
European Social Survey (2010)

Sampling for the European Social Survey Round V: Principles and Requirements

Mannheim, European Social Survey, GESIS

Guide

Final Version



The Sampling Expert Panel of the ESS

May 26, 2010

Summary: The objective of work package 3 is the “design and implementation of workable and equivalent sampling strategies in all participating countries”. This concept stands for random (probability) samples with estimates of comparable precision. From the statistical point of view, full coverage of the population, non-response reduction, and consideration of design effects are prerequisites for the comparability of unbiased or at least minimum biased estimates.

In the following we shortly want to

- describe the theoretical background for these requirements,
- show some examples, how the requirements can be kept in the practices of the individual countries and
- explain, which information the sampling expert panel needs from the National Co-ordinators to evaluate their proposed sampling schemes.

1 Basic principles for sampling in cross-cultural surveys

Kish (1994, p.173) provides the starting point of the sampling expert panel's work: "Sample designs may be chosen flexibly and there is no need for similarity of sample designs. Flexibility of choice is particularly advisable for multinational comparisons, because the sampling resources differ greatly between countries. All this flexibility assumes probability selection methods: known probabilities of selection for all population elements." Following this statement, an optimal sample design for cross-cultural surveys should consist of the best random practice used in each participating country. The choice of a specific design depends on the availability of frames, experience, and of course also the costs in different countries. If adequate estimators are chosen, the resulting values are comparable¹. This comparability has to be the goal of the sampling strategy and its implementation for the ESS.

2 Discussion of standards set in the Technical Annex / Specification for participating countries

Only random samples provide a theoretical basis which allows us to infer from the sample to the whole target population or sub-sets of it. As design based inference is one important goal in the project, probability samples are required. This, however, is related to other requirements:

- full coverage of the target population,
- high response rates (ESS: target minimum response rate: 70%),
- the same minimum effective sample sizes (completely responded units) in participating countries (ESS: 1,500 or 800 where population is smaller than two million inhabitants).

These requirements can only be sensibly discussed in the context of random samples. They form a theoretical system that in the end ensures equivalence. The crucial point, however, is that the practical implementation works.

2.1 Full coverage of the residential population

An important step in planning a survey is the definition of the population under study. In the case of the ESS it contains persons 15 years or older who are resident within private households, regardless of nationality and citizenship or language². This definition applies to all participating countries and thus every person with the defined characteristics should have a

¹To ensure comparability, design weights have to be computed for each country. For this, the relative selection probabilities of every sample member at each stage of selection must be known and recorded.

²In countries in which any minority language is spoken as a first language by 5% or more of the population, the questionnaire has to be translated into that language.

non-zero chance of being selected. Thus, the more completely the frame covers the persons belonging to the target population, the higher the quality of the sample. However, the quality of the frames – e.g. coverage, updating intervals and accessibility – may differ from country to country. Therefore, frames have to be evaluated carefully. The results of these evaluations have to be documented and taken into account when the data are analysed.

The following differences in frames can be expected:

- a) countries with reliable lists of residents that are available for social research such as Norway, Sweden, Denmark
- b) countries with reliable lists of the households/addresses that are available for social research such as Switzerland, Netherlands, U.K.
- c) countries without reliable and/or available lists such as Portugal or France

Drawing a sample is more complicated if no registers (lists) are available (group c). In this instance multi-stage designs are usually applied, in which the selection of municipalities forms the first stage and the selection of households within these municipalities the second stage. Because no sampling frames are available, the crucial problem is the selection of households. There are mainly two ways to go about this: The first is to list all addresses within a certain district of each selected community. The target households are then drawn from these lists. Arguably, it is possible to assess this procedure as one way of drawing a random sample, even if one which is fairly strongly clustered. Another way to find target households is the application of random route techniques. The question is to which extent random routes can be judged to be “strictly random”. In Lyberg’s view these techniques do result in non-probability samples (see evaluation of the IALS DATE). At the very least, the following questions have to be answered in order to minimise the interviewer’s influence on the selection of respondents:

- How are the rules for random routes defined in the countries?
- What experience do interviewers have with random walks?
- How can the whole random walk process be controlled?

An acceptable method might involve the interviewer doing the complete walk, recording the sampled addresses and transferring them to the survey office before he/she begins contacting any addresses.

Even in countries where reliable frames exist, we have to expect pitfalls in the sampling process. It is, for example, difficult to fully cover people with illegal status. Such systematic losses due to undercoverage cannot be ruled out in practice but must be documented carefully.

2.2 Response rates

Non-response is a second major issue for the representativeness of the target population in the sample. A carefully drawn gross sample from a perfect frame can be worthless if non-contacts and refusals lead to systematic biases. Therefore, it is of essential importance to plan and implement a sufficient number of contacts as well as appropriate field work strategies for the persuasion of the target persons to participate in the survey. However, the fixed goal of 70% response rate in the ESS is particularly challenging for some countries where response rates of 50 percent or even less are common (see Technical reports of prior rounds). Nevertheless, all efforts should be made to avoid non-response because it increases the danger of biased samples, and cell weighting is not such a global mean of “repairing” samples, as some authors argue (Häder and Gabler, 1997).

If any reliable information about the expected amount of non-response is available, it should be used in the sample design. If, for example, empirical evidence suggests that response rates in big cities are much lower than in rural areas, the gross sample size in big cities should be increased. If the gross sample size in a PSU is 10 on average, the overall expected response rate is 70% but only 40% in big cities, then the gross sample size of PSUs located in big cities should be $10 \cdot \left(\frac{.70}{.40}\right) = 17.5 \approx 18$.

To sum up, the transition process from the gross sample to the net sample is of great importance for the quality of the data collected. Comparability of estimates can be achieved only if the net samples are not seriously biased. Bias, however, is less likely if the response rates are fairly high and appropriate auxiliary data is collected to aid weighting.

2.3 Design Effects and Effective Sample Size

As already mentioned, a variety of complex sample designs such as multi-stage stratified and clustered sampling was used in rounds I to IV of the ESS and can also be expected to be used in round V. For determining the sample sizes, the design effects of the respective country have to be considered to ensure the comparability of estimates with respect to their confidence intervals. The design effect is defined as ratio of the variance of a variable under the actual sampling design to the variance computed under the assumption of simple random sampling. The problem is that design effects do not only vary from survey to survey because of different designs but also within one survey from item to item. “In general, for a well designed study, the design effect usually ranges from 1 to 3” (Shackman, 2001). It is essential that National Coordinators and the fieldwork organizations analyse the data from round I to IV to calculate appropriate intraclass correlation coefficients for the sample designs used in their countries. The cluster size of the selection units also influences the design effect. It should be chosen as small as possible because:

The larger the average cluster sizes are, the lower the effective sample size is and the more interviews have to be conducted to reach the minimum size of 1,500. In that sense, a large number of primary selection units should be the goal with only a few interviews in each.

Another important effect is that of departures from equal probability selection methods, which requires design weighting to correct for different inclusion probabilities. In particular, in countries where the only frames available are of households or addresses, design effects will be larger than in countries where frames of persons are available. This fact also has to be taken into account when computing the sample sizes.

NCs and sampling experts are asked to note that gross sample sizes may have to be larger than usual for similar national or international surveys in order to achieve an effective sample size of 1500. A sufficient budget therefore needs to be set aside to allow for this. In Round 4, for example, gross sample sizes from all but the smallest country ranged from 1600 to 6719. Please discuss this with your sampling expert at the earliest opportunity

3 Summary

Comparability in terms of sampling means that the national surveys must provide estimates of comparable precision of parameters of interest. These estimators must have minimal bias for the equivalent populations. The basic requirement to use probability samples together with the additional requirements discussed in this paper leads theoretically to comparable estimates. However, in the end data quality depends also on the implementation process, e.g. the practical applications. Therefore, this process has to be guided and monitored carefully.

4 Handling of the Workpackage

In round I to IV we worked with an expert panel on sampling. This panel will continue its work. Members are the following sampling specialists:

- Sabine Häder (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Germany)
- Siegfried Gabler (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Germany)
- Matthias Ganninger (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Germany)

- Seppo Laaksonen (University of Helsinki, Finland)
- Peter Lynn (University of Essex, U.K.)

Each of the experts will be assigned about six countries to liaise and support. However, the decision to “sign off” a design will be made together by the whole team.

As a starting point for the assessment of the sampling designs the sampling expert panel needs the information available from the tenders. The National Coordinators should ensure that the questions listed in paragraph 5 can be answered with the help of the tenders. That means that the survey organisations have to be informed by the NCs about these requirements in advance of handing in the tenders. Additionally, we ask the NCs to give their comments to the proposed designs, e.g. to evaluate them with the help of their experience. At least the following points should be treated:

- Is the proposed design good or best practice in the country concerned?
- Does the survey organisation have experience with the proposed design?
- Is the proposed response rate realistic?

If the information contained in the bidding and the additional comments by the National Coordinators is sufficient, the expert panel is enabled to “sign off” the proposals without delay. If the information is not sufficient, the respective expert will start a dialogue with the National Coordinator (and possibly the survey organisation involved) in order to clarify details or propose amendments. If necessary, other sampling specialists in the country will be joined in the discussion, so that their knowledge of local practices, arrangements and vocabulary can be drawn on. Similarly, where necessary, the panellist will visit the country to give help and support. These consultations will be conducted as efficiently as possible to give maximum time for the design to be implemented in good time according to the specification.

5 Information need to be contained in the tenders

Answers to the following questions concerning sampling should be given in the tenders from the survey organisations.

Description of the target population

- Are the ESS specifications of the sampling ‘universe’ adhered to (i.e. all residents aged 15+, regardless of nationality or citizenship, excluding only the homeless and the institutional population)?

Description of the sampling frame

- Is the quality of the proposed sampling frame suited to its proposed purpose (in terms of coverage, updating, access, etc)?

Detailed(!) description of the sample design

Please explain, if applicable, in detail how the following points are to be implemented in your sample design:

- How is the sample stratified?
- Is the design single- or multi-stage?
- Which stages are defined?
- How much clustering is proposed?
- Is there any oversampling due to expected amount of non-response?

Sample size

- How has the effective sample size been calculated, including estimates of response rates and design effects due to clustering or necessary weighting?³
- Will any population subgroups be over-sampled?
- What steps will be taken to achieve the target response rate?

The National Coordinators are responsible for inquiring the survey organisations about these points. As a result, the assigned sampling expert shall be enabled to fill in the following form (as an example see the form of Spain from round IV):

³For the computation see Appendix 1 of the Specification for participating countries of the ESS.

Sampling for the European Social Survey- Round IV

Country: Spain
NC: Mariano Torcal (mariano.torcal@upf.edu)
Sampling design: Anna Cuxart (anna.cuxart@upf.edu) and Clara Riba (clara.riba@upf.edu)
Survey Institute: METROSCOPIA, Consuelo Perera Cabañas
Expert: Seppo Laaksonen (Seppo.Laaksonen@Helsinki.Fi)
Reference Survey: ESS Spain Round 3
Date:

| | |
|--|--|
| Target Population, Population coverage | Persons aged 15 years and over who are resident in private households in Spain, including the North-African cities of Ceuta and Melilla |
| Sampling frame | <p>The population census structured in census sections taken from the Continuous Census (Padrón Continuo), updated in January 2007 by the Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE, the Public Statistics Office of Spain).</p> <p>There are 34,600 census sections in Spain. Census sections are the most elementary framing units of eligible voters. The size of sections vary between 500 and 2,000 voters (18+ years old), being the average size of 1,300. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that although census sections are defined with regard to electoral processes, these are only used for establishing the boundaries of administrative units that are used for sample designs. Census sections do include all citizens registered in the municipal rolls, regardless of their voting rights.</p> |
| Problem | The frame includes all residents in private houses, yet being family or <u>collective</u> . This can result in a selection of approximately 0,1% individuals not included in the target population. |
| Sampling design | <p>Stratified Two-stage probability sampling.</p> <p>The strata will be obtained by crossing two population classification criteria: Autonomous Community of residence (18 regions) and size of habitat according to the target population (4 brackets). The four brackets of habitat are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• First: cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants of 15 and more• Second: cities between 50,001 and 100,000 inhabitants of 15 and more• Third: municipalities between 10,001 and 50,000 inhabitants of 15 and more• Fourth: municipalities with less than 10,001 inhabitants of 15 and more <p>64 of the 72 theoretical strata are not empty.</p> |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| | <p>Stage 1: Selection of PSUs proportionally to population of 15+ years old.</p> <p>Stage 2: Random selection of 6 or 7 individuals in each PSU selected in the previous stage (7 in the two first brackets and 6 in the rest).</p> |
| Improvement | In the 2008 sampling design the stratification brackets will be defined according to <u>the number of persons of the sampling population</u> in each city (that is, of 15 or more) not according to the total number of inhabitants as been used until now. |
| Remark 1 | This time two Spanish regions (Catalonia and Galicia) are interested in having a sample big enough to perform specific estimations. Both Autonomous governments will fund the extra-costs. As a result, an extra-sample has been designed for the corresponding strata and the total sample size is bigger than it could be. |
| Remark 2 | Not overrepresentation of any strata is applied this time. The analysis of the 2006 response rate did not reveal important differences among the strata. |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Design effects | $DEFF = DEFF_c = 1.126$ $DEFF_c = 1 + (3.722 - 1) * 0.046 = 1.126$ |
|----------------|---|

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Improvement | A more sound calculation of the mean intraclass correlation coefficient. A variety of 22 variables had been used (11 numerical and 11 ordinal and dummy variables) instead of the 11 variables (all numerical) used in 2006 sample design. |
|-------------|--|

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Planned over-sampling | In some regions where low response rates are expected a larger number of persons will be contacted. |
|-----------------------|---|

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Target response rate | 70% , although a safe estimation of 67% is handled for the calculation of the sample size. |
|----------------------|--|

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Sample size | <p>3,962</p> <p>The basic values for the estimation of the gross sample size are: valid cases (87%), mean response rate (67%) and design effect (1.126).</p> <p>The calculations are: Minimum effective sample size = 1,500 Net sample size = 1,500 · 1.126 = 1,689 Total valid cases = 1,689 / 0.67 = 2,521 Gross sample size = 2,521 / 0.87 = 2,898</p> <p>After the distribution of cases in sections the gross sample size became 2,897 Gross sample size including extra-samples for Catalonia and Galicia = 2,897 + 1,065 = 3,962</p> |
|-------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Special Features of the design | The sample design ensures equal probability of individual selection for all the individuals in the same stratum, but not among strata. |
| Remark | Two pre-test samples will be selected in Madrid and Barcelona with the same sampling design than the ordinary sample. In order to raise the specification of 50 completed interviews, 6 sections and 42 cases in each city will be selected. |

References

- HÄDER, S., AND S. GABLER (1997): *Eurobarometer - Measurements for opinions in Europe*chap. Deviations from the population and optimal weights, no. 2 in ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial. ZUMA.
- KISH, L. (1994): “Multipopulation Survey Designs: Five Types with Seven Shared Aspects,” *International Statistical Review*, 62, 167–186.
- LYBERG, L. (2000): *Measuring Adult Literacy*chap. Review of IALS – a commentary on the technical report. Office for National Statistics.
- SHACKMAN, G. (2001): “Sample size and design effect,” http://www.albany.edu/~areilly/albany_asa/confweb01/abstract/Download/shackman.pdf.

A Sampling issues in the “Specifications for participating countries” – Round 5 of the ESS

5.1 Population coverage

The survey will be representative of all persons aged 15 and over (no upper age limit) resident within private households in each country, regardless of their nationality, citizenship or language⁴. Potential under-coverage of certain groups, say because of language problems or sampling frame deficiencies, or for any other reason, must be discussed with the sampling panel prior to deciding on the final sampling method, so that the problem can be remedied if at all possible.

5.2 The sample

The sample is to be selected by strict random probability methods at every stage and respondents are to be interviewed face-to-face (see section 5.12). Where a sample frame of individuals is not available, countries may use a sample frame of households or of addresses. In these cases, procedures for selecting a household from a multi-household address (where appropriate), and an individual within a household will be specified and agreed in advance with the sampling panel. In any event, the relative selection probabilities of every sample member must be known and recorded, as should any remaining systematic non-coverage problems. Quota sampling is not permitted at any stage, nor is substitution of non-responding households or individuals (whether ‘refusals’ or ‘non-

⁴Please note that questionnaires are to be available in all languages spoken as a first language by 5 per cent or more of the population and interviewers must be available to administer them (see 5.12). For speakers of certain minority languages (spoken by fewer than 5 per cent of the population), however, it may be possible to adapt the questionnaire produced by another participating country. If National Coordinators wish to offer translated questionnaires to these smaller minority language groups, they should refer to the CCT for advice. Countries are not, however, required to interview language minorities under the 5% cut-off and must never allow interviewers to perform their own ‘oral’ translations for this purpose.

contacts'). Over-sampling of certain subgroups must be discussed and agreed in advance with the sampling panel.

5.3 **Effective sample size**

The **minimum 'effective achieved sample size' should be 1,500**, after discounting for design effects (see Appendix 1), or 800 in countries with populations of less than 2 million. Thus, with the help of the sampling panel, each country should determine the appropriate size of its initial issued sample by taking into account the realistic estimated impact of clustering, eligibility rates (where appropriate), over-sampling and response rate. The sampling panel will help to calculate the actual gross achieved sample size required in order to achieve an effective sample size of 1,500 interviews.

5.4 **Documentation of sampling procedures**

The precise sampling procedures to be employed in each country, and their implications for representativeness, must be documented in full and submitted in advance to the expert panel for 'signing off' and subsequently to the CCT for reference. This precaution is to ensure that all countries within the ESS have defensible (and equivalent) national probability samples of their resident (aged 15 and over) populations. The following details will be required before the sampling panel can 'sign off' a country's sample design:

- a description of the sampling frame and of the units it comprises (including information on units that might be used either to stratify the sample or to vary probabilities of selection for certain subgroups, and estimates of any likely undercoverage, duplication and ineligibles)
- for those using multi-stage samples, a description of how the units at each stage will be selected to result in a random sample of individuals, plus the inclusion probabilities of units at each stage of selection
- details of whether and how the survey is to be clustered geographically, and how the initial clusters are to be selected
- full details of any stratification to be employed
- the calculations on which the predicted effective sample size has been based.

The final sample design will be fully documented by each national team in the national technical report of the survey. Furthermore, a sample design data file has to be produced by each country and then delivered to the sampling panel. It must contain all information about the sample design, such as inclusion probabilities of each stage, information on clustering

and stratification. A full and detailed specification about this is provided by the sampling panel.

The final sample design will be fully documented by each national team in the national technical report of the survey. This documentation will be translated into one or more variables within the national data file to indicate the relative selection probabilities of cases and to enable appropriate weighting strategies to be calculated.

5.5 Target response rates

Outcomes of all approaches to addresses, households and individuals in the sample will be defined and recorded according to a pre-specified set of categories that distinguish non-eligibility, non-contacts and refusals (see section 5.8). Model 'contact forms', will be produced by the CCT, for translation and use by national teams. Countries may use their own contact forms if they wish, ensuring that these collect data on all of the variables specified by the CCT. Examples of the contact forms from Round 3 can be found on the ESS website:

http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=173&Itemid=80.

The proportion of non-contacts should not exceed 3 per cent of all sampled units, and the minimum target response rate – after discounting ineligibles (and other 'deadwood', as defined by the CCT - see section 5.7) – should be 70%. As seen in Round 2, this figure is likely to be exceeded in certain countries. Countries that participated in Round 4 and achieved lower response rates will nevertheless be expected to aim for the same 70% target in Round 5. Survey organisations should thus cost their surveys with this response rate in mind and consider what steps may be required to achieve it.

B Rules for estimating design effects

Effective Sample Size

The effective sample size (n_{eff}) is the size of a simple random sample which would produce the same precision (standard errors) as the design actually used. Typically, n_{eff} is less than the actual number of achieved interviews, m , as certain aspects of survey design – for example, clustering or the use of differing selection probabilities – tend to reduce the precision of estimates. The reduction of precision is known as the design effect ($deff$):

$$deff = \frac{\text{Actual sampling variance}}{\text{Sampling variance with simple random samples of same size}}$$

$$deff = \frac{m}{n_{\text{eff}}}, \quad \text{so } n_{\text{eff}} = \frac{m}{deff}$$

We therefore need to be able to predict the value of $deff$ for a proposed sample design, in order to determine how many interviews should be

achieved so as to produce a particular value of n_{eff} . We suggest that two components of $deff$ should be taken into account at the design stage – the design effect arising from differing selection probabilities ($deff_p$) and the design effect arising from clustering ($deff_{clu}$). Then $deff = deff_p \times deff_{clu}$. We then also need to predict the survey response rate (and the proportion of ineligibles on the sampling frame, if relevant) in order to determine the size of the initial sample (n) required in order to achieve approximately m interviews.

Design Effects due to Differing Selection Probabilities

In some countries which have accessible population registers, it will be possible to select an equal-probability sample from the survey population. In other countries, it will be necessary to select the sample in stages, with the penultimate stage being residential addresses. In this case, each person's selection probability will depend on their household size. Another reason why differing selection probabilities might be used is if important minority groups were to be over-sampled.

If differing selection probabilities are to be used - for whatever reason - the associated design effect should be predicted. This can be done very simply, using the following formula

$$deff_p = \frac{m \sum m_i w_i^2}{(\sum m_i w_i)^2}$$

where there are m_i respondents in the i th selection probability class, each receiving a weight of $w_i \propto \frac{N_i}{m_i}$, where \propto means 'proportional to'. Note that this formula assumes that the population variance of survey variables will not vary over selection probability classes – a reasonable assumption in most situations.

Design Effects Due to Clustering

It is anticipated that in most countries it will be efficient to select a multi-stage, clustered, sample. In such situations there will also be a design effect due to clustering:

$$deff_{clu} = 1 + (\bar{b} - 1) \times \rho,$$

where \bar{b} is the mean number of respondents per cluster and ρ is the intra-cluster correlation (or “rate of homogeneity”) – a measure of the extent to which persons within a clustering unit are more homogeneous than persons within the population as a whole (see Kish, 1994, Survey Sampling, pp. 161-164 (New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc.)). This design effect can be estimated, at least crudely, from knowledge of other surveys and/or the nature of the clustering units.

In practice, all elements of the overall design effect, including that due to differing selection probabilities and that due to clustering, will take different values for different survey estimates. For sample design purposes, an average value should be used.

Example: How to determine the size of issued sample

We have prescribed $n_{\text{eff}} > 1500$.

To determine m , we must first estimate $deff = deff_p \times deff_c$

1. Suppose the proposed clustering units are administrative areas of around 5,000 households on average and that based on data from other surveys, we expect that for these areas, ρ will take values of around 0.02 for many variables. Then, if we are proposing a design with a mean of 15 interviews per cluster:

$$deff_{clu} = 1 + (15 - 1) \times 0.02 = 1.28.$$

[Note: If there is no available empirical evidence at all upon which to base an estimate of ρ , then we suggest that a value of 0.02 should be used.]

2. Suppose that the only available sampling frame is a list of addresses and that these must be selected with equal probabilities. The proposed design is then randomly to select one person to interview at each address. This is the only aspect of the proposed design that involves differing selection probabilities. Then, we can use population statistics on the distribution of household size to estimate the number of respondents in each selection probability class, thus:

| No. of persons aged 18+ in household i | Proportion of households in population $\frac{H_i}{H}$ | No. of achieved interviews m_i | Relative weight | | |
|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|
| | | | w_i | $m_i w_i$ | $m_i w_i^2$ |
| 1 | 0.35 | 0.35m | 1 | 0.35m | 0.35m |
| 2 | 0.45 | 0.45m | 2 | 0.90m | 1.80m |
| 3 | 0.12 | 0.12m | 3 | 0.36m | 1.08m |
| 4 | 0.06 | 0.06m | 4 | 0.24m | 0.96m |
| 5 | 0.02 | 0.02m | 5 | 0.10m | 0.50m |
| | | | | 1.95m | 4.69m |

The population distribution of household size appears in the first two columns. From this, we can predict that the sample distribution will be as shown in the third column. We can thus predict $deff_p$:

$$deff_p = m \times \frac{4.69m}{(1.95m)^2} = \frac{4.69}{1.95^2} = 1.23$$

3. Thus, we predict $deff = 1.28 \times 1.23 = 1.57$. Consequently, to achieve $n_{\text{eff}} > 1,500$ with this design, we would need $m > 1,500 \times 1.57 = 2,355$.

4. The final stage is to calculate the gross sample size in order to achieve around 2,355 interviews. If we anticipate a response rate of 80% and 5% of ineligibles (e.g. addresses which do not contain a resident household), we have:

$$n = \frac{\left(\frac{m}{0.80}\right)}{0.95} = \frac{\left(\frac{2,355}{0.80}\right)}{0.95} \approx 3,098$$

So we would select a sample of at least 3,100 addresses.