several, selected one DU at random (using a Kish grid and random numbers generated separately for each serial number).
 - ii. At each (selected) DU, the interviewer established the number of adults aged 18+ normally resident there, and selected one adult at random (using the same procedure as for selecting a DU).
- e. Categories of ineligible addresses ('deadwood') were:
- Insufficient address
 - Not traced
 - Not yet built/not yet ready for occupation
 - Derelict/demolished
 - Empty
 - Business/industrial only (no private dwellings)
 - Institutional only (no private dwellings)
 - Weekend of holiday home
 - Other deadwood

Note that this list does *not* include 'No answer at housing unit'.

- f. No

4. Compliance

- a. Letter prior to the study - yes
 Payment - no
 Token gift - no
 Any other incentive - no

- b. *Do you mean minimum number of contacts?*

The interviewers were told to call on at least four occasions, at different times of the day and spread across the fieldwork period before classifying an address as unproductive. If necessary, at least one of the calls should be in the evening and one at a weekend. However, interviewers were also instructed to keep on calling while working in the area, so most unproductive addresses would have received a great many more than four calls. There was no set maximum number of calls.

- c. Every effort was made to convert refusals. Interviewers had doorstep letters that they could use for reluctant respondents. There were two main conversion strategies:
- Unproductives were sent to SCPR's Telephone Unit who approached the household by telephone and attempted to make an appointment for an interviewer to return. They occasionally sent out further information about the study.
 - Unproductives were also turned over to more experienced interviewers ('reissues').

No payments or other incentives to respondents were used at any stage. There was no set maximum number of calls.

X. RESPONSE RATE

Issued addresses	6,540	
Of which eligible	5,814	
Of which:		
refusals	1,588	27.3%
non-contact	300	5.2%
other unproductive	311	5.3%
interviewed	3,615	62.2%
of which verified electors	3,422	n.a.
returned self-completion:	3,084	53.0%
of which verified electors	2,931	n.a.

XII. SAMPLE WEIGHT

- a. Yes
- b. Yes
- c. No
- d. Yes

XIII. INTERVIEWERS

The interviewers were all drawn from SCPR's panel of trained interviewers.

XIV. COMPARISON OF SAMPLE TO POPULATION

Not available at time of writing.

XV. LANGUAGES USED IN THE INTERVIEWS

British English.