Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) Module 6 Design Report

Version: December 2022

Country/territory: Great Britain
Date of election: 04/07/2024
Prepared by: The British Election Study
Date of preparation: 18/12/2025

The answers provided in this Design Report are used to create variables in the CSES dataset, enable the CSES Secretariat to evaluate the eligibility of election studies for inclusion in the cross-national dataset, and provide users with important information for their analyses.

Notes to collaborators…

- All sections of the Design Report must be filled in for an election study deposit to be considered complete. The CSES Secretariat is available to provide clarification and support.
- Where brackets [ ] appear, answer by placing an "X" within the appropriate bracket(s).
- If more space or iterations are required to answer any question, please lengthen the document and duplicate items as necessary.
- In your deposited dataset, please be sure to include any weight variables, as well a variable that indicates the mode of interview for each observation (respondent) that is included.
- If you have an existing methodology report for your study, we would appreciate receiving an electronic copy of it, to supplement the information in your completed Design Report. We will make both your Design Report and any supplemental methodological report available for download from the CSES website. We encourage you to cut-and-paste information from your existing methodology report into your answers below, as appropriate.

Section A1. Collaborator(s)

Collaborators are the contact persons for election studies that appear in CSES. Collaborators are not necessarily who collected the data. This collaborators list will appear on the CSES website.

Collaborator name: Edward Fieldhouse
Affiliation: University of Manchester
Email: ed.fieldhouse@manchester.ac.uk

Collaborator name: Jane Green
Affiliation: Nuffield College, University of Oxford
Email: jane.green@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

Collaborator name: Geoffrey Evans
Affiliation: Nuffield College, University of Oxford
Email: geoffrey.evans@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

Collaborator name: Jonathan Mellon
Affiliation: N/A
Email: jonamellon@gmail.com

Collaborator name: Christopher Prosser
Affiliation: Royal Holloway, University of London
Email: chris.prosser@rhul.ac.uk

Collaborator name: Jack Bailey
Affiliation: University of Manchester
Email: jack.bailey@manchester.ac.uk

Collaborator name: James David Griffiths
Affiliation: University of Manchester
Email: james.griffiths@manchester.ac.uk

Collaborator name: Stuart Perrett
Affiliation: University of Manchester
Email: stuart.perrett@manchester.ac.uk

Section A2. Data Collection Organization

Organization that conducted the survey field work/data collection…

Organization name: Ipsos
Address: 3 Thomas More Square, London, United Kingdom, E1W 1YW
Email: Cameron.Garrett@ipsos.com; Alex.Bogdan@ipsos.com
Website: http://www.ipsos.com/en-uk

Section A3. Funding Organization(s)

Organization(s) that funded the data collection…

Organization: Economic and Social Research Council

Address:
Polaris House
North Star Avenue
Swindon
SN2 1UJ

Telephone: +44 1793 413000
Fax:
E-Mail: esrcenquiries@esrc.ac.uk
Website: www.esrc.ac.uk

Section A4. Archiving Organization

If appropriate, please indicate the primary location where the full, original election study dataset (not just the CSES portion) will archived.

Organization: UK Data Service
Address:
University of Essex
Wivenhoe Park
Colchester
Essex
C04 3SQ

Telephone: +44 1206 872001
Fax:
E-Mail: help@ukdataservice.ac.uk
Website: https://www.ukdataservice.ac.uk/

Section B. Study Design

1. Timing of the study that the CSES Module was included in:
   [X] Post-Election Study
   [ ] Pre-Election/Post-Election Panel Study
   [ ] Between Rounds
   [ ] Other, please specify: _____

2. For the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared, please provide the following three pieces of information…

The date that interviewing began: 5/7/2024

The date that interviewing ended: 11/12/2024

The number of days between the date of the election and when interviewing began: 1

3. Was the survey that included the CSES Module part of a panel study?
   [ ] Yes
   [X] No

   If yes, please describe the design of the panel study, including the date at which interviewing for each prior wave began and ended:

4. How many respondents answered the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared? That is, how many records/observations are there in the CSES portion of your study?
1627

5. Did respondents give their consent to share their responses as part of the CSES dataset, in accordance with local human rights regulations and data protection laws?

[X] Yes
[ ] No

Section C. Sample frame, selection, and eligibility

6. Please describe the population that your study is meant to be representative of.
18+ adults in Great Britain who are eligible to vote

7. What steps were taken as part of the sampling and/or data collection process to ensure that the sample is representative of the target population? In what ways were those steps successful, and in what ways were they not (please provide evidence wherever possible)?

We adopted gold standard random probability sampling with stratification (as set out below). The sample was designed to be representative of all those who live in Great Britain aged 18+ and who are eligible to vote in general elections. Individuals eligible to vote are British Citizens, Citizens of the Republic of Ireland or Citizens of a Commonwealth country with the "right to remain" in the UK. A high priority was given to achieving a high response rate especially among hard-to-reach groups. For example, to minimize non-contact, interviewers were required to complete a strict 6-call pattern as a minimum, and to call on different days and at different times. Advance letters were designed and interviewers trained to maximise cooperation. Differential incentives were offered to encourage hard to reach groups/areas addresses were reissued to a different interviewer with an enhanced incentive. The response AAPOR3 response rate achieved was 44.1%

All respondents were invited to complete the CSES module. We used an online first approach for the additional questions but offered a paper questionnaire option. To maximise the response rate, we offered a conditional additional incentive (and unconditional to hard to some reach groups) We sent regular reminders on a rolling-basis so all respondents who agreed to receive an invite. 52.7% of all main survey respondents completed the CSES

The sample was selected based on a multi-stage design, summarised as:

- Stratified random sample of 300 Parliamentary constituencies with probability proportional to size
- Two Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) per constituency selected with probability proportional to size
- Selection of a fixed number of addresses in each LSOA from the Small User version of the Postcode Address File (PAF)
- One eligible individual randomly selected per address by the interviewer.

8. Please list the criteria for an individual to be eligible to be interviewed in your study. For example minimum age, citizenship, voter registration, etc.

People aged 18 or over, who were eligible to vote in a general election.

9. Please describe the sample frame, its type and source, and its coverage of the population.

The sample is drawn from the small user Postcode Address file and some sections of the population fall outside this sampling frame e.g. elderly people in residential care, prisoners and military personnel living in defense establishments

Selection of parliamentary constituencies

300 Parliamentary constituencies were sampled from the whole of Great Britain.

Constituencies were stratified by country and then within England by region. Within each country/region, constituencies were classified by party competition, defined as a combination of winning party and party competition from the 2019 general election. Given a new set of boundaries was used for Parliamentary constituencies at the 2024 general election, data for party competition was based on notional estimates of the 2019 general election results in these new constituencies.[1] Within each party competition strata, constituencies were sorted by the estimated

[1] Estimates compiled by Professors Colin Rallings and Michael Thrasher on behalf of BBC News, ITV News, Sky News and the Press Association. Calculations for Scotland were done by Professor David Denver, https://interactive.news.sky.com/2024/doc/estimates-2019-general-election-result-new-constituencies-explainer.pdf.

share of the Leave vote at the 2016 EU referendum, again which has been modelled to fit the new constituency boundaries.[2]

Constituencies were then selected with probability proportional to population size. The full list of sampled constituencies can be found in Appendix A.

Selection of Lower Super Output Area (LSOAs)

Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) were used as secondary sampling units in each sampled constituency. As there is not a perfect match between LSOAs and constituencies (some LSOAs straddle two seats) the LSOAs were treated as being part of the constituency in which the majority of its population live. Addresses that were in a different constituency were allocated to a neighbouring LSOA in the correct constituency, so that no addresses were removed from the sampling frame and addresses were allocated to the correct constituency.

All LSOAs were ranked in each constituency by their Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) score and then divided into quartiles. Within each quartile LSOAs were listed from lowest to highest population density. Two LSOAs were sampled with probability proportional to size: one from the top two quartiles, and the other from the lower two quartiles.

Selection of addresses

Thirteen addresses per LSOA were sampled from the latest version of the Small User Postcode Address File using a fixed sampling interval and random start. In London constituencies, 15 addresses per LSOA were sampled as in previous studies response rates tend to be lower in the capital.

In terms of how successful these methods were, we compare our sample values to our targets of the eligible voting population in the table below. For the demographic variables, we have targets of the eligible voting population that we derive from specially commissioned bespoke tables from the 2021 Census (England and Wales) and the 2022 Census (Scotland). We describe our

[2] House of Commons Library, Brexit: Votes by Constituency, based on estimates by Dr Chris Hanretty https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/parliament-and-elections/elections-elections/brexit-votes-by-constituency/

eligibility criteria further in Section H. For turnout and voting, we use data from the House of Commons Library.

Target values of our estimate of the voting eligible population			
		Targets	Sample
Degree*Age	Missing	2.6	2.6
	18-24 Degree	2.5	1.7
	18-24 No degree	6.9	3.9
	25-34 Degree	7.5	9.1
	25-34 No degree	8.0	6.7
	35-44 Degree	7.1	9.1
	35-44 No degree	7.9	6.3
	45-54 Degree	6.3	6.5
	45-54 No degree	10.3	7.0
	55-64 Degree	5.3	7.5
	55-64 No degree	11.3	8.7
	65-74	13.3	16.3
	75+	11.0	14.8
Region	East Midlands	7.5	7.7
	East of England	9.7	9.0
	London	11.8	11.8
	North East	4.3	4.9
	North West	11.6	12.1
	Scotland	8.8	10.8
	South East	14.2	12.7
	South West	9.2	8.8
	Wales	5.0	5.2
	West Midlands	9.2	8.5
	Yorkshire & Humberside	8.6	8.5

Gender	Missing	1.1	1.1
	Male	47.9	45.3
	Female	51.0	53.6
Turnout	Did not vote	42.0	27.7
	Voted	57.2	71.4
	Missing	0.8	0.8
Results	Labour	34.6	43.7
	Conservatives	24.4	19.9
	Liberal Democrats	12.6	10.9
	Scottish National Party	2.6	3.7
	Plaid Cymru	0.7	1.1
	Green Party	6.9	7.2
	Reform UK	14.7	10.8
	Other	3.6	2.6

The two largest areas of differences between our targets are turnout and vote. Turnout is regularly overestimated in social science surveys, and this level of overestimation is consistent with previous British Election Study post-election surveys. In terms of vote choice, we have a slight over sample of Labour vote due to an unknown combination of differential non-response and misreporting.

10. Were any of the following excluded from the sample frame? Mark all that apply.

[ ] Specific regions of the country
[X] Institutionalized persons
[ ] Military personnel
[X] Other, please specify: We excluded the speakers seat (Chorley). These accounted for 0.16 percent of the electorate in the 2024 UK General Election. Based on the British Election Study results file, the full electorate was 46,889,232 and there was an electorate of 74,801 people in Chorley.

Perrett, S., Scott, R., Griffiths, J., Prosser, C., Bailey, J., Evans, G., Fieldhouse, E., Green, J., Mellon, J., (2025). 2024 BES Constituency Results with Census and Candidate Data. University of Manchester. Dataset. https://doi.org/10.48420/28430672.v1

For each group that was excluded, please provide additional details about the exclusion (for instance, the regions excluded), why the exclusion, and what percent of the total

eligible population was excluded from the sample frame in each instance. Please also indicate the total percentage of the eligible population excluded from the sample frame.

11. Please describe in detail how the sample for the study was selected from the sampling frame.

For multi-stage samples, please sure to list all sampling stages, and describe the sampling units and selection methods at each stage. Furthermore, please describe how individual respondents were identified and selected in the final stage. If the survey is part of a panel study, please describe not just the current wave but also the original sample. For telephone samples, please indicate whether the sample was a random digit dial (RDD) sample, listed sample, or dual frame sample. For surveys conducted by mail, indicate whether a listed sample.

Selection of individuals

Face-to-face interviews

For the face-to-face survey, an interviewer at each address established the number of dwellings, households, and eligible participants (i.e., people aged 18 or over who were eligible to vote in a general election). At each stage, if more than one dwelling/households/eligible individuals were found, interviewers conducted a random selected. Each dwelling/household/eligible individual were listed into an Electronic Contact Sheet and one was chosen at random through an electronic Kish Grid. Once a selection was completed, interviewers were only allowed to interview the selected individual, or revising the selected dwelling/household.

Push-to-web interviews

In some cases, addresses where a respondent was selected during the initial stages of face-to-face interviewing did not result in an interview and were issued to a push-to-web follow-up. In these cases, where a name was available, the selected individual was invited by name to complete the online survey. Where this selection process had not been completed, or if a full name was not available, an unnamed invitation was sent. Further details on sampling for the push-to-web survey are provided in the next section.

Due to the nature of push-to-web surveys, it is impractical to assess the number of dwellings and households at an address. It was therefore assumed that, for unnamed sample invited to complete the push-to-web survey, addresses contained only one dwelling and one household. In reality,

this would affect a very small number of cases: 0.6% of face-to-face interviews were conducted at addresses with more than one dwelling, and 2.9% at addresses with more than one household.

For the unnamed sample element of the push-to-web survey, we implemented a random approach selection. Where there were multiple eligible people in a household, we invited the person with the next birthday to complete the survey. This approach randomises the selection to a degree, however, we cannot guarantee the instruction is followed by households. Additionally, where named invitations were sent, we cannot guarantee that the named person completed the survey.

Push-to-web sampling

When face-to-face fieldwork finished, a selection of addresses where interviews had not been achieved were invited to an online self-completion push-to-web survey. Addresses which were recorded as 'soft refusals', 'addresses not found' and all 'non-contacts' during the face-to-face fieldwork were included in the push-to-web sample. Addresses coded as 'hard refusals', where the interviewer advised they should not be recontacted, as well as ineligible addresses ('deadwood') were excluded.

Three mailings were sent during the push-to-web phase of this research. These are detailed in Appendix C. 4,157 addresses were included as part of the initial push-to-web invite sample. A top-up of 307 addresses was then as more face-to-face fieldwork closed. In total, there were 4,464 addresses in the push-to-web sample: 3,899 in England, 343 in Scotland, and 222 in Wales.

In the first mailing, 422 addresses who had already completed the face-to-face survey were erroneously invited to complete the push-to-web survey. This was rectified in the second mailing and figures are not included in the counts above. Where a push-to-web survey was completed at such addresses, all data were deleted – except if a participant completed the CSES element of the push-to-web survey if they had not done so after the initial face-to-face interview. In total, 80 cases were deleted, with data from 14 CSES surveys retained.

12. Were probability-based methods used for all stages of the selection process? That is, units were randomly selected throughout the process, including at initial recruitment (if a panel).

[X] Yes
[ ] No

If no, please describe all instances where non-probability methods were used and provide a justification for each as to why random selection was not used.

13. Did your sampling design make use of one or more of the following techniques? Please mark all that apply.

[X] Stratification
[X] Cluster sampling
[ ] Quota sampling
[ ] Interviewing more than one respondent from a single household
[ ] Respondent or household substitution
[ ] Non-sample replacement methods

Definitions:

- Stratification involves the division of the population into groups according to certain characteristics (for instance by demographic characteristics). Random selection then occurs within each of the groups that result to ensure their adequate inclusion.
- Cluster sampling divides the population into groups and then uses random selection to include some of the groups but not others. For example, a cluster sample might divide a large country into geographic areas and then select only some of the areas while excluding others, to avoid the need (and cost) of interviewer travel to all areas.
- In quota sampling, a respondent is sometimes selected based on demographic characteristics, rather than randomly, to ensure certain target distributions are met.
- Substitution is replacing one sampling unit with another when the first sampled unit is difficult to reach and/or interview.

Section D1. Interviewing Mode(s)

14. Please indicate the mode(s) of interviewing for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared. Mark all that apply.

[X] Interviewer-administered: In person (sometimes called face-to-face)
[ ] Interviewer-administered: Video
[ ] Interviewer-administered: Telephone
[X] Self-completion: Paper (by mail, supplement, etc.)
[X] Self-completion: Internet
[ ] Other, please specify: _____

Section D2. Interviewing Mode(s): Mixed-Mode

15. If the survey in which the CSES Module appeared was mixed-mode (that is, made use of more than one mode type)…

Was the mixed-mode design intended to address a particular problem or problems?

[X] Yes
[ ] No

If yes, please elaborate: The mixed-mode design was intended to improve response rates. Response rates have generally declined seen since the pandemic, where few random probability surveys have transitioned back to a face-to-face methodology and those that have struggle to reach their previous response rates.

One reason for these is changing public attitudes with respondents appearing more reluctant to letting interviewers in their home. This is evidenced by looking across the BES data series, where there has been an increase in the proportion of the sample who refuse to participate before being screened; in 2024 this accounted for 28.5% of the sample, which is an increase from 20.0% in 2019 and 15.3% in 2017. The self-completion push-to-web follow-up was introduced this wave to address this.

Were all modes available to respondents from the beginning, or was there a mode progression (that is, if the respondent did not respond by one mode, another mode was subsequently offered to them)? If the latter, please describe the mode progression.

For the main survey, there was a mode progression. First, respondents were invited to complete the study face-to-face. Second, when face-to-face fieldwork finished, a selection of addresses where interviews had not been achieved were invited to an online self-completion push-to-web survey. Addresses which were recorded as ‘soft refusals’, ‘addresses not found’ and all ‘non-contacts’ during the face-to-face fieldwork were included in the push-to-web sample. Addresses coded as ‘hard refusals’, where the interviewer advised they should not be recontacted, as well as ineligible addresses (‘deadwood’) were excluded.

During the period in which face-to-face interviewing took place, participants were offered the chance to complete CSES as a postal or online follow-up survey. The CSES module was then also integrated into the push-to-web survey as an additional module which would be completed immediately.

Were individuals assigned a mode after recruitment or was this part of the recruitment?

[X] Assigned a mode after recruitment
[ ] Assigned a mode as part of the recruitment

Did respondents self-select the mode by which they would respond?

[X] Yes
[ ] No

Did the design include a mode change *within* interviews (e.g., selected self-completion elements within the same questionnaire)?

[X] Yes
[ ] No

If yes, please provide details: The main fieldwork was conducted in-person for most respondents, whereas the CSES questions were included in the self-completion mail back survey. Respondents had the option of completing this section of the survey either via the internet or a mail-back paper questionnaire.

If there were substantial differences in the distribution of key demographics across modes, please note them here.
There were no substantial differences in gender.
Those who completed the CSES by paper were more likely to be aged 65 and above (72.8) than those who completed the CSES via the push-to-web section (15.2) or the online follow-up (29.5).

Section D3. Interviewing Mode(s): Telephone

16. If the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared was entirely or partly conducted by telephone…

What is the estimated percentage of households without a phone? _____ %

Were unlisted telephone numbers included in the population sampled?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

If no, what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

Section D4. Interviewing Mode(s): Internet

17. If the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared was entirely or partly conducted via the Internet…

What is the estimated percentage of households without access to the Internet (that is, the percent of the eligible population excluded due to lack of Internet access)? _____ %

We do not have accurate information on the percentage of the eligible population that lack internet access. According to Clark et al. (2023) from the House of Commons Library, "Ofcom's 2023 Technology Tracker estimates that 7% of UK households did not have internet access at home."

This estimate will be different from the number for our eligible population because our sample only includes Great Britain rather than the United Kingdom (i.e. England, Scotland, and Wales, but not Northern Ireland), and our eligible population includes those over 18 who are eligible to vote, rather than all households.

Clark,A. Baker, C., and Carthew, H., 2023. Access to broadband. House of Commons Library [Research Briefing]. Available at https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cdp-2023-0176/

Were provisions taken to include members of the population without access to the Internet?

[X] Yes
[ ] No

If "Yes", please explain: We provided a paper and pen interview (PAPI) that respondents could mail back.

If "No", what percent of the total eligible population did this exclude from the sample frame? _____ %

Did the survey make use of an access panel (i.e. respondents were selected from a group of pre-screened panelists)?

[ ] Yes
[X] No

If yes, please describe the access panel (company, population [does it include persons without initial access to the Internet and how are they interviewed], method of recruiting members, total size of access panel, method of selecting survey respondents from the panel):

Did respondents self-select into the survey, at any stage?

[ ] Yes
[X] No

If yes, please explain:

Section E. Respondent Persuasion

18. What was the average number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample (not just for survey completions)?
During the face-to-face stage the average number of visits was 4.8 per household (including ineligibles and refusals). For CSES, the average number of email contacts was 2.1 per respondent, and the average number of letter reminders sent was 1.9 per respondent.

19. What was the maximum number of contact attempts made per household, for the entire sample (not just for survey completions)?
During the face-to-face stage the maximum number of visits at one household was 29 attempts. Respondents who agreed to complete CSES received a maximum of 3 reminders.

20. Did respondents receive incentive payments? Please mark all that apply.

[ ] Yes, during the screening process

[X] Yes, in advance of their interview

For the online approach, we offered an unconditional incentive of £5 to participants aged 18-24 before they completed the online CSES questions to encourage participation among hard-to-reach groups.

[X] Yes, after their interview

Respondents aged 25+ received £5 after they finished the CSES component. All respondents were given a conditional incentive after completing the face-to-face interview: all respondents aged 18-34 were give a £25 incentive Respondents aged 35+ in London were given a £20 incentive, and respondents aged 18-34 outside London a £10 incentive. Respondents who did not complete the core face-to-face survey but completed the core survey online were given a higher conditional incentive (£5 higher for each group). This group of respondents were given an additional £5 for completing the CSES module within the online survey. The incentive was again increased by £5 for each group if they completed the core survey, and if they completed the CSES module after a reminder was issued.

[ ] No

21. Were special efforts made to persuade respondents who were reluctant to be interviewed?

[X] Yes – For the face-to-face element, interviewers were asked to complete a six-stage call-pattern before marking an address as a non-contact. Unsuccessful sample was reissued to different interviewers, and the incentive was increased by £5. At the end of fieldwork, any unsuccessful addresses (that were not marked as hard refusals) were sent a postal invite asking them to complete the survey online. This followed a 3-stage mailing process where the incentive was increased again.

[ ] No

Section F: Interview/Survey Verification

22. Was interview/survey verification used?

[X] Yes

[ ] No

If yes, please indicate the percent of completed surveys that were verified: 12%

If yes, please describe the method(s) used for verification:

Back-checks were conducted by head of office by re-contacting participants who completed the survey by telephone. They verified that the correct household member completed the survey and re-asked a selection of questions to compare their answers matched their survey responses.

Definition: Interview/survey verification is the process of verifying that an interview was conducted and that the survey was administered to the correct respondent, for quality control purposes.

23. What steps, if any, were taken to ensure that respondents were providing truthful answers to the questions? Were any respondents remove from the final dataset (e.g. due to speeding, satisficing, completing multiple surveys, etc.)? Please provide details.

~

Researchers completed data validation checks across the data set. This included looking at any anomalies in the length of the survey, checking for only one response per address, verifying they answered the correct questions and identifying any evidence of satisficing. No responses were removed due to this.

Specifically on the paper survey, 6 returned questionnaires were rejected because the substantial parts of the survey had been left uncompleted. The paper survey was also checked to ensure all answer were logically consistent and make decisions where there were inconsistencies (e.g. two answers being given).

Section G1. Response Rate

Notes to collaborators:

- If multiple modes of interviewing were used for the post-election survey in which the CSES Module appeared, please repeat the following questions as appropriate for each mode used.
- Standard definitions for the below items, as well as a helpful response rate calculator, can be accessed on the website of the American Association for Public Opinion Research at: https://www.aapor.org/Communications/AAPOR-Journals/Standard-Definitions.aspx

24. For each of the following categories, please indicate the number of cases/records from the sample that fall into each. (If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study, please report the numbers for the first wave of the study, even if the CSES Module did not appear in that wave.)

Interviews	
I. Completed interviews	I = 1628
P. Partial interviews	P = N/A
Non-interviews	
R. Refusals and break-offs	R = _____
NC. Non-Contact	NC = _____
O. Other	O = _____
Unknown Eligibility	
UH. Unknown if household/occupied household unit	UH = _____
UO. Unknown, other	UO = _____

25. Please calculate the response rate (RR2) by inserting the answers from Question 24 into the following formula.

$$RR2 = \frac{(I + P)}{(I + P) + (R + NC + O) + (UH + UO)}$$

Response rate of CSES compared to total number of addresses issued in the sample, excluding households that are definitely ineligible: 22.8%

Response rate of CSES compared to total number of addresses issued in the sample, excluding households that are definitely ineligible and have unknown eligibility: 39.1%
Response rate of CSES of those who completed the main survey: 52.7%

26. If the number of cases with unknown eligibility (UH and/or UO in Question 24) is greater than zero, please estimate what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible. Please indicate the basis, evidence, and any scientific justification for this estimate.

96.5%

Section G2. Response Rate: Panel Studies

27. If the CSES Module appeared in a panel study… N/A

How many waves were conducted prior to the wave that included the CSES Module?

What was the response rate at the initial recruitment stage? Please show your calculations.

What percent of recruited respondents participated in the first wave of the study? Please show your calculations.

What was the total panel attrition between the first wave of the study and the wave that included the CSES Module? Please show your calculations.

If there were substantial differences in the distribution of key demographics (for example, age, gender, education, etc.) between the first wave of the study and the wave that included CSES, please note them here.

Please provide the number of completed interviews for the wave that included the CSES Module.

Section H. Post-Survey Adjustment Weights

28. Are weights included in the data file?
[X] Yes
[ ] No

If No, please explain why no weights are provided:

If Yes, please describe in detail: their construction, what they correct for, and how their use makes the survey dataset more representative of the population.

The 2024 BES Face-to-Face Post-Election Survey dataset includes two important survey weights: wt_demog, which adjusts for key demographic characteristics, and wt_vote, which further calibrates the sample to vote shares, as reported by the House of Commons Library, and our estimates of turnout among the voting eligible population. These weights have been

developed using bespoke census tables from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and National Records of Scotland (NRS). The enhanced population benchmarks allow for more precise demographic alignment between the survey sample and the 2024 Voting Eligible Population in England, Scotland, and Wales.

More specifically, we use official population data from the 2021 Census for England and Wales and the 2022 Census for Scotland to construct demographic weighting targets. These census datasets provide authoritative benchmarks for the following demographic variables: age, sex, region and education. In addition, we commissioned datasets from each census to estimate the voting eligible population among relevant demographic subgroups: country of birth (UK or British Crown Dependencies; Ireland; Commonwealth countries or British Overseas Territories; rest of world) by age by highest level of qualification (binary Level 4 qualifications or above) by bespoke passport held (UK or Ireland or Commonwealth countries or British Overseas Territories; Other passport; No passport held) across England, Wales, Scotland, as well as Government Office Regions, for all usual residents aged 18 or over in households.

The content of these tables ensures consistent weighting estimates can be obtained given differences in variable definitions and classification schemes across the ONS and NRS. We then use these harmonised census margins to weight the BES respondents via a post-stratification procedure, ensuring that the achieved sample accurately reflects the demographic composition of the voting eligible population in England, Scotland, and Wales in 2024. We apply standard quality controls, including the inspection of weight distributions and the trimming of extreme weights to maintain statistical efficiency.

We make the following assumptions regarding an individual's eligibility to have voted in the 2024 general election: those born in the UK, Crown Dependencies, or Ireland, are assumed to be eligible to vote regardless of their passport status. People born in Commonwealth countries are included if they hold a UK, Irish, or Commonwealth passport, or if they have no passport (for example, because their passport has expired), but not if they only hold another (non-Commonwealth) passport. Those born elsewhere in the world are classed as eligible only if they have a UK, Irish, or Commonwealth passport.

29. Were any other steps taken to mitigate the impact of non-response in the dataset? If so, how do the adjustments affect the survey results? N/A

Section I. Translation

Notes to collaborators…

- As part of your deposit, please provide the original questionnaire(s) in each language used.
- For questionnaires in a language other than English, if a back-translation to English happens to be available, we would appreciate receiving the back-translation, also.
- The below questions on translation are adapted from those developed for the ISSP.

30. Was the questionnaire translated?

[ ] Yes, translated by member(s) of research team
[ ] Yes, by translation bureau

[ ] Yes, by specially trained translator(s)
[X] No, not translated

31. Please list all languages used for the fielded module.
English

32. If the questionnaire was translated, was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated? Please mark all that apply.
[ ] Yes, a group worked together on it and reconciled their differences through discussion
[ ] Yes, an expert checked it
[ ] Yes, by back translation
[ ] Other; please specify: _____
[ ] No
[X] Not applicable

33. If the questionnaire was translated, was the questionnaire pre-tested?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[X] Not applicable

34. If the questionnaire was translated, were there any questions which caused problems when translating?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[X] Not applicable

35. If the questionnaire was translated, please provide a list of all questions which caused problems when translating. For each question listed, describe what problems were encountered and how they were solved:

Section J. Other

36. Please list any additional advice you have for analysts about how the survey should be used, and any remaining special considerations in that regard.