

A Longitudinal Survey of Ethnic Minorities

Methodological issues

28 September 2005

Bob Erens & Susan Purdon
National Centre *for* Social Research

Objectives and methods

- ✂ Minimum sample size for each group of interest=1000 adults; minimum effective sample size=750; probability sample; cost-effective
- ✂ Doorstep screening - yes
- ✂ Follow-up of other surveys - no
- ✂ Selection on surnames - no
- ✂ Snowballing - no

The problem

✂ Ethnic minority groups = 8% of population. Need to screen lots of adults to generate a reasonably sized sample. A (simple) screen of 1000 adults will generate 80. A screen of 12500 will generate 1000.

✂ Problem not so simple because want 1000 *per* group.

	Rate	Need to screen
Indian	1.8%	56,000
Chinese	0.4%	250,000
Pakistani	1.3%	79,000
Bangladeshi	0.5%	208,000
Black Caribbean	1.0%	104,000
Black African	0.8%	120,000
Mixed ethnicity	1.2%	87,000

Reducing the screening - Indian

✂ 1.8% of population. Screen 56,000 to get 1000.

✂ But Indian population relatively clustered.

10% of wards = 80% of Indian pop

20% of wards = 91% of Indian pop

30% of wards = 95% of Indian pop

✂ If concentrate sample in 10% of wards: Indian=8.1% of pop;
Screen 12,500 to get 1000.

✂ If concentrate sample in 20% of wards: Indian=5.1% of pop;
Screen 20,000 to get 1000.

✂ Or, screen 15,000, but with a skew towards first 10% of wards,
and still achieve 1000.

Reducing the screening - Indian

- ✂ Main problem is non-coverage bias: 9% of Indians live in the 80% of un-covered wards. To the extent that these Indians differ from the 91%, the survey will be biased.
- ✂ Our view: the reduction in cost makes the bias tolerable.

Reducing the screening - Chinese

✂ 0.4% of population. Screen 250,000 to get 1000.

✂ Chinese population relatively un-clustered.

10% of wards = 52% of Chinese pop

20% of wards = 70% of Chinese pop

30% of wards = 81% of Chinese pop

40% of wards = 88% of Chinese pop

50% of wards = 93% of Chinese pop

✂ To get 'good' coverage need to include 40% of wards.

✂ But within these 40% Chinese=0.7%. So screen 143,000 to get 1000.

Reducing the screening - Bangladeshi

✂ 0.5% of population. Screen 208,000 to get 1000.

✂ Bangladeshi population very clustered.

10% of wards = 89% of Bangladeshi pop

20% of wards = 95% of Bangladeshi pop

✂ Within the 10% of wards: Bangladeshi=2.6%. Screen 38,500 to get 1000.

Reducing the screening

- ✂ Similar calculations suggest can get good coverage and relatively small screening samples for: Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black Caribbean, Black African
- ✂ Chinese and mixed ethnicity groups are too small and too unclustered for cost-effective screening
- ✂ So: design a doorstep screen for the first 5 groups; look to other sample sources for Chinese and mixed.

A doorstep screen for 5 groups

- ✂ Calculate percentage of population of these 5 ethnic minority groups for each ward in GB.
- ✂ Divide wards into strata based on this proportion.
- ✂ Exclude any strata where the proportion is low. We could exclude 75% of wards and still achieve over 92% coverage per group.
- ✂ Allocate a screening sample across the remaining 25% of wards.

A doorstep screen for 5 groups

✂ Screen 70,000 adults (at about 45,000 addresses). After non-response:

	Achieved sample size at W I	Effective sample size at W I
Indian	2 2 0 0	1 5 5 0
Pakistani	1 8 0 0	1 2 0 0
Bangladeshi	1 4 0 0	7 5 0
Black Caribbean	1 2 5 0	9 0 0
Black African	1 1 5 0	8 5 0
Mixed: White/Black Caribbean	2 5 0	1 6 0
Mixed: White/Black African	1 0 0	7 0
Mixed: White/Asian	1 8 0	1 2 0
Chinese	3 7 0	2 5 0
'Other' non-white	1 2 5 0	8 5 0

Two more issues

- ⌘ The estimates are based on data current in 2001. Change between then and the end of the decade are hard to factor in.
- ⌘ For about 25% of the screening sample the screened-in rate will be low. One option is to use focussed enumeration for these 25%.

Chinese and mixed ethnicity groups

✂ We haven't found an efficient doorstep screening method for these two groups.

Options:

✂ Accept the cost of extra screening; or

✂ Generate a sample from another large scale survey. Sample size of that survey(s) would need to be about 150-250,000.

✂ Main problem of latter is inherited non-response bias.

Translations

- ✂ Options for translations
- ✂ Which languages to translate
- ✂ How to carry out the translations
- ✂ Problems

Translations: Options

✂ Do nothing/English only interviews

No written translation and:

✂ Use other household members to translate ('causal translators')

✂ Use bilingual interviewers to translate

✂ Use interpreters to translate

✂ Use a translation helpline

Written translation and:

✂ Use bilingual interviewers to translate

✂ Use interpreters to translate

Translations: Which languages?

Depends on:

- ✂ Number of non-English speakers in the group
- ✂ Achieved sample size

Interviews carried out in another language (HSE):

	1999
Indian	15%
Pakistani	30%
Chinese	31%
Bangladeshi	66%

Translations: Process

- ✂ Specialist agency translates questionnaire
- ✂ Second agency person checks translation
- ✂ Survey organisation checks translation using independent translator (an experienced interviewer or researcher)
- ✂ Queries discussed between independent translator and agency
- ✂ Field test translated questionnaire

Translations: Difficulties

- ✂ Lengthens development period
- ✂ Non-written languages (eg, Sylheti)
- ✂ Recruiting bilingual interviewers
- ✂ Costs
- ✂ Cross-cultural validity
- ✂ Use of anchoring vignettes

Ethnic matching

Advantages:

- ✂ Increase perceptions of legitimacy and response rates
- ✂ Beneficial for certain topics - eg, racial discrimination (but no effect on most topics)

Disadvantages:

- ✂ Extra interviewer recruitment/training costs
- ✂ Complicating and extending fieldwork period