

## ESS Round 10 Core Questionnaire Review

### Summary of changes

**Core Review Team:** Niccolò Ghirelli (author), Rory Fitzgerald (head of the Core Review Team), Angelika Scheuer, Brina Malnar, Brita Dorer, Christian Staerklé, Diana Zavala-Rojas, Gianmaria Bottoni, Knut Kalgraff Skjåk, Nicolas Sauger, Patrizia Castellani, Tim Hanson.

#### Aim of the Core Review

The ESS core questionnaire was reviewed ahead of ESS Round 10. The purpose of the review was “to ensure that the ESS core questionnaire continues to accurately reflect the most pertinent social, political and demographic cleavages across Europe”.

Representatives of the Core Scientific Team (CST), including ESS HQ, GESIS, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, NSD and University of Ljubljana, and a sub-set of the ESS Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) formed a Core Review Team to review the core questions item by item. An initial evidence gathering exercise to inform the Core Review Team included feedback from subject experts involved in the original core questionnaire and item count analyses produced by the University of Ljubljana showing how frequently different items were used in publications. The Core Review Team met in June 2018, reviewed the whole ESS core questionnaire and identified items with potential for improvement, along with a small number of potentially new topics, which it may be possible to include in the core.

The review progressed throughout the second half of 2018, refining a short list of items to be amended, removed or added. This list was then reviewed by the CST, the SAB, the ESS Methodological Advisory Board (MAB) and the ESS National Coordinators with several meetings in 2018-2019. Alongside this feedback, ESS data users were consulted in September 2019 via an online consultation. In addition, the proposed changes were tested in the following ways:

- Omnibus Surveys (May-June 2019) in Bulgaria, Italy and the United Kingdom.
- Cognitive interviews (June 2019) in Finland, France, Germany, Poland, and the United Kingdom.
- Pilot Survey (November-December 2019) in Austria and the United Kingdom.

The results of these pretesting phases were used by the Core Review Team to draft the final list of the proposed changes. Finally, these were reviewed by the CST in January 2020 to approve the final amendments, cuts and additions to the ESS Round 10 Core Questionnaire.

The present document illustrates the final amendments compared with the Round 9 Core Questionnaire, summarizing their rationale, the results of the different consultations and pre-tests and the final decisions of the Core Review Team. Details on each pre-test stage and its sampling and methods are provided in *Appendix 1. Methodological Notes*.

NOTE: unless stated otherwise, the question numbers quoted in the document refer to R10 Source Questionnaire<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The Round 10 Source Questionnaire is expected to be published on the European Social Survey website in June 2021.

## 1) Amendments to battery on political engagements (B15 - B22)

### a) Wording changes at B16

#### Rationale

The use of the term *worked* (original item below<sup>2</sup>) was seen as problematic by both the Core Review Team and the CST.

*There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following? Have you... READ OUT...*

*...worked in a political party or action group?*

As a result, it was agreed to amend the item to clarify that it does not exclusively refer to being in the paid employment of a political party or action group, but rather broader less formal participation. In addition, it was proposed to include donating money to political parties or action groups in this item.

#### Pretesting and discussion outcomes

Amended versions of the item were tested with cognitive interviews and in the pilot survey.

In the cognitive interviews the wording ‘...*donated to or participated in a political party or action group?*’ was used. Respondents across all test countries seemed to have a consistent understanding of ‘*participated in a political party*’. Nearly all respondents understood ‘donating’ to be a monetary contribution and ‘participating’ to be giving your time.

Examples of ‘participation in a political party’ included people attending meetings, and/or organised rallies, taking part in election campaigns and door knocking. Others also mentioned shared beliefs and ideas as a cornerstone of participation. Nearly all participants provided examples of people physically doing something to support a political party. There was a slightly less cohesive understanding of the phrase ‘*action group*’. A few participants had no understanding of what an action group was.

As a result, the following wording was used ‘...*donated to or participated in a political party or pressure group?*’ in the pilot survey, with the hypothesis that ‘pressure group’ would sound clearer than ‘action group’ to the respondents (the latter felt to be a term more common in the USA).

Notwithstanding sample differences, the analyses on the Round 10 pilot data showed the new item captured wider participation when compared to the Round 9 data for Austria and the United Kingdom<sup>3</sup>, with a greater proportion of respondents answering “Yes” to the new item than to the original one in both the countries.

To better observe the understanding of the term “*pressure group*”, a respondent debrief questionnaire was used to investigate what the respondents understood by this term. No major issue with the term emerged. In both of the pilot countries the question was generally evaluated as easy; the term “*pressure group*” was mainly seen as a political organization sharing a defined common interest as well as representing and promoting those interests.

Finally, the proposed amendments were positively received by all of the consulted stakeholders, even if some ESS National Coordinators highlighted possible translation issues with the new term ‘pressure group’.

<sup>2</sup> Item B16 in the [ESS9 Source Questionnaire](#)

<sup>3</sup> The analyses refer to the ESS9-2018 Edition 2.0, released on 15th of June 2020 in the [European Social Survey website](#).

### Final item

The following amended item was approved by the CST to be part of the ESS Core Questionnaire from Round 10:

*There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following? Have you... **READ OUT...***  
*...donated to or participated in a political party or pressure group?*

To address possible issues with the translation of ‘*pressure group*’ an annotation (these aid translation and are not presented to respondents) is added to the Source Questionnaire, defining ‘*pressure group*’ as ‘*a group of people who work together to try to influence what other people or the government think about a particular subject, in order to achieve the things they want*’. It was also recommended to use the same translation as for ‘*action group*’ in ESS1-ESS9 if this reflects the definition of pressure group provided.

### b) Item on working in another organisation or association<sup>4</sup> removed

#### Removed item

*There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following? Have you... **READ OUT...***  
*...worked in another organisation or association?*

#### Rationale

The Core Review Team considered the item to be too vague. In addition, as part of a long battery and with a few items before, it was suspected based on earlier observations of ESS interviews that respondents could have forgotten the first sentence of the question: ‘*There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong*’ and therefore the item might not make sense to them. More precisely, it is not clear what another ‘*organisation or association*’ refers to. Moreover, the issue raised at B16 about work in the sense of being in paid employment is also relevant at this item.

These issues have consistently been reported by National Coordinators, and all the consulted stakeholders evaluated positively the Core Review Team proposal to remove the item from the ESS Core Questionnaire, outlining that this would free a slot for a more suitable item. It was acknowledged that the time series would end but it was felt that this was required to improve quality.

The ESS data users registered to the ESS User Bulletin were also consulted on the suitability of dropping the item. Only 12% of the respondents (n=238) rated negatively the proposal to drop B17. While these respondents tended to agree on the vagueness of the item’s wording, they suggested that it should be rephrased rather than removed. Suggestions were mainly focused on not-for-profit or charitable organisations.

As a result of this feedback, the CST approved the decision to remove the item from the ESS Core Questionnaire.

<sup>4</sup> Item B17 in [ESS Round 9 Source Questionnaire](#)

### c) Wording changes at B19

#### Removed item

*There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following? Have you... READ OUT...  
...taken part in a lawful public demonstration?*

#### Rationale

The original item<sup>5</sup> in the battery asks only about having taken part in ‘*lawful*’ public demonstrations. This is due to the decision not to ask about unlawful behaviours in the ESS core questionnaire, but the Core Review Team evaluated this wording as sub-optimal for the battery quality. It was observed that, on the one hand, it might be unclear to respondents if a demonstration is lawful or not; on the other, no information on the participation in unlawful demonstration is collected. As a result, limiting the item only to the demonstrations that respondents consider lawful underestimates overall participation in public demonstrations.

#### Pretesting and discussion outcomes

An amended version of the item without the term ‘*lawful*’ was tested in the Round 10 ESS Pilot Questionnaire. Notwithstanding the sample differences, the analyses of the pilot data show a larger percentage of respondents reporting to have participated in a ‘*public demonstration*’ in comparison with the proportion of respondents reporting to have participated in a ‘*lawful public demonstration*’ in the Round 9 data. This appears to support the original aim of enlarging the item coverage to all the kind of public demonstration.

The analyses also showed no notable differences in item non-response between the two versions of the items.

All of the different stakeholders consulted during the Core Review process evaluated the proposed change as positive.

#### Final item

The following amended item was approved by the CST to be included in the ESS Core Questionnaire from Round 10:

*There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following? Have you... READ OUT...  
...taken part in a public demonstration?*

### d) New item on having volunteered for a not-for-profit or charitable organisation (B22)

#### Rationale

To address the data users’ feedback on the suitability of replacing the item on having worked in another organisation or association with a question more focused on volunteering, the Core Review Team produced a new item specifically targeted on volunteering. The new item exclusively refers to non-profit or charitable organisations. Even if it is acknowledged that the distinction between non-profit and charitable organisations might be not fully clear to the respondents, it was agreed that having both the terms in the item fits adequately with the introductory sentence of the question battery (‘...*different ways of trying to improve things in*

<sup>5</sup> Item B20 in [ESS Round 9 Source Questionnaire](#).

[country] or help prevent things from going wrong...’), allowing the respondent to consider all the relevant organisations in the answer process.

The item also relates well to the ESS1 rotating module on [Citizenship, Involvement and Democracy](#), and bibliographic research by University of Ljubljana (Malnar, 2019) showed that volunteering items are widely and consistently used in academic publications with ESS data, underlining the opportunity to include this topic in the ESS Core Questionnaire.

### Final item

The following amended item was approved by the CST to be included in the ESS Core Questionnaire from Round 10:

*There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following? Have you... READ OUT...*

*...volunteered for a not-for-profit or charitable organisation?*

### e) Split of the battery at B18

#### Rationale

To reduce the issue of the battery length and the risk of respondents forgetting the first part of the introductory sentence, the Core Review Team and the CST decided to split the battery at B18 and repeat the battery introduction after the first four items.

#### Full final battery

*There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following?  
Have you... READ OUT...*

[Display before items B15-B18: **(IF NECESSARY: During the last 12 months, have you...)** **READ OUT...**]

		Yes	No	(Refusal)	(Don't know)
<b>B15</b>	<i>...contacted a politician, government or local government official?</i>	1	2	7	8
<b>B16</b>	<i>...donated to or participated in a political party or pressure group?</i>	1	2	7	8
<b>B17</b>	<i>...worn or displayed a campaign badge/sticker?</i>	1	2	7	8
<b>B18</b>	<i>...signed a petition?</i>	1	2	7	8

And still thinking about different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong, during the last 12 months, have you done any of the following?  
Have you... **READ OUT**...

[Display before items B20-B22: (IF NECESSARY: During the last 12 months, have you...) **READ OUT**...]

		Yes	No	(Refusal)	(Don't know)
<b>B19</b>	...taken part in a public demonstration?	1	2	7	8
<b>B20</b>	...boycotted certain products?	1	2	7	8
<b>B21</b>	...posted or shared anything about politics online, for example on blogs, via email or on social media such as Facebook or Twitter?	1	2	7	8
<b>B22</b>	...volunteered for a not-for-profit or charitable organisation?	1	2	7	8

## 2) New items on authoritarianism (B38-B39)

### Rationale

With the libertarianism-authoritarianism divide increasingly prevalent throughout Europe, the Core Review Team agreed it would be suitable to add two new items to measure attitudes towards authoritarianism.

There are three dimensions of authoritarianism (Duckitt et al., 2010):

- **Authoritarian Submission:** defined as expressing attitudes favouring uncritical, respectful, obedient, submissive support for existing societal or group authorities and institutions versus critical, questioning, rebellious, oppositional attitudes to them.
- **Conventionalism:** defined as expressing attitudes favouring traditional, old fashioned social norms, values, and morality versus modern, liberal, secular, bohemian, “alternative” values, norms, and morality.
- **Authoritarian Aggression:** defined as expressing attitudinal beliefs favouring the use of strict, tough, harsh, punitive, coercive social control versus leniency, indulgence, permissiveness, softness, to violation of social rules and laws.

The Core Review Team noted that the ESS Core Questionnaire already indirectly measures Conventionalism<sup>6</sup> and Authoritarian Aggression<sup>7</sup>. As a result, it was agreed that the new items should cover the dimension of Authoritarian Submission. A selection of items from validated scales (Duckitt et al., 2010; Funke & Dunwoody 2016) were reviewed. These items were revised and adapted to the European Social Survey format (e.g. replacing formulations like “our countries” with “of [country]”) to be tested in the Omnibus Questionnaire and in the R10 Pilot questionnaire.

<sup>6</sup> Item B34, B35 and B36 in [ESS Round 9 Source Questionnaire](#).

<sup>7</sup> Item C32 in [ESS Round 9 Source Questionnaire](#).

## Pretesting and discussion outcomes

The four items tested in the Omnibus Survey were:

1. *Obedience and respect for authority are most important virtues children should learn. [obedience]*
2. *What [country] needs most is discipline with everyone following their leaders in unity. [discipline]*
3. *What [country] needs most is loyalty to its leaders. [loyalty]*
4. *People should believe what their leaders tell them. [leaders]*

- a) *Agree strongly*
- b) *Agree*
- c) *Neither agree nor disagree*
- d) *Disagree*
- e) *Disagree strongly*
- f) *(Refusal)*
- g) *(Don't know)*

With regards to the content of the items, all but the first item (*Obedience*) contain references to the country's leader. The obedience item refers to authority, but this could be understood as social or personal authority, rather than political.

The omnibus survey found that each of the four items was positively correlated with each other, but the distribution of responses differed somewhat between the items. Respondents were most likely to agree with the *Obedience* item and most likely to disagree with the *Leaders* item. Following factor analysis and internal discussion within the Core Review Team, it was decided that *Obedience* and *Loyalty* would be the most suitable items to retain. ESS data users were also consulted on these two items and mostly gave positive feedback about their potential inclusion.

As a result, the Core Review Team chose to include the *Obedience* and *Loyalty* items in the Round 10 Pilot Questionnaire. Table 3 summarises the answer distribution of each item.

Responses to the two items differed substantially. For the *Obedience* item, which asks about children's attitudes to authority, the majority of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed. However, when asked about whether the country should maintain loyalty towards its leaders (a more direct question related to political authority), respondents were more likely to disagree than agree with the item. There was a fairly high level of midpoint ("neither agree nor disagree") response to the *Loyalty* item.

Table 1. Answer distribution for the *Obedience* and the *Loyalty* items by country (Pilot Data).

	Obedience				Loyalty			
	United Kingdom		Austria		United Kingdom		Austria	
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.
Agree strongly	74	24.7	40	13.4	13	4.4	5	1.7
Agree	137	45.7	110	36.9	76	25.7	30	10.4
Neither agree nor disagree	51	17.0	60	20.1	88	29.7	78	27.0
Disagree	29	9.7	50	16.8	93	31.4	61	21.1
Disagree strongly	9	3.0	38	12.8	26	8.8	115	39.8
Total	300	100.0	298	100.0	296	100.0	289	100.0
(Don't know)	7		2	.7	1	.3	5	1.7
Total	307		300		10	3.3	6	2.0



The ESS National Coordinators rated both the items as a positive addition to the ESS Core Questionnaire, but some translation issues with identified the term “*virtues*” in the Obedience items. As a result, it was agreed to replace it with “*values*” in the final item included in the Round 10 Source Questionnaire.

### Final items

**CARD 17** Using this card, please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. **READ OUT EACH STATEMENT**

		<i>Agree strongly</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree strongly</i>	<i>(Refusal)</i>	<i>(Don't know)</i>
<b>B38</b>	<i>Obedience and respect for authority are the most important values children should learn.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	7	8
<b>B39</b>	<i>What [country] needs most is loyalty towards its leaders.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	7	8

### 3) Question on foreign citizenship<sup>8</sup> removed

#### Removed item

**ASK IF NOT CITIZEN OF TARGET COUNTRY OR DON'T KNOW**

*What citizenship do you hold?*

*WRITE IN .....*

*[To be coded into pre-specified ISO 3166-1 (2 character)]*

#### Rationale

In the ESS Core Questionnaire, respondents who state not to be a citizen of the target country are asked an open follow up question on which citizenship they hold. However, the item has been used very rarely (only 8 publications are reported in the bibliographic research made by University of Ljubljana), as migration studies mainly use other items to identify migration background (e.g. ancestry, respondent's country of birth and parents' country of birth).

For these reasons, removing the item on foreign citizenship was seen as suitable to free a slot for a new item, in line with the aims of the core questionnaire review.

<sup>8</sup> Item C19 in the [ESS Round 9 Source Questionnaire](#).



The National Coordinators were consulted on the proposal and the majority agreed with removing the item. However, the item was reported to be useful in specific countries with large and homogenic groups of foreign citizens (e.g. Russian population in Baltic countries). In these cases, fielding the item as country-specific question was agreed as a viable solution.

ESS data users were also consulted on the suitability of dropping the item. Their feedback was mixed, with 37% of the respondents rating the proposal positively or very positively, while 24% rated it negatively or very negatively. The main concern about removing the question was the loss of data on the migrant population of different countries. In addition, some users reported that merging several ESS rounds provides enough data on national population to run useful analyses. It was noted that, for various reasons, people may have a different nationality/citizenship to their country of birth and therefore the item does capture distinct information from the other items. Issues of citizenship may become more relevant given the current political context (for example, the attitudes of migrants after Brexit).

Following a review of the feedback from all parties, as well as considering the value of this versus other items, the CST approved the decision to remove the item on foreign citizenship from the ESS Core Questionnaire.

#### 4) Question change on ethnic minority (C25)

##### Rationale

The original question on ethnic minority<sup>9</sup> asked whether the respondent belongs to a minority ethnic group in the country where the interview occurs. This was seen as problematic by many ESS National Coordinators, as it is reported that in some countries ‘*minority ethnic group*’ is not well understood. The respondent’s identification in a minority ethnic group seems to vary depending of national characteristics and the subjectivity of respondent. Besides, during early pre-testing for the ancestry item, in which an attempt was made to develop a measure of ethnic origins, an imperfect correspondence was found between responses to both the open and closed ethnicity items and the existing item in the ESS core questionnaire. Although responses to the two items were correlated, the correlation was not perfect; some respondents who might appear to be part of the Caucasian majority in the United Kingdom given their self-reported ethnicity nevertheless felt themselves to be part of a minority and vice versa. This inconsistency was not found in Bulgaria to the same extent but was previously found in Portugal during the ESS7 two-nation pilot.

For this reason, the Core Review Team agreed on the necessity to revise or drop the item.

##### Pretesting and discussion outcomes

The original item ‘*Do you belong to a minority ethnic group in [country]?*’ was tested with cognitive interviews. This showed a considerable and varied understanding of the term ‘*ethnic minority group*’ across all of the test countries.

Many respondents referred to their ancestry and colour when answering and selected ‘*No*’. Several respondents referred to religion and felt as though an individual’s faith would determine if they were an ethnic minority. A few respondents also felt that the term ‘*ethnic minority*’ was relative to where someone lived (i.e. countryside vs. multicultural cities).

The term ‘*minority ethnic group*’ was found to be particularly problematic in Germany during cognitive testing. The translation uses two words ‘*Volksgruppe*’ and ‘*ethnics gruppe*’. The term ‘*Volksgruppe*’ was associated with right-wing radical groups. In general, most respondents felt as though people were born into a minority ethnic group, though some respondents felt you could ‘*choose*’ to be in a minority ethnic group, i.e. through

<sup>9</sup> Item C24 in the [ESS Round 9 Source Questionnaire](#)

getting married or converting to a certain religion.

Finally, some respondents interpreted the term ‘belong to’ to mean literally being part of a community. Therefore, a small number of respondents who would technically be categorized as an ‘*ethnic minority*’ did not answer with ‘Yes’ as they felt as though they did not identify with a ‘minority group’ in that way.

In response to these results, the Core Review Team decided to propose a completely new item to be tested in the Round 10 Pilot Questionnaire: ‘*Are you part of the same ethnic group as most people in [country]?*’. This wording was expected to better fit with the original concept of the question: to investigate the respondents self-identification in the ethnic majority of the target country rather than to collect information on the actual belonging to specific minoritarian ethnic groups. Besides, replacing ‘*belonging*’ with ‘*being part of*’ aimed to include more subjective forms of ethnic self-identification. Furthermore, an open follow-up question was added for the testing, asking the respondents to report their ethnic group if they answered as not being part of the same ethnic group as most people in their country.

The analyses on the Round 10 Pilot data show that a larger proportion of respondents reported not self-identifying as part of the same ethnic group of the majority of the population in their country based on the new item, compared with the previous item included at ESS Round 9 (Table 4 and Table 5). Notwithstanding sample differences, the difference was particularly marked for the United Kingdom. In contrast, the answer distribution for Austria does not show notable differences between the Pilot and Round 9 datasets. Item non-response is low for both versions with no statistical difference between the countries.

Table 2. Answer distribution of the R10 Pilot item on being part of the same ethnic group as most people in [country] in the United Kingdom and in Austria (Pilot data)

	United Kingdom		Austria	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
Yes	256	83.4	276	92.0
No	44	14.3	19	6.3
Refusal	1	0.3	0	0.0
Don't know	6	2.0	5	1.7
Total	307	100	300	100

Table 3. Answer distribution of the ESS core questionnaire item on belonging to a minority ethnic group as most people in [country] in the United Kingdom and in Austria (released R9 ESS data)

	United Kingdom		Austria	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
Yes	172	7.8	112	4.5
No	2,022	91.7	2,373	95.0
Refusal	0	0.0	3	0.1
Don't know	10	0.5	11	0.4
Total	2,204	100	2,499	100

The relation between the new item and the other related variables was investigated. In the pilot data, reporting a first ancestry other than the most common one in the country (British and Austrian) was statistically associated with answering “No” to the new item. Moreover, the answers to the open follow-up question were observed. In the vast majority of cases, the ethnic groups reported by those saying they were not part of the same ethnic group as most people in the country appear sensible. In the United Kingdom sample, respondents who did not identify themselves as part of the ethnic majority were mainly driven by race if they have a British ancestry and by nationality if they have an “other” ancestry. Religion appears as another determinant in both the population segments. In Austria, the pattern was less clear for respondents with Austrian ancestry that do not identify themselves part of the ethnic majority. This seems mainly related to religion and belonging to the Slavic population. In contrast, respondents with non-Austrian ancestry that did not identify themselves as part

of the ethnic majority mainly reported other nationalities. However, the extremely low number of answers to the follow up questions in the Austrian Sample (n=19) makes any inference on these less reliable.

Overall, the pretesting results suggest that the new item represented an improvement compared to the original item, even if the issues of defining ‘*ethnic group*’ are not overcome by the new version. As a result, both the Core Review Team and the CST agreed that implementing the new item is preferable to keeping the original question or dropping the item. Some National Coordinators highlighted possible issues with the new item in multi-language countries like Belgium or Switzerland, where some language groups that usually do not identify themselves as minorities might be confused by the new item. In this case, the results of the analyses using this variable might be incompatible with the previous rounds.

Addressing this issue, the Core Review Team agreed that the new item would be considered an entirely new item. This should encourage users to treat comparisons with the previous item with caution.

Finally, it was decided to add ‘*race*’ to ‘*ethnic group*’ in the final wording for the new item to be consistent with item B40 (attitudes toward migration). This is meant to ease the translation problems with the ethnic group, especially for German translations.

### Final item

The following item was approved by the CST to be part of the ESS Core Questionnaire from Round 10:

*Do you feel you are part of the same race or ethnic group as most people in [country]?*

Yes	1
No	2
(Refusal)	7
(Don't know)	8

## 5) New items on climate change (C30-C32)

### Rationale

In response to the increasing importance of climate change in public opinion, the ESS Scientific Advisory Board suggested to include at least two items on this topic in the ESS Core Questionnaire. It was agreed that these would be taken from the ESS8 Rotating module “*Attitudes to Climate Change and Energy*”.

Among these items, the Core Review Team initially selected:

- Two items related to the concept ‘Climate Change Beliefs’, respectively measuring the following sub concepts:
  - ‘Climate Change Reality’: referring to beliefs about the reality of climate change, that is, whether people think the world’s climate is changing or not, irrespective of the possible perceived causes.
  - ‘Climate Change Cause’: referring to beliefs about the causes of climate change, that is, whether people think climate change is caused by human activity, natural processes, or a combination of the two.
- One item related to the simple concept ‘Climate Concern’: defined as an affective evaluation of the seriousness of the impacts of climate change, reflected in personal feelings of worry about the issue.

- One item related to the simple concept 'Pro-Environmental Personal Norms': referring to feelings of moral obligation or responsibility to perform or refrain from specific actions to contribute to the solution of a perceived collective problem.

### Pretesting and discussion outcomes

The ESS data users registered to the ESS User Bulletin were consulted on their preference regarding the proposed items. The items on 'Climate Change Cause' and on 'Pro-Environmental Personal Norms' had the highest preference levels. This preference was also confirmed by the ESS National Coordinators.

As a result, the Core Review Team decided to exclude the sub concept 'Climate Change Reality'. This was judged to be less relevant to the current European public debate and partially covered by the item on 'Climate Change Cause'.

The three remaining items were included in the Round 10 ESS Pilot Questionnaire. Notwithstanding sample differences, the items showed a different distribution in the Round 8 and Pilot data, but these changes could be considered in the expected direction (i.e. increased concern about climate change in recent years). Item non-response was low for all items.

Given there was no evidence against the introduction of the tested items, the Core Review Team and the Core Scientific Team agreed on including the three items in the Core Questionnaire starting from Round 10. The decision of adding three items rather than two was feasible due to the number of items removed from the Core Questionnaire.

### Final Items

**C30 CARD 29** *Do you think that climate change is caused by natural processes, human activity, or both?*

<i>Entirely by natural processes</i>	0	
	1	
<i>Mainly by natural processes</i>	0	
	2	
<i>About equally by natural processes and human activity</i>	0	<b>ASK C31</b>
	3	
<i>Mainly by human activity</i>	0	
	4	
<i>Entirely by human activity</i>	0	
	5	
<i>(I don't think climate change is happening)</i>	5	<b>GO TO INTRODUCTION</b>
	5	<b>BEFORE C43</b>
<i>(Refusal)</i>	7	
	7	<b>ASK C31</b>
<i>(Don't know)</i>	8	
	8	

**ASK IF NOT CODE 55 AT C30 (IF C30 = 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 77, 88)**

**C31 CARD 30** To what extent do you feel a personal responsibility to try to reduce climate change?

<i>Not at all</i>											<i>A great deal</i>	<i>(Refusal)</i>	<i>(Don't know)</i>
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		77	88

**C32 CARD 31** How worried are you about climate change?

<i>Not at all worried</i>	1
<i>Not very worried</i>	2
<i>Somewhat worried</i>	3
<i>Very worried</i>	4
<i>Extremely worried</i>	5
<i>(Refusal)</i>	7
<i>(Don't know)</i>	8

## 6) Questions on parents' occupation (string)<sup>10</sup> removed

### Removed item

*ASK IF FATHER/MOTHER WORKING OR DON'T KNOW*

*What was the name or title of his/her main job? WRITE IN \_\_\_\_\_*

### Rationale

The ESS Source Questionnaire asks whether the respondent's parents worked as an employee, were self-employed, or not working when the respondent was 14 years old<sup>11</sup>. If a respondent reports that the relevant parent was working or that they do not know the answer, they are asked about the job their parent worked in at that time. In the previous rounds this was done through two questions. First, with an open question where the job is collected as string variable, then asking the respondent to choose the best description in a 9-category showcard<sup>12</sup>, based on a [simplified version of the Erikson/Goldthorpe/Portocarero \(EGP\) scheme](#).

The string variable is not coded by the National Coordinators into a code frame but it is available in raw format if required from the ESS Data Archive. Requests for this were rare and mostly occurred in relation to the [ESS-DEVO](#) project. From this project a mapping of the string variable was produced taking into account data from Round 1 to Round 5. This has been the starting point for a small number of academic publications on social mobility using ESS data.

Despite this limited use, the Core Review Team considered these string variables sub-optimal, as significant work is a required by the data user to analyse the raw data. Furthermore, it was highlighted how the largest

<sup>10</sup> Items F54 (father) and F57 (mother) in the [ESS Round 9 Source Questionnaire](#)

<sup>11</sup> Items F53 (father) and F56 (mother) in the [ESS Round 9 Source Questionnaire](#)

part of social mobility publications with ESS data use the level of education of the parents rather than their job. As a result, the two items were seen as suitable to cut in order to make space for new items.

ESS data users were also consulted on the proposal to remove these items. About half of the users rated positively the proposal of the Core Review Team to remove the items. In addition, it was outlined that as a different classification than ISCO coding is used for the closed item on parents' job, it would not be possible to recode to ISCO the parents' occupations without the string variable.

The CST considered whether to retain the string variables and requiring the National Coordinators to recode them to the ISCO scheme. However, this was considered too demanding for the National Teams and it was agreed to remove the item from the ESS Core Questionnaire

## Appendix 1. Methodological notes

### Omnibus Surveys

Ipsos MORI conducted the ESS10 Omnibus test in 3 countries: Great Britain, Italy and Bulgaria. The methodology adopted was to use a face-to-face omnibus approach in all countries.

In the UK, Ipsos MORI’s Capibus service was used, which is a weekly face-to-face omnibus of 1000/2000 GB adults aged 15+ using CAPI (Computer Administered Personal Interviewing). The Capibus interviewing style is based on completing the survey inside the home instead of on the doorstep, or in a hall, to ensure that interviewers spend time with the respondents, building a rapport. This in turn engages respondents and fundamentally improves the quality of responses.

For the ESS module, 1118 adults aged 15+ were interviewed in Great Britain, between 3<sup>rd</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> May 2019.

In Italy, Doxa’s face-to-face omnibus service was used, which is a monthly face-to-face omnibus of 1000/2000 Italian adults aged 15+ using CAPI (Computer Administered Personal Interviewing).

For the ESS module, 1140 adults aged 15+ were interviewed in Italy, between 23<sup>rd</sup> May and 03<sup>rd</sup> June 2019.

In Bulgaria, the Ipsos BG face-to-face omnibus service was used, which is run on an ad-hoc basis, typically running no more often than once per month with samples of 1000/2000 BG adults aged 15+ using CAPI (Computer Administered Personal Interviewing).

For the ESS module, 1015 adults aged 15+ were interviewed in Bulgaria, between 30<sup>th</sup> May and 12<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

### Cognitive interviews

R10 pre-test cognitive interviews were collected in Finland, France, Germany, Poland, and the United Kingdom in June 2019. All countries involved will need to conduct 20 interviews in total.

Two protocols were developed for the project:

- **Protocol A:** mainly including new items on **democracy**
- **Protocol B:** mainly including new items on **digital social contacts**.

A small number of questions from the **ESS Core questionnaire** will also be tested in each protocol. The table below summarises the number of interviews conducted in each country using each protocol.

#### *Interview numbers per country*

Country	Protocol A	Protocol B	Total interviews required
France	10	10	20
Finland	10	10	20
Germany	10	10	20
Poland	10	10	20
United Kingdom	10	10	20
<b>Total interviews required</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>

Due to the nature of the material being tested, different sampling criteria were used for the participants allocated to



Protocol A and the participants allocated to Protocol B.

For **both protocols** respondents were required to vary in terms of their:

- Sex
- Age-group; and
- Level of highest qualification/ educational attainment

For **Protocol A** additional quotas were set to select respondents who vary in terms of their:

- Self-reported interest in politics
- Ethnic Minority status.

For **Protocol B** quotas were used to select:

- Some respondents who were employed and some who were self-employed
- Some respondent with children aged 12 or over who do not live with participant. This would include people with adult children who live elsewhere.

### **Pilot Surveys**

The R10 pilot data were separately collected by IHS - Institute for Advanced Studies (Austria) and Kantar (United Kingdom).

#### Austria

Fieldwork for the pilot was conducted face-to-face, using CAPI and self-completion techniques, with interviews taking place in respondents' homes. A total of 300 interviews were conducted between 4th November – 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2019.

The ESS10 pilot survey used a quota sampling strategy reflecting the key characteristics of the general population.

The sampling universe was individuals aged 16 and older living in residential accommodations in Austria. The areas where the interviews were conducted were randomly selected to guarantee a good regional distribution of the sample.

At the second stage, a quota sampling strategy was applied. In the Round 9 pilot study the following quotas were used:

- age
- gender
- working status (working full time vs. not full time; employed vs. self-employed)
- size of municipalities
- educational level

The table below illustrates in details the sample composition.

Quota	%	Planned		Realised	
		n=300	%	n=300	%
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	50%	150	47%	151	
Female	50%	150	53%	149	
<b>Age</b>					
16-29	20%	60	16%	47	
30-49	35%	105	29%	88	
50-64	25%	75	29%	87	
65+	20%	60	27%	78	
<b>Education</b>					
less than A-levels	70%	210	59%	181	
A-levels and higher	30%	90	41%	114	
<b>Professional Status</b>					
Employed	50%	150	55%	149	
Self employed	10%	30	4%	14	
Not employed	40%	120	38%	126	
<b>Size of municipalities</b>					
up to 4.999	40%	120	26%	95	
5.000-49.999	30%	90	33%	86	
50.000-499.999	10%	30	14%	65	
500.000+	20%	60	22%	54	

### United Kingdom

Fieldwork for the pilot was conducted face-to-face, using CAPI and self-completion techniques, with interviews taking place in respondents' homes. A total of 307 interviews were conducted between 15th November - 8th December 2019.

The UK pilot used a random location sampling approach. This is expected to avoid some of the biases of simple quota methods by minimising interviewer discretion about where to interview.

The sampling strategy covered the population of individuals aged 16 or over:

- Living in GB south of the Caledonian Canal (this excludes those living in sparsely populated areas of Scotland, and is a convention regularly adopted on GB/UK-wide surveys for reasons of cost-effectiveness as its impact on non-coverage bias is negligible); and
- Living in private accommodation (i.e. those living in communal establishments were excluded).

Interviews were carried out across 79 points with a total of 47 interviewers working on the pilot. All interviewers received a face-to-face briefing before starting work from the ESS and Kantar. All respondents who completed an interview were given a £5 high street voucher for taking part in the research. Further incentives were offered for the respondent feedback interview and recruitment for further surveys.

Northern Ireland was excluded from the pilot stage.

## **Online User Consultation**

An online user consultation was shared via Qualtrics with 5556 ESS data users registered to the *European Social Survey (ESS) User Bulletin* and with 113 social researcher who took part in ESS Rotating Modules questionnaire design across all the ESS Rounds.

The respondents were notified via email about the opportunity to take part in it. They were then encouraged to participate via two emails which aimed to remind them about the consultation. The consultation was online from 23<sup>rd</sup> August to 25<sup>th</sup> September 2019 in order to allow all interested users to share their opinion about the proposed changes. A total of 556 respondents took part in the online consultation over a period of one month in autumn 2019.

## **Bibliographic references**

Duckitt, J., Bizumic, B., Krauss, S.W. and Heled, E. (2010), A Tripartite Approach to Right-Wing Authoritarianism: The Authoritarianism-Conservatism-Traditionalism Model. *Political Psychology*, 31: 685-715. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00781.x>

Dunwoody, Philip & Funke, Friedrich. (2016). The Aggression-Submission-Conventionalism Scale: Testing a New Three Factor Measure of Authoritarianism. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*. 4. 571-600. 10.5964/jspp.v4i2.168.

Malnar, B. (2019). ESS annual bibliographic report 2019 (Deliverable 11.8). *European Social Survey ERIC*. <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/docs/findings/ESS-ERICAnnual-Bibliographic-Report-2019.pdf>