

The 2000 Canadian Election Survey

Technical Documentation

The 2000 Canadian Election Survey

Technical Documentation

David A. Northrup

Institute for Social Research
York University
January 2003

Conditions of Release

All research based upon these data must include an acknowledgement such as the following:

Data from the 2000 Canadian Election Survey were provided by the Institute for Social Research, York University. The survey was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), and was completed for the 2000 Canadian Election Team of André Blais (Université de Montréal), Elisabeth Gidengil (McGill University), Richard Nadeau (Université de Montréal) and Neil Nevitte (University of Toronto). Neither the Institute for Social Research, the SSHRC, nor the Canadian Election Survey Team are responsible for the analyses and interpretations presented here.

Researchers are requested to forward a copy of any publications or scholarly papers to the Director, Institute for Social Research, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Ontario, M3J 1P3 and to André Blais, Département de Politique Science, Université de Montréal, CP6128 Succ. Centreville, Montréal, H3C 3J7.

Data acquired from the Institute for Social Research may not be re-disseminated outside the recipient institution.

Table of Contents

Conditions of Release	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	iv
1. Study Description	1
1.1 Introduction	1
2. Sample Design	3
2.1 Introduction	3
2.2 Selection of Households	3
2.3 Selection of Respondents	4
2.4 Household Weights for the CES Survey	4
2.5 Provincial Sample Distribution	7
2.6 National Estimates	8
2.7 Daily Sample Distribution for the Campaign-Period	9
2.8 Post-Election and Mailback Samples	10
3. Data Collection	13
3.1 Introduction	13
3.2 Data Collection Procedures: Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys	13
3.3 Response Rate: Campaign-Period Survey	15
3.4 Re-Interview Rate: Post-Election Survey	17
3.5 Data Collection Procedures: Mailback Survey	18
4. Questionnaire Issues and Data Processing	19
4.1 Introduction	19
4.2 Date Specific Questions	19
4.3 Randomization of Question Order and Question Wording	20
4.31 Order Experiments in the Campaign-Period Questionnaire	20
4.32 Random Assignment to Different Versions of the “Same” Question in the CPS	22
4.33 Order Experiments in the Post-Election Questionnaire	23
4.34 Random Assignment to Different Versions of the “Same” Question in the PES	23

4.4	Province Specific Questions	25
4.5	Coding of Open-Ended Questions and "Other Specify" Options	25
4.51	Open Ended Questions	25
4.52	Other Specifies	28
4.6	Response Time Measurement	29
4.7	Linking Respondents from Three Surveys and the WAVE and RTYPE Variable	29
5	Additional Components of the 2000 CPS	31
5.1	The Media Study	31
5.2	The Ontario Election Study (OES) Supplement	31
	References	32

List of Tables

2.1	Calculation of Household Weights for the CES Survey (CESHHWGT)	6
2.2	Sample Distribution and Calculation of the Provincial Weight Variable (CESPWGT)	8
2.3	Completions Per Day: 2000 Campaign-Period Survey	11
3.1	Number of Call Attempts: Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys	13
3.2	Final Sample Disposition: 2000 Campaign-Period Survey	16
3.3	Completed Interviews, Response Rates, and Re-Interview Rates by Province: Campaign-Period, Post-Election, and Mailback Surveys	17

1. STUDY DESCRIPTION

1.1 Introduction

As was the case for the 1988, 1993 and 1997 Canadian Election Survey (CES), the 2000 CES included three survey components. The election writ was dropped on Sunday October 22 and the Campaign-Period Survey (CPS) started on Tuesday Oct 24th and continued until the last day of the campaign--November 26. Data was collected for 34 days, however the first day of calling did not include any cases from the province of Quebec. Of those respondents who completed the CPS, almost 80 percent also participated in the Post-Election Survey (PES). The PES commenced the day after the November 27th election and continued for 15 weeks, with the exception of about a week around Christmas. (The date of completion for all CPS and PES interviews is included in the data set.). Respondents were normally sent the Mailback Survey (MBS), one to two weeks after completing the PES. The MBS was completed by 53 percent of the PES respondents (or 42 percent of the CPS respondents).

A rolling cross sectional sample release was employed for the campaign-period survey. The sample selection methodology used in the 1997 Canadian Election Survey was similar to that used in previous Canadian Election Studies. Modified random digit dialling (RDD) procedures were utilized to select households, and, within households, the birthday selection method was used to select respondents.

Interviewing in all provinces, except Quebec, was completed at the Institute's centralized telephone facilities in Toronto. In Quebec interviewing was completed by Jolicoeur & Associés. While both ISR and Jolicoeur use Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) techniques, different software packages are used at the two firms. Having the Quebec interviews completed by Jolicoeur allowed for a larger sample to be used than would have been possible if ISR had completed all of the interviewing. (Both the ISR and the CES research team presumed the election would be called in 2001 which resulted in limits to the number of interviewing stations the ISR could allocate to the CES.) Considerable effort was made to ensure that the flow of the questionnaire was the same at both survey houses. Different designs and utilities in the CATI software packages between the ISR and Jolicoeur, as well as differences in standard operating which became evident only after data collection was well under way, has

resulted in less information about the survey procedures for the data collected in Quebec. So, for instance, only the data completed at ISR includes variables such as interview length, number of call attempts and so on. The difference in the availability of these variables is not an indication of any differences in survey procedures. The selection of respondents, number of call attempts, the response rates, the distribution of the sample through the campaign, the timing of the PES and MBS (as well as the questionnaires) were either exactly the same (sample selection and questionnaire) or very similar (call patterns and response rates) at the two survey houses.

Easy-to-read copies of the questionnaire accompany this documentation. Complete copies of the CATI surveys are available at ISR upon request. (Contact Anne Oram at ISR oram@yorku.ca.) An explanation of the way in which CATI was used in the survey is included in Section 4 of this documentation.

2. SAMPLE DESIGN

2.1 Introduction

The sample for the Canadian Election Survey (CES) was designed to represent the adult population of Canada: Canadian citizens 18 years of age or older who speak one of Canada's official languages, English or French, and reside in private homes¹ in the ten Canadian provinces (thus excluding the territories). Because the survey was conducted by telephone, the small proportion of households in Canada without telephones were excluded from the sample population.²

2.2 Selection of Households

To select individual survey respondents, a two-stage probability selection process was utilized. The first stage involved the selection of households by randomly selecting telephone numbers. The ideal sampling frame for the campaign-period survey would have been a complete listing of all residential telephone numbers in Canada. Unfortunately, such a listing does not exist. To select numbers ISR employs a modified form of random digit dialling (RDD).

All telephone numbers in Canada consist of an area code, a “central office code” or exchange (the first three digits of the telephone number), and a suffix or “bank” (the last four digits of the number). A list of most telephone numbers in Canada can be constructed from CD-ROM versions of telephone books and other commercially available lists of telephone numbers. Numbers from these sources, as well as telephone numbers between or on either side of listed numbers are included in the sampling frame. For example, if the following two telephone numbers were found in a directory, (416) 651-8513 (416) 651-8518, then all numbers from (416) 651-8510 to (416) 651-8519 would be included in the sample. A computer would then generate a random sample of telephone numbers from this list. Since unlisted numbers and numbers too new to be

¹ Interviews were not completed with respondents who could not speak English well enough to complete the survey and residents of old age homes, group homes, educational and penal institutions were excluded from the sample.

² Using their Household Inventory and Facilities and Equipment (HIFE) surveys, Statistics Canada estimates that two percent of the private households in Canada do not have a telephone (1997, Catalogue 52-203).

included in the directory are interspersed among valid numbers, this strategy provides a much better sample than one based on listed numbers alone.

As well as household telephone numbers, RDD samples include "not-in-service" and "non-residential" telephone numbers. Typically, non-household numbers are identified the first time the interviewer calls. Most of the interviewer's subsequent efforts are then directed at encouraging an informant from the household to provide information about the number of adults living in the home, and after randomly selecting a respondent, completing the interview.

2.3 Selection of Respondents

The second stage of the sample selection process was the random selection of a respondent from the selected household. To be eligible for the interview the household member had to be an adult (18 years of age or older) and a Canadian citizen. If there was more than one eligible person in the household, the person with the next birthday was selected as the survey respondent.³ The birthday selection method is used as it ensures a random selection of respondents and is a much less intrusive way to begin an interview than more traditional methods that require the interviewer to obtain a list of all adult household residents. This less intrusive approach makes it easier for the interviewer to secure the respondent's cooperation.

2.4 Household Weights for the CES Survey

The probability of an adult member of the household being selected for an interview varies inversely with the number of people living in that household. In a household with only one adult, this person has a 100 percent chance of selection, in a two adult household each adult has a 50 percent chance of selection, and so on. Analyses based on unweighted estimates are therefore biased: members of one adult households are over-represented, and larger households are under-represented. Most practitioners of survey research "weight the data" in order to compensate for the unequal probabilities of selection (one adult households are given a weight

³ See O'Rourke and Blair, 1983; for a review of the birthday selection method.

of one, two adult households are given a weight of two, three adult households are given a weight of three, etc.).⁴

Conventionally, most users of survey data wish to have the same number of observations in the weighted and unweighted data set.⁵ This adjustment is made by determining the number of cases in each household size category that would have been in the sample, if an interview had been completed with each adult member of the household, and then dividing the sample among each household size category according to the proportion of interviews completed in each household size category.

In the campaign-period survey there are 3,651 households in the sample and 1,091 are one-adult households, 1,965 are two-adult households, and 417 are three-adult households, etc. (Table 2.1 and variable `NADULTS` in the data set). The weights for each household are calculated as follows. First, the total number of weighted cases is calculated (number of cases times the number of adults in the household). For three-adult households the calculation is: 417 times 3 which gives 1,251 three-adult households in the weighted sample. In the campaign-period survey there are 7,057 weighted cases. Second, the 7,057 weighted cases are adjusted down to the original sample size of 3,651 (calculated as weighted cases for each household size divided by the weighted sample size times the original sample size). For three-adult households the calculation is: $(1,251/7,057) * 3,651 = 647.22$. Third, the weight for each household size is calculated (by dividing the adjustment to original sample size by the number of cases). For three-adult households the calculation is: $647.22/417 = 1.5521$.

⁴ Weighting to correct for unequal probabilities of selection, stratification, and other factors in order to improve sample estimates is common in survey research. See, for example: Lessler and Kalsbeek, 1992 Chapter 8; Kalton, 1983 Chapter 10; and Babbie, 1992 Chapter 5. Kish, 1965; specifically addresses the issue of weighting to correct for unequal probability of selection at the household level (p. 400) and suggests, unlike most survey researchers, that household weighting may not be necessary.

⁵ While such weights are common they do not include a downward adjustment in sample size to compensate for design effects. Another option used by some researchers is to “weight up” to the population.

Table 2.1 Calculation of Household Weights for the CES Survey (CESHHWGT)

HH Size	No. of HH's	Weighted Cases	Adjustment	Weight
1 adult	1,091	1,091	564.44	0.5174
2 adults	1,965	3,930	2,033.22	1.0347
3 adults	417	1,251	647.22	1.5521
4 adults	133	532	275.23	2.0694
5 adults	31	155	80.19	2.5868
6 adults	7	42	21.73	3.1042
7 adults	4	28	14.49	3.6215
9 adults*	2	18	9.31	4.6562
10 adults	1	10	5.17	5.1736
Totals	3,651	7,057	3,651.00	

* There were no 8 adult households in the sample

Note that in the calculation of the household weights the total number of observations in the sample—the “weighted sample size”—is based on the original sample size, but we do not have a true random sample and there is no accounting for sample design effects. Weighting in this manner, so that the weighted sample size is equal to the actual number of interviews, provides researchers with a good approximation of the precision of their sample. But, treating the sample as if it was a simple random sample of equal size results in *incorrect* estimates of standard errors and, of course, incorrect significance tests. Worse, the errors are *downwardly* biased and so give a false sense of the precision of estimates as well as significance tests with too many false positives.

Researchers should consider the use of a statistical package that takes proper account of weights (such as STATA) or the use of procedures in other packages that treat these data appropriately (e.g., UNIANOVA in SPSS) when analysing the data.

2.5 Provincial Sample Distribution

The distribution of the sample among the provinces is detailed in Table 2.2. Note that the smaller Atlantic provinces are over-represented in the data set. For example, Newfoundland has 1.71 percent of the households in the country, but 3.97 percent of the households in the sample. Conversely, larger provinces such as Ontario and BC are under-represented in the data set. Quebec is a special case; it is a large province like Ontario, but like the smaller Atlantic provinces it is also over-represented in the data set as Quebec has 26 percent of the households in the population but 34 percent of the households in the sample.

One of the aims of the CES was to understand regional/provincial dynamics in the 2000 campaign, and it was anticipated that the campaign in Quebec would be central to the overall outcome, thus more, rather than fewer, sample cases were allocated to Quebec. Furthermore, the fact that Quebec voters were offered a different choice set (only in Quebec did voters have the option of voting for the Bloc Québécois) means that separate analyses of voting behaviour must be performed inside and outside Quebec.

Because the sample distribution is not proportional to the population (pps) of the provinces, the data must be weighted before national estimates are derived. (No province weight is required for analysis of a specific province or for comparisons between provinces.) Weights are obtained by dividing the proportion of households in the province by the proportion of the households in the sample for that province. Ontario has the largest weight, 1.3435, as it has 36 percent of Canada's households, but only 27 percent of the sample. In preparing national estimates, each Ontario case counts for 1.3435 observations in the weighted data set; in other words, Ontario cases are “weighted up” so that the impact of the Ontario sample on national estimates is an accurate reflection of Ontario's proportion of the total number of households in Canada. Conversely, provinces where the weights are small, for example PEI (.3228), are those in which the proportion of the sample allocated to the province considerably exceeds the province's proportion of the national population. Such cases are “weighted down.” Caveats about the effect of weighting on the variance estimates noted above apply here as well.

2.6 National Estimates

In order to produce national estimates it is advisable to correct for both the unequal probabilities of selection at the household stage and the unequal probabilities of selection based on province of residence. CESNWGT (National Weight) is the product of the household weight and the provincial weight and should be used with the National Sample when national estimates are required. ROCNWGT allows for “national” estimates excluding the province of Quebec. This weight combines a household weight and provincial weight, calculated for the provinces, excluding Quebec. An Atlantic Province weight and Western Province weight have also been added to the data set and should be used if the analyst wants to examine either of these regions separately.

Table 2.2 Sample Distribution and Calculation of the Provincial Weight Variable (CESPWGT)

Province	# of HHs*	% of HHs	# HHs Sample	%HHs Sample	Weight
Nfld	185,495	1.71	145	3.97	0.4305
PEI	47,960	0.44	50	1.37	0.3228
Nova Scotia	342,590	3.16	138	3.78	0.8354
NB	271,155	2.50	144	3.94	0.6336
Quebec	2,882,030	26.56	1,251	34.26	0.7752
Ontario	3,924,515	36.17	983	26.92	1.3435
Manitoba	419,385	3.87	118	3.23	1.1960
Saskatchewan	372,820	3.44	116	3.18	1.0815
Alberta	979,175	9.02	325	8.90	1.0138
BC	1,424,640	13.13	381	10.44	1.2583
Totals	10,849,765	100.00	3,651	100.00	

* Statistics Canada, 1997. Dwellings and Households: The Nation. Ministry of Industry, Science and Technology, Catalogue No. 93-111, pp 78-89.

Although the weights are provided as part of the data set, users must specify the weights they wish to use in the appropriate programming language before analysing the data. If weights are not invoked the tabulations produced will be for unweighted data. Because the weights include

fractions that are rounded and missing values vary by item, there will be minor variations in the number of cases for different analytical procedures and subsets of the data.

2.7 Daily Sample Distribution for the Campaign-Period Survey

The importance of campaign dynamics in understanding election results has been documented by a number of researchers (André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte, 2002; Blais et al. Forthcoming; Nevitte, Blais, Gidengil, and Nadeau, 2000; Holbrook, 1996; Blais and Boyer, 1996; Johnston, Blais, Gidengil, and Nevitte, 1996; Johnston, Blais, Brady and Crête, 1992; Bartels, 1988; and Brady and Johnston, 1987). By interviewing a cross section of Canadians each day (and including date of interview as a variable in the data set), it is possible to determine the impact of events during a campaign. Using data from the election survey, the analyst can determine if support for specific policy issues, predictions of the results of the election, or ratings of the Prime Minister or the opposition leaders varied, or remained constant, over the course of the election campaign. Similarly, utilization of a rolling cross section sample release facilitates division of the campaign-period data sets into temporal components. For example, analysts can divide the campaign-period data into before and after the leaders' debates.

It is critical to any analysis which includes date of interview as a continuous or contingent variable, that the sociodemographic characteristics of the survey respondents do not systematically vary over time. Because easy-to-reach respondents (people who are more often home and willing to do the interview when first contacted) have different characteristics than hard-to-reach respondents (Durand, Blais, and Vachon, 2002; Groves, 1989; Hawkins, 1975; and Dunkleberg and Day, 1973), it is important that each day of interviewing includes a mix of easy and hard-to-reach people.

Assume, for example, that educational achievement is found to covary with attitudes about a specific election issue such as the importance of creating jobs. If more of the interviews at the beginning of data collection were completed with respondents with lower levels of education (and if they were more supportive of job creation efforts as compared to paying down the debt), and if more of the interviews at the end of data collection were completed with respondents with high levels of education (and they were less supportive of job creation efforts), it would be possible to mistake a change in respondent characteristics for a change in attitudes.

Given the small sample for any one day, the daily variation in the number of completed interviews is expected. However, as seen in Table 2.3, this variation is less pronounced when the number of completed interviews is averaged over a three or five day period.

Each day of sample release was, within provinces, divided into six "sample replicates." Each sample replicate was a random sample of the day's release. Because response to the survey varied by the day of the week (Friday evenings were often least productive while Sunday afternoons were often most productive), and the sample size for any one day was small, there was some modification to the number of replicates released to ensure the number of completions was close to the desired daily goal.

2.8 Post-Election and Mailback Samples

The sample for the post-election survey was comprised of respondents to the CPS. At the end of the CPS, interviewers ensured that they had a first name or some other identifier (such as the respondent's initials or position in the household, e.g., mother). This information, as well as the sex and year of birth of the CPS respondent, and the respondent's telephone number, was recorded on a "cover sheet." At the start of the PES, the cover sheets were put into a random order (shuffled) so that the time of the first call for the PES was not related to the date of interview, or the day of sample release during the CPS.

At the end of the post-election survey, respondents were asked to provide their address so they could be sent the mailback survey. Mailback information was provided by 79 percent of the PES respondents.

Table 2.3 Completions Per Day: 2000 Campaign-Period Survey

Day	Completions	3 Day Average	5 Day Average
Oct. 24	21	--	--
25	48	38	--
26	44	55	49
27	72	58	62
28	59	72	73
29	86	82	82
30	102	93	88
31	91	98	103
Nov. 1	101	109	108
2	135	116	107
3	113	114	105
4	93	97	109
5	85	99	109
6	119	112	113
7	133	129	116
8	134	125	119
9	109	115	116
10	102	105	110
11	103	102	107
12	101	109	111
13	122	116	114
14	125	122	118
15	119	122	120
16	121	118	116
17	113	112	107
18	103	99	110
19	80	105	113
20	131	117	121
21	140	140	129
22	150	145	142
23	144	147	142
24	146	140	149
25	130	151	--
26	176	--	--

Separate weights were not prepared for the PES and MBS data sets. The re-interview rates are reasonably high and sample attrition between the surveys was not associated with household size or province.

3. DATA COLLECTION

3.1 Introduction

A description of the data collection procedures is outlined in this section of the technical documentation. Supervisors monitored (listened to) about 10 percent of interviewers' calls to verify that the interviewers were reading questions and recording answers correctly.

3.2 Data Collection Procedures: Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys

In order to maximize the chances of getting a completed interview from each sample number, call attempts were made during the day and the evening - for both week and weekend days. Typically, between two and four call attempts were made each day (split between day and evening hours) during the first four days that a sample was released. The same call pattern was used by both survey firms. Although over half of the interviews completed in the CPS took three or fewer call attempts, 10 percent of the completed interviews required ten or more calls (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1. Number of Call Attempts: Campaign-Period and Post-Election Surveys*

Calls	CPS		PES	
	number	percent	number	percent
1	498	21	325	17
2	515	22	310	16
3	367	15	206	11
4	262	11	167	9
5	184	8	132	7
6 to 9	393	16	348	18
10 to 14	155	6	225	11
15 or more	26	1	206	11
Totals	2,400	100	1,919	100

* excludes all Quebec interviews and interviews completed over two or more calls.

The rolling cross section aspect of the sample release required intensive efforts over a short period of time (10 days). The relationship between the number of call attempts and completed interviews in the 2000 election survey is very similar to the previous three election studies completed at ISR (1988, 1993 and 1997). The survey data files and accompanying documentation for these studies are also available from ISR.

With respect to data collection, the aim of the PES survey was to complete as many of the reinterviews as quickly as possible after the November 27th election. Reinterviewing commenced on November 28 and about 60 percent of the PES interviews were completed in the following three and one-half weeks before Christmas. Interviewing resumed in early January (the 5th) but it took an additional five plus weeks to February 12th to complete the data collection for the PES.

On average it took more call attempts to complete an interview for the PES than it did for the CPS. Twenty-two percent of the PES interviews were completed on the 10th or subsequent call, while only seven percent of the CPS interviews required this number of calls. Unlike the CPS however, the calls in the PES were spread out over a much longer time period. The high number of call attempts in the 2000 survey is about the same as that required for the 1997 survey. Both the 1993 and 1988 survey required fewer call attempts. The additional effort required to achieve acceptable response rates mirrors the trend in declining response rates reported by a number of American survey research experts (see, for example, Dillman, 2000; Smith, 1995; and *Survey Research*, 1998 and 1999 (volumes 29 through 31)).

The variables CPSATEMP and PESATEMP identify the number of calls required to obtain a completion.

In order to maximize response rates, respondents and/or households who refused to participate when initially contacted by the interviewer were called a second time in both surveys. In the CPS, refusal conversion attempts had to be made within the 10 day calling period, whereas in the PES the conversion attempts were typically made two or three weeks after the initial refusal. It is not surprising, therefore, that interviewers had more success in converting refusals in the PES (17 percent success rate) than in the CPS (8 percent). Converted refusals represent about four percent of the completions in each survey. The conversion rate was a couple of percentage points lower in 2000 than in 1997, which in turn is one or two points below what they were in 1993 (12 and

24 percent for the CPS and PES respectively). The variables CPSREFUS and PESREFUS identify whether the interview was a "standard" completion or a "converted" refusal.

The careful attention to the number and timing of callbacks and refusal conversions is designed to increase the response rate, thereby improving sample representativeness. Many researchers have found that respondents who are "hard-to-reach" and those who "refused" have characteristics that are somewhat different from typical survey responders (Claire Durand, André Blais, and Sébastien Vachon. 2002. "Accounting for Biases in Election Surveys: The Case of the 1998 Quebec Election." *Journal of Official Statistics* 18: 25-44; Dunkelberg and Day, 1973; and Fitzgerald and Fuller).

3.3 Response Rate: Campaign-Period Survey

There are numerous ways to calculate response rates in survey research (Dillman, 2000; Smith, 1995; Groves, 1989; and Groves and Lyberg, 1988). The method used in this project was conservative; most other ways of calculating the response rate would produce inflated values. The response rate was defined as the number of completed interviews divided by the estimated number of eligible households times 100 percent.

Details on the calculation of the response rate are as follows. Of the 7,913 telephone numbers included in the sample, 5,777 were identified as being eligible households (completions [n=3,651] + refusals [n=1,743] + callbacks [n=383], see Table 3.2). Not eligible households (respondent was unable to speak English or French, was not physically or mentally healthy enough to complete the interview, was not a Canadian citizen, etc. [n=746], and nonresidential and not in service numbers [n=995]) accounted for 1,741 of the telephone numbers. It was not possible to determine the eligibility status for 395 of the sample telephone numbers. For response rate calculations, it was assumed that the proportion of these 395 numbers which were eligible household numbers was the same as it was in the rest of the sample.

This proportion, or "household eligibility rate" was .73 (eligibles [5,777]/(eligibles [5,777] + not eligibles [1,741]) = .73). The estimated total number of eligibles was then computed as 6,081 (5,777 + [.73 x 395] = 6,081). Dividing the number of completions (3,651) by the estimated number of eligibles (6,081) gives a final response rate of 60 percent.

Many organizations would not include "eligibility not determined" numbers in the denominator for the response rate calculations on the argument that few of these numbers would be eligible households. (See: Groves and Lyberg, 1988 for a debate on this issue.) This version of the response rate, sometimes called a completion rate, calculated as completions/known eligibles is 63 percent (3,651/5,777). Other organizations calculate response rates as the number of completions over the number of completions plus refusals. This version of the response rate, which is sometimes known as the participation rate, is 68 percent (3,651/3,651+1,743). The response rate to the 2000 survey is the same as in 1997, but about four points lower than 1993.

Table 3.2 Final Sample Disposition: 2000 Campaign-Period Survey

Results	number	percent
completions	3,651	46
refusals	1,743	22
callbacks	383	5
ill/aged/language problem/ absent/not a citizen	746	9
not-in-service & nonresidential	995	13
eligibility not determined	395	5
total	7,913	100
household eligibility rate	-	.73
estimated number of eligibles	6,081	-
response rate	-	60

The variation in the response rate by province that was found in previous CPSS is also evident in the 2000 survey. The rates tend to be higher in the Atlantic and Prairie provinces and lower in the more urban provinces of Ontario and BC (Table 3.3). In 2000, unlike earlier CPS surveys, the response rate in Quebec was higher than the average for the rest of the country. Calling respondents in Quebec from Montreal (where Jolicoeur is located), rather than from Toronto likely accounts for some of this increase in response rate for the CPS component of the 2000 CES.

Table 3.3 Completed Interviews, Response Rates, and Re-Interview Rates by Province: Campaign-Period, Post-Election, and Mailback Surveys

Province	Campaign-Period		Post-Election		Mailback	
	Interviews (#)	Response Rate (%)	Interviews (#)	Re-Interview Rate (%)	Interviews (#)	Re-Interview Rate (%)
Nfld	145	66	106	73	68	64
PEI	50	71	41	82	23	56
Nova Scotia	138	59	113	82	67	59
NB	144	71	111	77	65	59
Quebec	1,251	63	941	75	457	49
Ontario	983	56	774	79	417	54
Manitoba	118	56	97	82	52	54
Sask.	116	60	101	87	59	58
Alberta	325	63	273	84	154	56
BC	381	56	303	80	155	51
Total	3,651	60	2,860	78	1,517	53

3.4 Re-Interview Rate: Post-Election Survey

The reinterview rate for the 2000 PES was 78 percent (which is about the same as 1997 (80 percent) and 1988 (81 percent) but less than the response rate in 1993 (88 percent)). There was small variation in response in reinterview rates by province, but the pattern was not the same as for the CPS. In general, the reinterview rates were higher in the west and somewhat lower, or closer to the average, in most of the rest of the country. The response rate in Quebec for the PES was lower than most of the other provinces.

Non-response to the PES was primarily accounted for by refusals and callbacks (respondents to the CPS who did not refuse the PES interview but were never home or always busy each time an interviewer called at a previously agreed upon time). About three-quarters of the non-response to the PES, was accounted for by refusals and callbacks. Illness or death of CPS respondents, never answered telephones (typically 15 or more calls), and changes in telephone numbers (PES respondents had their number changed and the new number was unlisted; the number was

changed and the new number (which was listed by the telephone company) reached the wrong household; respondent left the household and those remaining in the household either could not or would not provide a new number) account for the remaining non-response to the PES.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures: Mailback Survey

At the end of the PES, respondents were asked if they would be willing to provide an address so that a mailback questionnaire could be sent to them. A fifth of the PES respondents declined to provide an address and could not be included in the MBS component of the CES. The 79 percent of PES respondents who provided a mailing address received up to five contacts encouraging them to complete and return the questionnaire. The first contact included the questionnaire, a covering letter, and a postage-paid pre-addressed return envelope. The second was a reminder/thank you card (physically like an over-sized post card). The first and second mail contacts were sent to all respondents. The mailings were staggered and sent every week at the start of the PES calling and somewhat less often near the end of calling. A second questionnaire (covering letter and return envelope) and reminder card were sent only to non-responders and typically were mailed about three weeks after the first reminder card. Finally, telephone calls were made to all non-responders.

In the end, just over half (53 percent) the respondents to the PES returned the MBS and this represents about 42 percent of the CPS respondents. Again there was limited variation in the return rate. Quebec PES respondents were least likely to return the MBS and respondents in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan were most likely. In comparison to previous CES the response rate for PES respondents completing the mail back continues to decline from a high of 72 percent in 1988 and 66 percent in 1993 and 1997.

4. QUESTIONNAIRE ISSUES AND DATA PROCESSING

4.1 Introduction

With CATI, interviewers read questions from a computer screen and enter answers directly into a file for processing. CATI software allows questions to be date stamped so they are asked on set days. CATI also allows systematic variation in the order in which respondents receive questions, and variation in the wording of questions. CATI code, while relatively easy to follow is cumbersome and requires considerable space as each question, no matter how small, (almost always) requires a separate screen (a page in CATI language). In addition, because Jolicoeur and ISR do not use the same CATI software there are two CATI versions of both the CPS and PES questionnaires. To facilitate use of the data, easy-to-read copies of the CPS and PES questionnaire (as well as an exact copy of the MBS) are provided with this documentation. In the easy-to-read versions of the questionnaire, CATI code has been replaced with a description of how the questionnaire was delivered to respondents. Copies of the CATI surveys used by ISR (which also include the French wording) are available upon request (contact Anne Oram oram@yorku.ca).

Note that most variables in the Campaign-Period Survey include the prefix CPS. The prefixes PES and MBS are used to indicate that the variable is from the post-election, and mailback survey (respectively).

4.2 Date Specific Questions

In the CPS questions about the French and English television debates were asked after November 8th and 9th respectively. A frequency count for the CPS respondents will produce missing data for all respondents interviewed before these dates. (As indicated earlier, the date of each interview, for both telephone surveys, is included in the data set (CPSDATE and PESDATE)).

As the party platforms/leaders views became more defined, two attitudinal questions were added to the CPS survey. The first was added on November 1st and referred to the Alliance Party leader Stockwell Day's statement, that higher taxes in Canada had produced a brain drain to the US (see item CPSL21). The NDP statement that tougher sentences would not reduce crime was central to a question asked first (and each day after) on November 7th (CPSL22).

4.3 Randomization of Question Order and Question Wording

The logical operators resident in CATI were used to randomize the order in which respondents received items in several sections of the questionnaire. Given that order effects have been identified in surveys, but are not always easy to predict (Schuman and Presser, 1981), the order randomization was designed primarily as a precautionary measure to limit the impact question order had on overall response. CATI was also used to vary the wording questions. The importance of the way in which issues are framed in question wording has been recognized by survey researchers (Converse and Presser, 1986; and Schuman and Presser, 1981).

The software used at ISR makes it easy for users of the data to determine what effect, if any, the random order and variation in question wording had on response. This is more difficult to do with the software used by Jolicoeur. As a result, the randomization described in the following sections refer only to the data collected outside of Quebec. To examine the effect of randomization, the user must work with a subset of the data and run cross tabulations for the questions of interest by the random number variables (in the data set as *CPSRNX* or *PESRNX*, where *X* is the specific random number). The random numbers were created before interviewing commenced and were added to the data set as part of the sample record (along with telephone number, ID number, etc.). The range and value of each random number (i.e., a range of 2 with values 1 and 2, each of which was used about one-half of the time; or a range of 3 with values of 1, 2 and 3 with each used one-third of the time, etc.) can be determined by running a frequency count on the random number, as each random number is a variable in the data set.

4.31 Order Experiments in the Campaign-Period Questionnaire

A: Randomization of the Party Leader Ratings

Respondents in Quebec were asked to rate all five main party leaders on a 0 to 100 scale and respondents in the rest of the country were asked to rate all of the leaders except Gilles Duceppe of the Bloc Québécois. As in previous versions of the CPS, the order in which a respondent was asked to rate the leaders was randomized. Each case was randomly assigned a five digit string of numbers (see variables *CPSRNL1* to *CPSRNL5*). CATI searched for the first digit of the five digit string and then followed the code as constructed. For example, if the first digit was a 3 the

respondent was asked about McDonough first (see variable *CPSRNL3*). CATI then worked through the code and checked the value of the second number in the string next. If the number was 1 the respondent was asked about Clark, if 2 it was Chrétien, if 4 Day and if 5 (and living in Quebec) Duceppe..

In Quebec each respondent received one of 120 possible orders for the party leader ratings (the product of $5*4*3*2*1$) and in the rest of the country there were 24 different sequences ($4*3*2*1$) for the four leader ratings questions. Given the small number of respondents receiving each of the possible sequences of questions the randomization is precautionary. Nevertheless, by using the five leader order variables (*CPSRNL1* to *CPSRNL5*) and the actual ratings (*CLARK*, *CHRETIEN*, etc.) and the user can actually determine if order affected response. By selecting only the responses for when *CPSRNL1* was 1 will give the scores for when *CLARK* was rated first, *CPSRNL2* when *CLARK* was second, etc.

Note that in the leader ratings, survey respondents who volunteered that they knew nothing about any of the leaders, when asked for a rating for the first or subsequent leader were not asked to rate the remaining leaders.

B: Randomization of Party Ratings

As was the case for the ratings of party leaders, the 0-100 ratings for the parties were randomized. Again there were 24 orders for respondents outside of Quebec, who were not asked to rate the Bloc Québécois, and 120 orders for respondents from Quebec, who were asked to rate all five of the federal parties. The order in which the parties were rated was controlled by the variables *CPSRNP1* to *CPSRNP5*. As with the party leader ratings, respondents who volunteered that they did not know anything about any of the parties were skipped out of the section.

C: Each Party's Chance of Winning in Respondent's Riding

Again the same form of randomization--sequence of questions-- was used for questions tapping respondents' perceptions of the various parties' chances of winning in their constituencies. See

variables CPSNPR1 to CPSNPR5. Respondents who volunteered that they knew nothing about the chance of any party in their riding were not asked the chances of the other parties.

D: Spending on Social Programs, Cutting Taxes or Reducing the Debt

Respondents were given three choices on how they would spend the deficit and asked for their first and second priority. Their choices were: 1, improving social programs, 2, cutting taxes and 3, reducing the deficit. When CPSRN4 was 1, the order in which the choices were read to respondents was as above. When CPSRN4 was 2 the order was taxes, deficit, social programs. For the third variate, when CPSRN4 was 3, the order was deficit, social programs, taxes.

4.32 Random Assignment to Different Versions of the “Same” Question in the CPS

A: Federal Party Identification

There were two versions of the party identification question. In the first version (see CPSLK1A when CPSRN1 was 1) respondents were asked: in federal politics, do you think of yourself as a Liberal, Alliance, Conservative, NDP, or *none of these*. (In Quebec the Bloc Québécois was added to the list.) In the second version (see CPSLK1B) respondents were read the following version of the question: “Generally speaking, in federal politics, do you think of yourself as a Liberal, Alliance, Conservative, NDP or *do you usually not think of yourself as not having a general preference.*” (The Bloc was included for respondents from Quebec).

4.33 Order Experiments in the Post-Election Questionnaire

A: Parties and Party Leaders

The randomization used in the CPS was repeated in the PES for the ratings of parties and party leaders. The same type of CATI code was utilized, see variables PESRNP1 to PESRNPS and PESRNL1 to PESRNL5.

B: Power of Business and Unions

As in the 1997 PES respondents were asked about the amount of power unions (PESD2) and business (PESD3) should have (“much more, somewhat more, about the same as now, somewhat less or much less”). Half of the respondents were asked about unions first and business second (when PESRN6 was 1) and half were asked the questions in the opposite order (PESRN6 was 2).

C: Spending Cuts

Respondents were asked the extent to which they would cut spending (“a lot, some, or not at all”) for seven different areas. When PESRN8 was 1 the order was defence (PESD1A), welfare (PESD1B), pensions and old age security (PESD1C), health care (PESD1D), Employment Insurance (PESD1E), education (PESD1F), foreign aid (PESD1G). When PESRN8 was 2 the order was welfare, pensions and old age security, health care, Employment Insurance, education, foreign aid, and defence. When it was 3, the first item was pensions and old age security and the last was welfare, etc. The spending cuts randomization matches an order experiment used in the 1997 PES.

4.34 Random Assignment to Different Versions of the “Same” Question in the PES

A: Charging Patients for Visits

The extent to which there was support or opposition to letting doctors charge patients a fee for an office visit was investigated. There were two versions of the questions and respondents were asked about visits with a \$10 charge when CPSRN1 was 1 and a \$20 charge when it was 2.

B: Division of Powers between Federal and Provincial Governments.

Respondents were assigned to one of two versions of this set of questions. The first set, when PESRN2 was 1, asked about the power of provincial governments (should *Provincial* Governments have more power, less power or about the same as now -- PESE1A). Respondents were also asked where they thought each of the Federal parties stood on the issue of the amount of power that should reside with the provincial governments (PESE2B to PESE6B). The second set of questions asked respondents (when PESRN2 was 2) if the *Federal* Government should have more, less or about the same power as now (PESE1B) and then where the respondent thought each of the federal parties stood on the issue (PESE2B to PESE6B).

C: Referendums

There were two versions of the referendum question (PESG4A and PESG4B). The first asked respondents the extent they supported referendums on *important* issues and the second on *controversial* issues. When PESRN3 was 1 respondents were delivered the importance version of the question and when it was 2 the controversial version of the question.

D: Representation in the House

When PESRN4 was 1 respondents were asked how serious a problem they thought the under representation of women was in the House of Commons (PESG7A). Then they were asked a follow up question to determine if they favoured or opposed requiring parties to have an equal number of women and men (PESG7B). The remaining half of the survey respondents (when PESRN4 was 2) were asked about the under representation of racial minorities (PES7C) and requiring parties to have more racial minority members (PESG7D).

E: Federal/Provincial Comparison in terms of Who Looks After the Average Person's Interest

There were two versions of the question asking if the respondent's provincial government or the federal government did the best job looking after their interest (PESE7A and PESE7B). The second version of the question (PESE7B) included the response option "or is there not much difference."

The version of the question assigned to respondents was determined by PESRN5: when it was 1 the respondent was read version A and when it was 2 version B. This experiment is similar to one was conducted in 1997.

4.4 Province Specific Questions

A number of survey questions were province specific. For example, when asked to rate leaders or parties, respondents outside of Quebec were not asked about Gilles Duceppe and the Bloc Québécois. Some questions were asked only of respondents from Quebec. For example, CPSF10J rating the job the Liberal government has done in “defending the interest of Quebec” was only asked of Quebec respondents. (See also CPSJ1L, PESK18 etc.) Both the easy-to-read version of the questionnaire and the variable label in the data set indicate when a question was asked of only a subset of respondents.

4.5 Coding of Open-Ended Questions and "Other Specify" Options

4.51 Open Ended Questions

A: Most Important Issue (CPS and PES Questionnaires)

The first question in both the campaign-period (CPSA1) and post-election (PESA1) interviews was open-ended and asked respondents to identify the issue which was most important to them personally in the election. Almost all respondents provided a single response. If a respondent provided more than one response, that could not be coded into a single category, the first response was coded (unless it was not codeable and then the second response was used). The same set of codes (listed below) was used to code both the CPS and PES responses. The list of categories used is extensive and the number of observations in some categories are quite small. However, the use of a large number of categories makes it easier for the analyst to recode the responses into a smaller set of broader categories. An attempt was made, when possible, to use categories developed for the 1993 and even more so, the 1997 Canadian Election Study.

Coding Categories for "Most Important Issue" Questions

JOBS AND EMPLOYMENT

- 10 need/create jobs; reduce unemployment
- 11 jobs for youth
- 12 want/need job security (includes things like keeping fisheries open)
- 13 lack of jobs in the east (fishing, farming, logging, mining)
- 14 need more job training, re-training
- 15 concentrate: jobs/unemployment
- 16 education/health education
- 17 local issues

FINANCIAL CONCERNS

- 20 general mention (debt, deficit, etc.)
- 21 debt - continue to reduce/control/balance
- 22 debt - eliminate
- 23 deficit - continue to reduce/control /balance
- 24 deficit - eliminate
- 25 continue fiscal policy/restraints
- 26 balance the budget

ECONOMIC CONCERNS

- 30 general mention: reform the economy
- 31 cost of living/inflation, low dollar
- 32 keep interest rates down
- 33 improve economy/bring prosperity
- 34 strengthen/stimulate the economy
- 35 economy/budget and jobs
- 36 need to stabilize the economy

HIGH COST OF GOV'T SPENDING

- 40 general negative: Lie/screw us around spend our \$
- 41 nothing/not really sure/not much
- 42 was by default no choice

- 46 to try to keep their promises
- 47 early election call/no point to this election/one sided election
- 48 to beat other parties
- 49 to change/get new ideas

TAXES

- 50 general mention: taxes
- 51 abolish GST taxes
- 52 cut GST taxes
- 53 keep taxes down
- 54 jobs and taxes both mentioned
- 55 fairer taxation
- 56 other policy issues

SOCIAL PROGRAMMES

- 57 general mention of health care
- 58 continue the cutbacks
- 59 maintain health care/more health care \$
- 60 protect social programs & services
- 61 protect old age pensions/security
- 62 protect child care/family benefits
- 63 jobs and social programmes
- 64 jobs and health care (both)
- 65 health care and budget (both)
- 66 deficit and health care (both)
- 68 elderly, care of
- 69 health care concern: general

MORAL ISSUES

- 70 to help Canadians
- 71 crime/violence/gun control
- 72 to deal with poverty
- 73 abortion
- 74 rights: aboriginal/other groups
- 75 environment
- 76 moral decline

UNITY/QUEBEC ISSUES

- 80 Quebec sovereignty
- 81 general mention of National Unity
- 82 maintain National Unity
- 83 stop Quebec independence
- 84 unity and economy
- 87 unity and health concerns

OTHER

- 98 don't know, not codeable, other
- 99 refused

REPRESENTATION ISSUES

- 90 to carry on governing
- 91 honesty, fair & accountable gov't
- 92 to form a majority government
- 95 to beat the Liberals/Chretien
- 96 to govern the country

B: Size of the Federal Deficit

In the CPS respondents were asked if they knew the size of the federal deficit (CPSC9). As with the “most important issue” questions, interviewers typed in the respondents’ answers and these responses were coded and added to the data set. For the deficit question most of the responses were coded as a number of billions. So, a response of 10 billion was coded as a 10. All answers in millions were coded as less than one billion and vague answers such as a few or several billion were coded as 996. Unspecified answers such as in the billions were coded as 997. Most respondents could not provide an answer (about 70 percent) and were assigned a don’t know (dk) code.

C: Main Reason for Not Voting

Most respondents, in the PES reported that they had voted. The 17 percent (or 479 respondents) who did not vote were asked, in an open ended question, why they did not vote (PESA2A). The answers were coded into eight categories and the value labels for these categories are mostly self explanatory. Code 1 (did not know who to vote for/what the issues were) and code 6 (not interested in the election or the issues) are similar. To the extent possible code 1 included respondents who seemed to express some interest but felt they did not have enough knowledge whereas code 6 indicated the respondents did not care about the election or the issues. There

is good reason to assume this distinction is fuzzy and it may be sensible to combine these categories.

Codes 3 (could not physically make it to the poll), 4 (did not know where to vote) and 8 (not registered) suggest a more structural reason for not voting. Code 7 (did not like the candidates/they are all the same) and code 5 (vote does not make a difference) suggests voter cynicism and code 2 (no time, forgot to vote) may, in a less direct way, also suggest a lack of faith in the role of elections and party politics in Canada.

D: If not on Voters List: Why not try to get Name on List

Respondents who indicated they did not receive a voter information card (PESM2) were asked if they tried to get their name on the list (PESM3) and those who answered negatively (224 respondents) were asked an open ended question about why they did not try to do so (PESM4). About one-tenth of the respondents answered they knew they could vote without being on the list (code 1) and another 10 percent (code 4) said they thought they were on the list (even though they did not receive a card). The most common responses were: that they did not bother because they knew they would not be voting (code 2); and they knew they would not have time to vote (code 3) so they saw no point in making the effort to get on the list.

4.52 Other Specifies

In a number of items, particularly questions about political parties, and in the demographics, interviewers had the option of writing in an “other specify” response. The information provided by interviewers was reviewed and placed into existing categories when appropriate and additional categories were added when appropriate. Observations that remain in the other category in the final data set normally are few in number, or cover such a wide range of possible options that it was not sensible to create specific codes.

4.6 Response Time Measurement

Research has explored the relationship between the length of time it takes a respondent to answer a question and how firmly committed they are to their answer (Bassili, 1996; Bassili, 1993; and Bassili and Fletcher, 1991). The questionnaire was programmed, using the clock resident in the CATI system, to measure how long it took respondents to answer a number of questions. The length of time, in hundredths of a second, was stored in a separate variable. Response-time measurement was used for the vote intention question (CPSK1A). A clock time was set when the respondents started the section (CPSTIME1), after they answered the first vote intention question, (CPSTIME2) and at the end of the section (CPSTIME3).

4.7 Linking Respondents from Three Surveys and the WAVE and RTYPE Variables

Considerable effort was made to ensure, within each household, that the same person completed each survey. For example, in the post-election survey, interviewers were provided with the first name, initial, or other identifier (mother, only male in household, etc.) of the respondent who completed the campaign-period survey as well as their sex and year of birth. However, in comparing the name (or identifier), sex, and year of birth for respondents across the surveys, it is possible to isolate cases where there are differences in sex, age, or name (identifier). There are 16 cases where we have reason to be concerned that the same respondent did not answer the surveys. These cases are identified as probable good links in the variable RLINK.

If there was an interest in examining those 1,517 respondents who completed all three surveys, the analyst would select for value 111 of the variable WAVE. A value of 100 in the WAVE variable identifies those 791 respondents who completed only the CPS, and a value of 110 identifies respondents who completed both telephone surveys, but not the mailback.

Questions were survey specific. A frequency tabulation (marginal) for an item from the mail-back survey will include valid cases only for the 1,517 respondents who completed the MBS. A "missing values/system missing" code will be assigned to respondents who were part of the Canadian Election Survey but did not complete the MBS. An alternative to including the missing cases is to specify that only a subset of the data is to be used in the analysis. A series of RTYPE variables have

been created. The variable `RTYPE3` for example, identifies respondents to the mailback survey (and `RTYPE1` and `RTYPE2` identify Campaign-Period and Post-Election survey respondents respectively).

5 ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS OF THE 2000 CPS

5.1 The Media Study

In April 2001 in Toronto three groups of approximately 20 respondents each participated in the media study by rating the national news coverage during the election. Each group met for about seven hours and were shown clips of the news on a large screen. The clips, 138 in total, covered every day from October 22, 2000 to November 26 (except November 11) and each clip focused on one of the parties. For each news clip, the respondents were asked if the story was: “very good, quite good, neither good nor bad, quite bad or very bad for the party” that was the main focus of the news clip. In recruiting participants for the media study an attempt was made to ensure that supporters of each of the parties were represented in the study. Respondents were given an honorarium of \$200 for participating. The respondents’ ratings have been entered into a data set which includes the respondent’s ID number. A similar study with two groups of approximately 20 respondents was conducted in Montreal. For further information on the Media Study contact a member of CES team.

5.2 The Ontario Election Study (OES) Supplement

Respondents to the CPS survey were called in May and June of 2001 and asked to complete a short telephone survey. Just over 57 percent of the Ontario respondents (567 of 983) completed the interview. Respondents to the OES were re-asked the ratings of party leaders and parties (in the same order as they were asked in the CPS) as well as the federal party identification questions. In addition, respondents were asked their occupation and if they knew any one in several different occupational categories. For further information on the Ontario Election Study contact a member of CES team.

REFERENCES

- Babbie, Earl. 1992. *The Practice of Survey Research* (6th Edition). Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Bartels, Larry M. 1988. *Presidential Primaries and the Dynamics of Public Choice*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bassili, John N. 1993. "Response Latency versus Certainty." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 57 (1) 54-61.
- Bassili, John N. 1996. "The How and Why of Response Latency Measurement in Surveys." In: *Answering Questions*, eds., Norbert Schwarz and Seymour Sudman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bassili, John N. and Joseph F. Fletcher. 1991. "Response-Time Measurement in Surveys." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 55 (3) 331-346.
- Blais, André, Elisabeth Gidengil, Richard Nadeau, and Neil Nevitte. 2002. *Anatomy of a Liberal Victory: Making Sense of the Vote in the 200 Canadian Election*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Forthcoming 2003. "Campaign Dynamics in the 2000 Canadian Election: How the Leader Debates Salvaged the Conservative Party" *Political Science and Politics*.
- Blais, André and Martin Boyer. 1996. "Assessing the Impact of Televised Debates: The Case of the 1988 Canadian Election." *British Journal of Political Science*, 26:143-164.
- Brady, Henry E. and Richard Johnston. 1987. "What's the Primary Message: Horse Race or Issue Journalism?" In Gary R. Orren and Nelson P. Polsby, eds., *The New Hampshire Primary and Nomination Politics*. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House.
- Converse, Jean M. And Stanley Presser. 1986. *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Beverley Hills: Sage
- Dillman, Don A. 2000. *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Dunkelberg, William C. and George S. Day. 1973. "Nonresponse Bias and Callbacks in Sample Surveys." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 10, 160-168.
- Durand, Claire, André Blais, and Sébastien Vachon. 2002. "Accounting for Biases in Election Surveys: The Case of the 1998 Quebec Election." *Journal of Official Statistics*, 18: 25-44.
- Fitzgerald, Robert and Linda Fuller. 1982. "I Hear You Knocking But You Can't Come In: The Effects of Reluctant Respondents and Refusers on Sample Survey Estimates." *Sociological Methods and Research*, 11 (1), 3-32.
- Groves, Robert M. and Lars E. Lyberg. 1988. "An Overview of Nonresponse Issues in Telephone Surveys." In *Telephone Survey Methodology*, Editors: Robert M. Groves, Paul P. Biemer, Lars E. Lyberg, James T. Massey, William L. Nicholls II and Joseph Waksberg. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 191-212.
- Groves, Robert M. 1989. *Survey Errors and Survey Costs*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hawkins, Darnell F. 1975. "Estimation of Nonresponse Bias." *Sociological Methods and Research*, 3 (4) 461-488.
- Holbrook, Thomas M. 1996. *Do Campaigns Matter?* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Johnston, Richard, André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. 1996. *The Challenge of Direct Democracy*. McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal.
- Johnston, Richard, André Blais, Henry E. Brady, and Jean Crête. 1992. *Letting the People Decide: Dynamics of a Canadian Election*. McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal.
- Kalton, Graham. 1983. *Introduction to Survey Sampling*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.
- Kish, Leslie. 1965. *Survey Sampling*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lessler, Judith T. and William D. Kalsbeek. 1992. *Nonsampling Errors in Surveys*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Nevitte, Neil, André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Richard Nadeau. 2000. *Unsteady State: The 1997 Canadian Federal Election*. Oxford, Toronto.

O'Rourke, D. and J. Blair. 1983. "Improving Random Respondent Selection in Telephone Surveys." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 428-432.

Schuman, Howard and Stanley Presser. 1981. *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys*. Orlando: Academic Press.

Smith, Tom W. 1995. "Trends in Non-Response Rates." *International Journal Of Public Opinion Research*, 7 (2), 157-70.

Survey Research Newsletter, 1998-1999.