

**Prepared by: Katarina Thomson, National Centre for Social Research**

**Date: 24.2.2006**

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS**  
**Module 2: Sample Design and Data Collection Report**  
August 23, 2004

**Country: Britain**

**Date of Election: 5 May 2005**

Type of Election (e.g., presidential, parliamentary, legislative): Parliamentary

Organization that conducted the survey field work: National Centre for Social Research

**Investigators Responsible for Data Collection:**

Name: Katarina Thomson

Name: Steve Fisher

Affiliation: National Centre for Social Research

Affiliation: Department of Sociology, University of Oxford

Address:  
35 Northampton Square  
London EC1V 0AX

Address:  
Manor Road, Oxford, OX1 3UQ

Fax: +44 20 7250 1524  
Phone: +44 20 7549 9570  
E-mail: k.thomson@natcen.ac.uk

Fax: +44 1865286170  
Phone: +44 1865286173  
E-mail: stephen.fisher@sociology.oxford.ac.uk

Name:

Name:

Affiliation:

Affiliation:

Address:

Address:

Fax:  
Phone:  
E-mail:

Fax:  
Phone:  
E-mail:

## **A. Study Design**

- ✓ Post-Election Study
- Pre-/Post-Election Panel Study

Date Post-Election Interviewing Began: 20 June 2005

Date Post-Election Interviewing Ended: 24 Nov 2005

*If Panel Study:*

Date Pre-Election Interviewing Began:

Date Pre-Election Interviewing Ended:

Mode of (post-election) interview:

- In person, face-to-face
- Telephone
- ✓ Mail or self-completion supplement

The CSES questions were implemented in a self-completion supplement to the annual British Social Attitudes (BSA) survey. This self-completion supplement is left behind by the interviewer at the end of a face-to-face interview and picked up later. The BSA sample was divided into four equal sized random subsamples, which were each given different versions of the questionnaire (A, B, C and D). The CSES questions were on version B of the BSA self-completion.

Language(s) used in questionnaire(s) (Please provide copies of questionnaires in all languages used, as well as a version translated in English, if applicable, as part of the Election Study Deposit):

English

## **B. Sample Design and Sampling Procedures**

### 1. Eligibility Requirements

- a) Age: Minimum\_\_\_18\_ Maximum\_\_None
- b) Citizenship: Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_✓\_\_\_
- c) Other requirements: Resident in private household (i.e. not institutions)

### 2. Sample Frame:

- a) Were any regions of the country excluded from the sample frame?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_✓\_\_\_

If yes, please explain:

Sample frame covered Britain (England, Scotland, Wales) – i.e. Northern Ireland was excluded

Also, Scotland north of the Caledonian Canal was excluded

- b) Were institutionalized persons excluded from the sample?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_✓\_\_\_

Please explain:

Sample covered people living in private households only.

- c) Were military personnel excluded from the sample?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_✓\_\_\_

Please explain: If stationed abroad but not if stationed in Britain.

d) If interviews were conducted by telephone: No

i. What is the estimated percentage of households without a phone: \_\_\_\_\_%

ii. Were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?

No\_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

iii. Were substitution methods used for unproductive sample points?

No\_\_✓\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

e) Were other persons excluded from the sample frame?

No\_\_✓\_\_ Yes\_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

f) Estimated total (a + b + c + d + e) percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame:

This information is not available. Given that the Post Address File (PAF, see description below), includes the people that needed to be excluded for CSES purposes, we know that the proportion of the population excluded is more than 3.1%. We cannot, however, provide an exact estimate.

The sample frame was the Postcode Address File, a list of addresses maintained by the Post Office. Estimates based on the 1991 Census Validation Study suggest that PAF has a 96.4% coverage of households and a 96.9% coverage of individuals (Foster, K. (1994), 'The coverage of the Postcode Address File as a sampling frame', OPCS Survey Methods Bulletin, 34.).

3. Sample Selection Procedures:

a) What were the primary sampling units?

Postcode sectors

b) Were the primary sampling units randomly selected?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes  \_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

Postcode sectors were stratified by region, population density and percent owner-owner-occupiers. (Percent non-manual head of household was used instead of percent owner-occupiers in Scotland). Sectors were drawn from this list at regular intervals using a random start, i.e. systematic random sample.

c) Were there further stages of selection?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes  \_\_\_\_\_

Please explain:

Within each selected postcode sector, addresses were drawn using regular intervals and a random start.

d) How were individual respondents identified?

At selected addresses, the interviewer enumerated any dwelling units within the address and if there were more than one, selected one using computer-generated random numbers and a Kish grid.

At the (selected) dwelling unit, the interviewer enumerated all residents aged 18+ and selected one using computer-generated random numbers and a Kish grid.

e) Under what circumstances was a sample line designated non- sample?

Please check all that apply:

- Non-residential sample point
- All members of household are ineligible
- Housing unit is vacant
- No answer at housing unit after \_\_\_\_\_ callbacks
- Other (Please explain):

f) Were non-sample replacement methods used?

No  Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

g). For surveys conducted by telephone:

i. Was the sample a random digit dial (RDD) sample? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Was the sample a listed sample? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

iii. Was the sample a dual frame sample? No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, what % list frame \_\_\_\_\_ and what % RDD \_\_\_\_\_

h) For surveys conducted by mail:

Was the sample a listed sample?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

4. Compliance:

Prior to the study:

a) Was a letter sent to respondent?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_✓\_\_\_

(If yes, please include a copy of the letter in the Deposit)

b) Was payment sent to respondent?

No \_\_\_✓\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

c) Was a token gift sent to respondent?

No \_\_\_✓\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

d) Were any other incentives used?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_✓\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

£5 (approx. 8.65 USD) gift voucher was sent to all respondents who took part.  
This was mentioned in the advance letter.

5. During the Field Period:

- a) How many contacts were made with the household before declaring it **non-sample**?

As many as necessary to establish non-eligibility. (Cases of uncertain eligibility due to non-contact are treated as non-interview rather than non-sample).

- b) How many contacts were made with the household before declaring it **non-interview**?

At least 4 calls.

- c) Maximum number of days over which a household was contacted?

No maximum set.

- d) Did interviewers vary the time of day at which they re-contacted the household? No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_✓\_\_

Please describe:

Before a household was recorded as a non-contact, the interviewer had to make at least 4 calls at different times of the day, of which at least one in the evening and one at a weekend

- e) Refusal Conversion:

- i. Were efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_✓\_\_

Please describe:

Practically all refusals and non-contacts (over a quarter of the original issued sample) were re-issued to another interviewer to try again.

- ii. Were respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed sent a letter persuading them to take part?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_✓\_\_

If so, please describe (in addition, please include a copy of the letter in the deposit):



iii. Was payment offered to respondents who were reluctant to take part?  
No  Yes \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, how much?

Just the £5 voucher sent to all respondents (see above).

iv. Were respondents who were reluctant to take part turned over to a more experienced interviewer? Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

v. What was the maximum number of re-contacts used to persuade respondent to be interviewed?

No maximum set

vi. Were any other methods used to persuade respondents reluctant to be interviewed to take part?

No  Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

#### 6. Response Rate:

(Note: if a panel study, please report response rate of the first wave)

Total number of sample lines issued:	2145
Number of refusals:	662
Number never contacted (no-contact):	111
Other non-response:	113
Face-to-face interview conducted but no self-completion	215
Number of lines of non-sample:	184
Total number of completed interviews:	860
Response Rate:	40%

7. Panel Attrition:

(Note: This only applies if CSES questionnaire is administered as part of a 2-wave panel study):

Total number of respondents in Wave I of the study:

\_\_\_\_\_

Number of Wave I respondents re-interviewed in wave containing CSES Module:

\_\_\_\_\_

Percent total panel attrition:

\_\_\_\_\_

8. Panel attrition by age and education (given as percentages; please indicate whether numbers provided are % re-interviewed or % attrition):

Age

18-25 \_\_\_\_\_ %  
26-40 \_\_\_\_\_ %  
41-65 \_\_\_\_\_ %  
65 & over \_\_\_\_\_ %

Education

None \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Incomplete primary \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Primary completed \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Incomplete secondary \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Secondary completed \_\_\_\_\_ %  
University incomplete \_\_\_\_\_ %  
University degree \_\_\_\_\_ %

9. Sample Weights

a) Are weights included in the data file?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes  \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe how the weights were constructed:

A note outlining the details of the weighting strategy is attached. This is summarised in b)-d) below.

Very large and very small values for the resultant weights were trimmed to avoid inefficiencies arising from a very wide range of weights. The final weights are scaled so that the weighted sample size of the whole of the BSA sample is equal to the unweighted sample size. As the CSES dataset is a subset of the whole BSA, the weighted and unweighted sample sizes for CSES differ slightly.

b) Are the weights designed to compensate for disproportionate probability of selection at the respondent/household level?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes  \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

Addresses were selected with equal probability but only one person interviewed at each address. Respondents at multi-household addresses and/or in large households, therefore had less chance of selection than respondents at single household addresses and/or in small households. The weights compensate for this..

c) Are the weights designed to match known demographic characteristics of the population?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_✓\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

The weights were matched to the age/sex distribution by region of the population aged 18+.

d) Are the data weighted to correct for non-response?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes\_\_✓\_\_\_\_

Please describe:

The data were modelled using information available about both interviews and non-interviews. This information included local area statistics supplied with the sample and interviewer observation variables. Variables significantly associated with response included % ethnic minorities in the local area, % households who are owner-occupiers in the local area and region.

10. a) Please describe the interviewers (e.g., age, level of education, years of experience):

Not available

- b) Please provide a description of interviewer training:

All interviewers receive two days' basic training, which includes laptop training. They are graded from Grade A, for new to Grade D for senior interviewers. The higher grades attract higher fee payments. To gain promotion through the grades, interviewers must complete their assignments satisfactorily, keep to deadlines, achieve high response rates and receive good supervision reports. After 18 months to two years, they are invited to an Intermediate Training School, which includes a written test.

In addition, all interviewers attended one-day project-specific briefing conferences conducted by the project researchers.

11. Comparison of Sample to Population

Characteristic	<u>Population Estimates</u>	<u>Sample Estimates</u>	
		Unweighted	Weighted
<u>Age</u>			
18-25	13.1%	8.3%	12.5%
26-40	17.5%	25.0%	26.0%
41-66	41.3%	45.7%	42.6%
65 and over	20.6%	21%	19%
<u>Education</u>			
None	Not available		
Incomplete Primary			
Primary Completed			
Incomplete Secondary			
Secondary Completed			
Post-Secondary Trade/Vocational			
Incomplete University			
University Degree			
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	48.3%	43.5%	46%
Female	51.7%	56.5%	54%