Understanding Society

Working Paper Series

No. 2008 – 03

Understanding Society. Some preliminary results from the Wave 1 Innovation Panel

Editors: Jon Burton, Heather Laurie, S.C. Noah Uhrig

Institute for Social and Economic Research
University of Essex

Contributors: Mark Bryan, Carol Desousa, Laura Fumagalli, Annette Jackle, Gundi Knies, Peter Lynn, Alita Nandi, Lucinda Platt, Stephen Pudney, Birgitta Rabe, Amanda Sacker, Emanuela Sala, Mark Taylor (Institute for Social and Economic Research); Dieter Wolke (University of Warwick); Renata Bottazzi, Thomas Crossley, Cormac O'Dea (Institute of Fiscal Studies)

Understanding Society
THE UK HOUSEHOLD LONGITUDINAL STUDY

E·S·R·C ECONOMIC & SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Non-technical summary

Longitudinal studies present many difficult methodological issues for those designing and conducting them. The aim in designing a questionnaire for a longitudinal study is to ensure that the questions are understood clearly by the people taking part, and that they produce estimates which are reliable not only at one point in time but also measure change accurately.

Gaining a high response rate and making people feel valued members of the study are key for any longitudinal study. If people drop out over time because they find that what we are asking of them is too burdensome, this will affect the long-term quality of the study as a whole.

Understanding Society is unusual in that it includes an Innovation Panel of 1500 designed explicitly to enable methodological research into the best ways of asking questions and conducting fieldwork operations. This provides a unique test-bed which should enable advances in longitudinal methodological research and provide the evidence needed to design the study to collect high quality data.

This paper reports on the first wave of the Innovation Panel where experimentation and a data quality assessment exercise have fed into design decisions for the main wave 1 survey.

Understanding Society.
Some preliminary results from the Wave 1 Innovation Panel

Editors: Jon Burton, Heather Laurie, S.C. Noah Uhrig

Institute for Social and Economic Research
University of Essex

Contributors: Mark Bryan, Carol Desousa, Laura Fumagalli, Annette Jackle, Gundi Knies, Peter Lynn, Alita Nandi, Lucinda Platt, Stephen Pudney, Birgitta Rabe, Amanda Sacker, Emanuela Sala, Mark Taylor; (Institute for Social and Economic Research), Dieter Wolke (University of Warwick); Renata Bottazzi, Thomas Crossley, Cormac O'Dea (Insitute of Fiscal Studies)

Abstract

Understanding Society is a major new panel survey for the UK of 40,000 households containing around 100,000 individuals including children. Wave 1 of the main survey goes into the field in January 2009. *Understanding Society* includes an Innovation Panel of 1500 households for methodological testing in advance of the main survey going into field. A number of split sample experiments were carried at wave 1 of the Innovation Panel and an assessment of data quality issues across a range of measures were examined. The paper reports the results of both these aspects.

Keywords: Panel survey methodology; split-sample experiments; data quality.

Contact: Heather Laurie, Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, CO4 3SQ, UK; +44 (0)1206 873556; laurh@essex.ac.uk

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all of our colleagues at ISER, the University of Warwick, and the Institute of Fiscal Studies who carried out the analysis reported in this paper. Thanks also to the researchers and interviewers at the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) responsible for delivering the survey. The research was supported by ESRC funding for *Understanding Society* (RES-586-47-0001) and the ESRC UK Longitudinal Studies Centre.

Understanding Society is an initiative by the Economic and Social Research Council, with scientific leadership by the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER), University of Essex and survey delivery by the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen).

1. Introduction

This paper presents some preliminary results from the Wave 1 Innovation Panel of *Understanding Society, The UK Household Longitudinal Study. Understanding Society* is a major new panel survey for the UK of 40,000 households containing around 100,000 individuals including children. Wave 1 of the main survey goes into the field in January 2009 with all sample members being followed over time and interviews conducted with all household members aged 10 and over. The design of *Understanding Society* the study includes an Innovation Panel of 1500 households for methodological testing in advance of the main survey going into field. The Innovation Panel provides a unique opportunity for experimentation which would not be possible in the context of the main sample, allowing systematic testing of differing question wordings or formats or varying fieldwork strategies and procedures. Most importantly as the Innovation Panel will take place annually, it will provide a test-bed for many longitudinal issues which to date have limited coverage in the methodological literature. It is therefore a major innovation for *Understanding Society* and should provide a wealth of methodological information relevant to many longitudinal studies.

A number of split sample experiments were carried at wave 1 of the Innovation Panel and it also allowed an assessment of data quality across a range of measures. The paper reports the results of both these aspects. Section 2 outlines the main design features of *Understanding Society* and Section 3 gives further details about the design and conduct of the wave 1 Innovation Panel. Section 4 reports on some of the experiments carried and Section 5 on data quality assessments of other measures. The results from wave 1 of the Innovation Panel have directly influenced decisions taken for the design, content and survey fieldwork procedures for the wave 1 main survey and Section 6 summarises these. Section 7 outlines plans for wave 2 of the Innovation Panel.

2. Understanding Society

Understanding Society aims to be the most ambitious survey of its kind in the world, with a target sample size of 40,000 households across the UK[1]. It will be significantly larger than the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), which ISER has been running since 1991 and will incorporate the BHPS from wave 2. *Understanding Society* is designed to provide high quality, longitudinal social survey data for academic and policy research and has a continuing programme of consultation with the user community on its content and coverage.

Understanding Society uses a household panel design similar to that of the BHPS and other national panels around the world. *Understanding Society* will collect data about each sample member and his or her household at annual intervals. The panel design provides unique information on the persistence of states such as child poverty or disability, on factors that influence key life transitions, such as marriage and divorce, and on the effects of earlier life circumstances on later outcomes. They also support research relevant to the formation and evaluation of policy. Panel surveys encourage more reliable analytical techniques, to assess causal sequences – an interpretation that cross-sectional data, based on only a single observation of each individual, cannot support.

Initially, interviews will be carried out face to face in people's homes but at later waves a mixed mode data collection strategy is likely to be introduced. The main wave 1 fieldwork begins in January 2009 and will spread over a two year fieldwork period, with monthly samples being issued over that period. Wave 2 interviews will begin in January 2010, which means there will be annual interviews for each sample member conducted at the same month of the year, but the fieldwork period for each wave will overlap.

[1] *Understanding Society* is an initiative by the Economic and Social Research Council with scientific leadership by the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER), University of Essex and survey delivery by the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen)

Understanding Society has seven key features that reflect its scientific rationale, and which can be exploited to generate major innovations in scientific research:

Sample size

The large sample size will give a unique opportunity to explore issues for which other longitudinal surveys are too small to support effective research. It will permit analysis of small subgroups, such as teenage parents or disabled people. Examples include analysis at regional and sub-regional levels, allowing examination of the effects of geographical variation in policy (notably differences between the countries of the UK). A large sample size also allows high-resolution analysis of events in time, for example, focusing on single-year age cohorts.

Household focus

Data will be collected on all members of sampled households and their interactions within the household. This has major advantages for important research areas such as consumption and income, where within-household sharing of resources is important, or demographic change, where the household itself is often the object of study. Compared with individual-based birth cohorts, it will give better and more continuous information on the family and household environment within which child development takes place. Observing multiple generations and all siblings allows examination of long-term transmission processes and isolates the effects of commonly shared family background characteristics. *Understanding Society* will also provide opportunities to explore linkages outside the household.

A full age range

Understanding Society will complement existing age-focused studies sampling elderly people (such as the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing) or young people (such as the 1958, 1970 and Millennium birth cohort studies), and provide a unique look at behaviours and transitions in mid-life. Moreover, the large sample size means that all cohorts can be analysed at a common point in time.

Innovative data collection methods

Continuous development in data collection methods will benefit from the experience of other longitudinal surveys and the introduction of new technologies. This entails additional methods of interviewing, collection of qualitative and visual data, external record linkage and the Innovation Panel to allow experimentation and methodological development. As the study will use a mixed mode data collection strategy in later waves, the Innovation Panel provides an invaluable means of testing and developing the best approaches for maintaining longitudinal comparability in the context of mixed mode data collection.

Broad, interdisciplinary topic coverage

Understanding Society is a multi-topic survey for the study of a range of life domains. While meeting the needs of 'traditional' quantitative social science disciplines such as economics, sociology and social policy, it will also serve other disciplines (both in the social sciences and the biomedical sciences) and make possible a wider set of methodological approaches (for example, via linked qualitative studies).

Ethnic minority research

The incorporation of an ethnicity research agenda within *Understanding Society* recognises the increasing prominence of research into ethnic difference for our understanding of the make-up of British society and issues of diversity and commonality. The survey will include a boost sample of ethnic minorities.

Biomedical research

Understanding Society will support collection of a wide range of biomarkers and health indicators. This opens up exciting prospects for advances at the interface between social science and biomedical research. It will provide the opportunity to assess exposure and antecedent factors of health status, understanding disease mechanisms (for example, gene-environment

interaction and gene-to-function links), household and socio-economic effects and analysis of outcomes using direct assessments or data linkage.

Further details about the design and coverage of the study can be found at www.understandingsociety.org.uk

3. Innovation Panel Wave 1 design

The sample for the Innovation Panel wave 1 consisted of 2,760 addresses in 120 areas (PSUs) across Britain, south of the Caledonian Canal. These were selected from the small user PAF with 23 addresses systematically selected from each PSU. The design is an equal probability design to minimise design effects and current BHPS addresses were excluded from the possibility of selection. On calling at the household, all eligible members of residential addresses were asked for an interview. All those resident at the address, including children, are defined as original sample members and will be followed throughout the life of the study.

The questionnaire at wave 1 follows the standard format to be carried on *Understanding Society* including a:

- Household roster and household questionnaire (15 minutes per household)
- Individual questionnaire: 32.5 minutes for each person aged 16 and over (includes the collection of tracking information and data linkage consents)
- Adult self-completion: 7.5 minutes for each person aged 16 and over
- Youth self-completion: 10 minutes for each child aged 10 – 15 years
- Proxy questionnaire – 10 minutes for adults aged 16 and over unable to be interviewed

With the exception of the self-completion questionnaires which were paper, the interviews are conducted using CAPI scripted using the software 'Blaise'. In addition to the questionnaires, respondents were asked for permission to link to administrative data sources including education records and benefit and pension records.

Wave 1 of the Innovation Panel was carried out from January to April in 2008 by NatCen. The target was to achieve interviews in 1500 households

representing a 60 percent household level response rate (excluding ineligible addresses). In total, 1489 households wee interviewed, falling just short of the target with a 59 percent household level response rate. In all, 2393 individuals aged 16 and over did an individual interview, there were 168 proxy interviews and 263 children aged 10 -15 completed the youth questionnaire.

4. Experimentation in the Innovation Panel Wave 1

The *Understanding Society* wave 1 Innovation Panel contained four randomised split-ballot experiments designed to evaluate alternative measurement protocols which have informed design decisions in developing the questionnaire and fieldwork procedures for the main wave 1 sample. These experiments concern the use of incentives and variation in three question design protocols obtaining information about receipt of unearned income, household and personal expenditure and job satisfaction.

4.1 Incentives

Obtaining whole household response is particularly important since *Understanding Society* is a household panel. Little is known, however, about the sorts of incentive strategies that would maximise whole household response rather than simple individual level response (Lynn and Sturgis, 1997). The literature on the use of incentives in cross-sectional surveys shows that cash incentives are generally effective in increasing response. Pre-paid monetary incentives seem to be the most effective at securing response as compared to some form of non-monetary gift (Church 1993; Dykema, Lepkowski and Blixt 1997; Ryu, Couper and Marans 2006; Singer et al. 1999). Singer et al (1999) also show that incentives work primarily by reducing refusals and have little effect on non-contact rates. Laurie (2007) shows that the amount of a cash incentive influences response rates with higher valued cash incentives generally achieving higher response rates.

A randomised three-way split sample design was used to ascertain the most effective incentive usage for achieving Wave 1 response including whole household response. Households were randomly allocated to experimental groups. The first experimental group was offered a £5 voucher and the second a £10 voucher for each adult who completed the survey. The third

experimental treatment group was offered a £5 voucher for each adult who participated which increased to a £10 voucher for each adult if all adults living in the household participated. Single person households randomly assigned to this third group received £5 initially which increased to £10 if they participated.

Each household received a cash voucher of the appropriate amount (£5 for groups 1 and 3 and £10 for group 2) unconditionally in advance along with a letter explaining that all household members had been sampled for participation in *Understanding Society*. The advance letter also explained that respondents would receive an incentive for participating and the amount of the incentive being offered. After interviewing was completed for a household, households were sent any remaining vouchers owed depending on how many adult household members participated in the survey. The initial voucher was included in the total sum for the households. Any children between the ages of 10 and 15 who also participated also received a £3 cash voucher. We experimentally varied only the incentive offered to adult household members.

Overall, 59 percent of households resulted in at least one productive interview. Approximately 27.6 percent of households refused while a further 4.6 percent were non-contacts. The remaining sampled units were either ineligible or otherwise unproductive. Looking at the household level response rate there were significant differences between the £5 incentive group and each of the other two groups. The £5 group achieved a response rate of 55.7 percent, the £10 group achieved 61.4 percent, while the £5 rising to £10 group achieved 60.7 percent.

<Table 1 here>

Recall that we provided each sampled address with an unconditional voucher in advance. Indicating receipt of the voucher or not was found to be strongly related to non-response. About 15.7 percent of households with whom contact was made indicated that they did not receive the initial voucher. Households claiming not to have received the advance mailing with the voucher were about 60 percent more likely to subsequently refuse given contact than those who did receive it ($X^2 = 17.8$, $p < 0.05$).

Variation in the incentive amount and structure was associated with differential rates of non-contact rather than refusal. Only 2.7 percent of households receiving the £10 voucher treatment resulted in non-contacts as compared to 5.8 percent of the £5 only group and 4.5 percent of the £5 becoming £10 group (X^2 = 10.2, $p < 0.05$). Wald tests confirm no difference between the £5 only and £5 becoming £10 groups. We found no difference across treatment groups in refusal rates, however (X^2 = 0.95, p = 0.62). This latter finding is surprising but may be explained by the fact that some non-contacts may in fact be covert refusals, that is people who fail to answer the door or respond to messages left by the interviewer and who, if contacted would be likely to refuse. Receipt of any unconditional amount in advance for all respondents may have been sufficient to militate against refusal equally across treatment groups. That is, variation in the amount of the unconditional incentive may have induced respondents to be available for interview but the fact that each household received a voucher in advance combined with interviewer door-step engagement reduced the likelihood of refusal for everyone equally. This is consistent with other studies where any cash incentive is more effective compared to none.

In a multi-variate analysis controlling for a range of environmental variables about the building structure, its surroundings and the local area, the £10 voucher group reduced the odds of being a non-contact household by about 64 percent. Acknowledging receipt of the voucher reduced the odds of refusal by about 48 percent. That is the household was about 2 times more likely to take part if they said they had received the voucher.

Did increasing the incentive from £5 to £10 induce whole household participation? We found that the £10 per adult and the £5 becoming £10 per adult with whole-household participation equally enhanced the likelihood of whole household participation relative to £5 only per adult. Table 2 shows significant variation across treatment groups within productive households. Both the £10 group and the £5 shifting to £10 group were significantly more likely to be fully co-operating. More importantly, however, Wald tests with these data indicate no difference between the £10 and the £5 becoming £10 groups in achieving whole-household completion. This suggests that either of

these approaches would enhance the data quality through maximising whole household co-operation.

<Table 2 here>

As a result of the findings from this experiment, the decision has been taken to use a £10 unconditional incentive sent with the advance mailing at wave 1 and to offer a £10 incentive to each co-operating person taking part (including the original £10). In addition, interviewers will have the remaining vouchers to hand out at the point of interview rather than having them posted following the interview. Given the evidence available, this strategy should help to maximise response rate while delivering the whole household co-operation rates required for the collection of high quality data.

4.2 Unearned Income from State Benefits and Other Sources

Precise measures of household income are required for studying income mobility and particularly for addressing questions of entry and exit from poverty (Jenkins and Micklewright, 2007). For example, since the inception of the British Household Panel Study (BHPS), we have seen that roughly one-third of households receive some form of state benefit, excluding the state pension (Jenkins, 2000). BHPS data are widely used, particularly for calculating population estimates of households below average income and the user community are particularly keen to maintain comparable measurement with the BHPS in this area.

Understanding Society will use mixed-mode data collection in later waves of the survey. Wave 1 will be a face-to-face CAPI design while wave 2 may move to a sequential mixed mode telephone and face-to-face design where face to face interviews follow up non-responders to the telephone interview. The existing BHPS protocol for enumerating income from various state benefits as well as from other sources relies heavily on show cards to prompt respondents. A version of the protocol that does not rely on show cards while maintaining longitudinal comparability of the data must be designed. The purpose of this experiment was to test two alternative designs against the original BHPS protocol to ensure that the measurement properties of a no show card design are comparable to the original.

We used a three group randomised split ballot design where household were randomly assigned to each treatment group. Appendix B contains question lists for each of the three protocols tested. The first treatment group was given the original BHPS version of the question protocol which results in an enumeration of unearned income sources. The second group received a version of the enumeration protocol adopted from the Labour Force Survey in which respondents are screened into different question sets through a series of forced choice yes or no questions about broad categories of income sources. The final group incorporates two initial binomial response screener questions for (a) whether the respondent receives any state benefits and (b) whether the respondent receives any other source of payment or income.

Our analysis aimed to determine which benefit enumeration protocol best matches the historical BHPS show card enumeration exercise. We compared the frequency distribution of mentioned income sources for each of the three experimental treatment groups as against the BHPS Wave 16 current receipt. We used Chi-Square tests to determine whether experimental treatment was associated with distributional differences. Table 3 contains these results.

< Table 3 here>

The first experimental group received the protocol identical to the BHPS. As expected, we found that the show card version tested in the Innovation Panel yielded distributions substantially similar to the current receipt data from BHPS Wave 16. We found differences in six of the 34 sources between BHPS Wave 16 and the identical version administered in the Innovation Panel. In four of these sources, fewer than 5 percent of the sample reported receipt. The remaining two income sources were the Working Family Tax Credit (5.5 percent in BHPS vs 3.1 percent in IP) and Housing Benefit (6.2 percent in BHPS vs 8.2 percent in IP). Variation in the distribution between the Innovation Panel and BHPS for these two sources cannot be explained, although variation of receipt within the BHPS for both items does encompass the spread observed between the Innovation Panel and BHPS here.

Of central importance to poverty research is ensuring that the distributions of Job Seekers' Allowance and Income Support are not affected by survey

administration mode. Table 3 shows that these key sources do not seem to be affected by the either alteration in questioning protocol.

As Table 3 shows, certain income sources were under-reported in the experimental treatments two and three which both do not involve show cards:

- Private pension or annuity
- Industrial Injury Allowance
- Attendance allowance
- Disability living allowance, care and mobility
- Maintenance and/or alimony
- Payments from family members
- Rent from other property

The BHPS and the BHPS-like parallel treatment group in the Innovation Panel include reactive checks based on respondent characteristics for various benefit sources. For example, Industrial Injury Allowance, Attendance allowance and Disability Living Allowance, are each implicated in a reactive check if the respondent's health or disability status obtained elsewhere in the questionnaire suggests that they may receive some type of disability benefit but this has not been mentioned by the respondent. These reactive checks were not successfully implemented in treatment groups two and three. Either protocol would benefit from re-instating these reactive checks more explicitly.

Education grants are under-reported in experimental treatment group two. However, we found that treatment group two slightly under-represents respondents between the ages of 16 and 24 while over-representing respondents over age 60. When controlling for respondent age, we found no significant difference between treatment group two and the BHPS nor Innovation Panel treatment group one for this item.

Two income sources were reported at rates less than 1 percent in the BHPS Wave 16 data. For this reason, we do not consider differences between the no-show card versions tested in the Innovation Panel and these items as being significant despite the analysis. Notably, we refer here to the Widow or War Widows Pension and Rent from Lodgers.

The mobility and care components of the Disability Living Allowance (DLA) were under-reported in both no-show card experimental treatments while not knowing the components seems to be over-reported in the these treatments. We found no difference between treatment group one, which approximated the BHPS show card version, and the BHPS Wave 16 current receipt. For this reason, we compared a collapsed no-show card distribution for treatment groups two and three against the BHPS version. We hoped to see that the distribution of respondents receiving some DLA irrespective of the components known matched across questioning protocols. We found, however, that the collapsed version still shows that the no-show card reporting to be under the show card reporting.

As a result of these analyses along with results from later cognitive testing of these questions, we adopted a modified version of the protocol administered to the second treatment group for the wave 1 design.

4.3 Job Satisfaction

The relationship between job satisfaction and other phenomena such as job quits and productivity is important for labour market research. Various studies have shown that workers less satisfied with their job are significantly more likely to quit (Akerloff, Rose and Yellen 1988; Clark, Georgellis and Sanfey 1998; Clark 2001; Freeman 1978; Levy-Garboua, Montmarquette and Simmonet 2001). The measurement of satisfaction, an inherently subjective phenomenon, can be affected however by even trivial aspects of survey design (Conti and Pudney forthcoming). For example, the methodological literature provides a variety of recommendations as to the appropriate number of response categories. Suggestions range from two or three (Johnson, Smith and Tucker 1982), to ten or more (Preston and Colman 2000) based on either internal consistency measured by Cronbach's α or test-retest reliability. Weng's (2004) substantial review of the literature suggests that a 7 point scale provides the most favourable results. Although the BHPS uses a 7 point scale to assess job satisfaction, several household longitudinal studies use 11 point rating scales. Offering respondents 11 points, ranging from 0 to 10 for example, tends to be argued to produce greater variability and better

statistical properties in such scales (Preston and Colman 2000). The purpose of this experiment was to evaluate the measurement properties of an 11 point job satisfaction scale as compared to the traditional 7 point version used in the BHPS.

Households were randomly assigned via a split-ballot version of the questionnaire into two treatment groups. All household members were treated identically. Employed respondents were provided with either an 11-point polar labelled satisfaction scale or a 7-point polar labelled satisfaction scale. The two versions of the questions are as follows:

> 11-point:
>
> "On a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means 'completely dissatisfied' and 10 means 'completely satisfied', how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your present job overall?"
>
> 7-point:
>
> "On a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 means 'completely dissatisfied' and 7 means 'completely satisfied', how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your present job overall?"

Note that a show card was not used for respondents; respondents were only provided with a verbal description of the scale they were to use in answering the question.

We found no significant difference in response rates for either scale implying that respondents were sufficiently able to answer the question regardless of the scale construction within it. The 11-point scale had a median of 8, a mean of 7.2 and a standard deviation of 2.1 while the 7-point scale had a median of 5, a mean of 5.2 and a standard deviation of 1.4. There was evidence of less clustering in the 11-point scale as compared to the 7-point scales. In the 11-point scale, 71 percent of respondents reported scores of 7-10. With the 7-point scale, about 78 percent of respondents report scores of 5-7. However, fewer than 10 percent report a score of 4 or lower on the 11-point scale. This suggests that the extended scale does not result in much more discrimination contrary to expectation.

The 7-point scale gives significant correlations with gender, age, education and earnings whereas the 11-point scale correlates only with education. Table

6 contains results of an ordered probit regression of various factors on the 7-point and 11-point job satisfaction scales. We see that few factors are predictive of job satisfaction when measured by the 11-point scale, with only excellent health and having a degree relative to no-degree as mildly significant predictors. Results of with the 7-point scale, however, show a strengthening of the bivariate results with age, marital status and education all showing moderate to strong effects on job satisfaction.

<Table 4 here>

The 7-point scale has been retained in wave 1 and future applications as a result of this exercise. Other work by Conti and Pudney (forthcoming) also suggests that the 7 point scale is more robust and reliable for these subjective measures than the 11 point scale and using the 7 point scale provides comparability with the 18 years of BHPS data already collected.

4.4 Household Consumption

Browning et al. (2003) and Attanasio et al. (2006) argue that researchers need longitudinal data on consumption and household expenditure, however a current lack of such information is a binding constraint in many areas of current research in both the UK and internationally. While a number of methods are employed in various other surveys, no clear cut question protocol exists that can efficiently gather the relevant expenditure data required for analysis. Indeed, Browning et al. “believe that the most accurate recall based measure of total expenditure will be derived from asking about an exhaustive list of highly disaggregated expenditure items. This is, however, a counsel of perfection that few general purpose surveys can afford” (2003 F560). Therefore, we experimented with three survey protocols intended to develop parsimonious questions to gather reasonable data with workable measurement properties. We focused on four key areas: food expenditure in the home; food expenditure out of the home; total non-durable expenditure; and personal expenditure on various items.

Households were randomly assigned via a split-ballot questionnaire design into one of three treatment groups. The questions about consumption were asked at the household level; the household reference person was asked to

provide information on expenditure for the household overall. The IP Wave 1 did not include any personal expenditure questions. Please see the questionnaire specification included in Appendix B.

The first treatment asked respondents to provide the total amount of household expenditure excluding housing costs and utility bills. The second treatment group asked for the same overall total sum but the question included cues about what should be included including such items as food eaten inside and outside the home, alcohol and tobacco, clothing and footwear for all household members, etc. The third experimental treatment group asked respondents a series of questions about levels of expenditure in a number of areas. Respondents were first asked for expenditure on food and groceries from a grocery store. They were then asked how much of that sum was for non-food items. Respondents were then asked for expenditure at places other than grocery stores. And lastly, we asked respondents for their household expenditure in a number of specific areas including: alcohol and tobacco; clothing and footwear; prescriptions and health expenses; public transport costs; telephone, landline, mobile and internet; and entertainment leisure and hobbies. The period over which respondents reported in each treatment group was the prior month. We asked the household reference person to provide expenditure numbers for all household members in total.

Item non-response, though generally low throughout the questionnaire, still remains relatively low with regard to all three sets of consumption questions. Notably, fewer than 10 percent of responding households had missing data across the items and with the third experimental treatment group total expenditure could be obtained for 88 percent of households and food-at-home expenditure for 93 percent. These response rates were similar to other surveys using similar items.

Interviewing time for the first two treatment groups were not significantly different from one another, however the administration time for the third treatment group was significantly longer.

The mean and median values for total expenditure obtained for each of the three treatment groups varied in expected directions. Notably, including the

cues in the total expenditure resulted in both higher mean and median expenditure (group 2 versus group 1) though these differences were not statistically significant. Group 1 had a mean expenditure of £674 and a median of £450 compared to a mean of £749 and median of £500 for group 2 with the extended cues. The series of expenditure items yielded the highest mean (£826) and median (£630) total expenditure and these totals were significantly different from either of the first experimental groups.

Bottazzi et al (May 2008) compared data from the IP experimentation to data obtained from the Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS) which uses a diary approach. They note that the categorisation for expenditure items used in the EFS does not match the categorisation used in the IP's third treatment group. They also noted that the EFS uses weights to obtain population representitiveness while the IP has no weights as yet. Despite these caveats, they found that the results for food expenditure were comparable in the IP as compared to the EFS. They found that budget shares and income elasticities for most goods were reasonably comparable except for in areas where expenditure categories could not be matched directly between surveys. They found, however, significant under-reporting in the IP data as compared to the EFS in terms of total expenditure across all three treatment groups. Notably the first two treatment groups capture only 50 to 60 percent of the total expenditure in the EFS. The sequence of questions used in the third treatment resulted in a derived total expenditure measure that was on average 67 to 69 percent of the EFS.

The questions about food consumption used in experimental treatment group three seemed to work although they are subject two design issues. Please see the experimental expenditure items in Appendix B for reference.

First, the initial question about expenditure refers to food and groceries while the second question asks respondents to deduct the amount they spent on non-food items. It may be the case that respondents were already deducting non-food items in the first question however the resulting data does not tell us whether this happened or not. If non-food items were included in the initial question by respondents, interested researchers should subtract non-food

items when obtaining a total expenditure which would result in the exclusion of non-food items that are not alcohol or tobacco from the total expenditure. Alternatively, if non-food items are not subtracted out the resulting total expenditure could result in double counting of alcohol and tobacco.

Second, the total expenditure question used for both treatment groups one and two concerned total expenses excluding housing costs and utility bills. These questions do not cue durables so it is not clear whether respondents are to include or exclude them in arriving at their total.

Given these design issues, the household food expenditure questions were revised for clarity and are included in the wave 1 questionnaire for the main panel. The remaining expenditure questions were retained for further testing and potential use at later waves.

5. Data quality assessments

In addition to running the experiments above, the Innovation Panel also tested the quality of the data resulting from a range of questions. For example, were the respondents able or wiling to answer the questions? Did the responses make sense? Are the results comparable with other data sources? The question areas here, include:

- Questions seeking consent to link to administrative data
- Questions used to indicate the scope for mixed-mode approaches
- Questions on national identity and heritage
- An ethnic minority screening question
- The SF-12 battery of health-related questions
- The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression scale (CES-D)
- A measure of disability
- The youth self-completion questionnaire
- The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, carried in the adult self-completion

In addition to the data collected during the survey from the respondent, we also analysed information from interviewer observations on the respondent, observations on the neighbourhood and address from an administrative address record form and a respondent feed-back form.

- A respondent feedback form
- Interviewer observations on the interview
- Information carried on the administrative address record form (ARF)

In this section, we will briefly outline each issue under analysis, the question or other source used to measure the issue, and the conclusions of the analysis.

5.1 Questions seeking consent to link to administrative data

At Wave 1 of *Understanding Society* we will be asking respondents for permission to link administrative data held about them by various government departments to the information they provide in the survey. The broad, multi-topic design of *Understanding Society*, together with the constraints on questionnaire time, mean that the depth of questioning may be limited. There are some areas where to get full, complete information would be time consuming and a significant cognitive burden for respondents. Where this information is held elsewhere, on an administrative database for example, the aim is to link those data to the respondent's survey information. This has the potential to increase the depth and scope of the survey.

At Wave 1 we will ask respondents for their permission to link data concerning health, education and economic circumstances. Asking permission to link in health data requires a lengthy and thorough appraisal by an NHS Multi-site Research Ethics Committee. We have successfully obtained ethical approval for both the BHPS and are awaiting confirmation of the approval for *Understanding Society*. At wave 1 of the Innovation Panel we did not therefore ask permission to link to health data but limited the consents to education and benefits data only.

Towards the end of the interview, respondents were presented with a form which asked for consent to link to benefits data (held by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC). Respondents aged 16-25 were also asked for permission to link to education data held by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). Respondents with children aged 4-15 were also asked for their permission to link to their child's education records.

We originally intended an experimental design to be applied when seeking these consents. We had planned for two-thirds of household to be asked for data linkage consent and for permission not to be sought from respondents in one-third of households. However, this experiment was not carried out correctly[2], and so we report the findings for those who were asked for permission.

Of respondents who were asked for permission to link to administrative records 57 percent of adults gave their consent to link in data held by the DWP. Almost two-thirds (65 percent) of parents gave their consent to link DCSF data on their children. For young adults (except those at school), 70 percent gave their consent to link to data about themselves held by the DCSF. These rates are lower than in other surveys which have asked for consent to link to administrative data, such as the English Longitudinal Survey of Aging (ELSA), the Improving Survey Measurement of Income and Employment (ISMIE) and the Families and Children Survey (FACS). However, these surveys had been established for a number of years before making the request to link to administrative data. With this being the first wave of the survey, respondents were unlikely to have developed the same degree of trust in the survey organisation and the survey itself.

Asking for permission to link in data from multiple domains did not appear to significantly affect consent rates overall. That is, respondents asked for consent to link in benefit and education data had similar consent rates to those just asked about benefit linkage. Young adults seemed to give permission for linkage to their own education data in a similar proportion to parents consenting on behalf of their under-16 year old children. Bearing in mind the small number of consents from young adults, there seems to be little risk of 'over-consenting' by asking parents to give permission on behalf of their children.

[2] 348 individuals in the "control" group were not asked to give consent, but it is unknown whether assignment into the groups were random due to a scripting error.

Consent rates did vary somewhat within the sample. For permission to link in DWP data this tended to vary by ethnicity and region. Asian respondents were the least likely to give their permission, particularly Indian and Pakistani respondents. Consent declined with age, with the elderly being less likely to give their permission. Consent rate was lowest in Wales and highest in England, with Scottish respondents being between the two. For permission to link in DCSF data, the variation was by number of school-age children in the household as rates increased with the number of children.

5.2 Questions used to indicate the scope for mixed-mode approaches

The wave 2 Innovation Panel will use a mixed mode approach with telephone and face to face interviews. At later waves, we also envisage using the internet to allow people to complete interviews online. At wave 1 of the Innovation Panel, we carried questions to assess the scope for using these types of mixed-mode approaches. We asked respondents whether they had a landline, a mobile phone and access to the internet.

About one in ten households (11 percent) did not have a land-line telephone and 10 percent of respondents lived in a household without a land-line telephone. Almost nine in ten respondents (88 percent) did personally have a mobile phone. Less than one per cent of respondents (0.7 percent) had neither a mobile phone nor a land-line phone. This suggests that there is near-universal phone coverage, and that for a proportion of respondents the *Understanding Society* survey will be carried out on a mobile telephone.

A set of questions exploring the possibility of carrying out an on-line survey was also included. Almost two-thirds (64 percent) of households had access to the internet while almost 57 percent of households had broadband access. In terms of individuals, 57 percent of adults use the internet for personal use and 81 percent of young people connect to the internet at home. There is a correlation of internet use within households; in 76 percent of households where at least one adult uses internet, all adults use the internet for personal use. Just over one-third of the respondents (35 percent) had already used the internet to complete forms or questionnaires in the past. We believe that this suggests that the internet potentially can be used to contact and interview

respondents, particularly among young people. However, we found some differences between who has and who has not got access to the internet implying potential coverage bias. Internet users tend to be more advantaged (i.e., higher educated, better health, in employment, ownership of cars, owner-occupiers), younger (78 percent of 16-24 year olds, compared to 28 percent of those aged 60 or more), more likely to be male, and more likely to live in England (rather than Scotland or Wales).

At the end of the interview, the interviewer asked the respondent for their contact details, so that they could be contacted the following year. The majority of respondents (94 percent) gave some form of contact, although most people (69 percent) gave just one contact. Most respondents gave a landline telephone number (71 percent) with around four in ten giving a mobile phone number (39 percent). Just 16.5 percent of respondents gave an email address (either work or personal). This means that collecting multiple contact details from each person will be an important component of the *Understanding Society* main-stage survey to help maintain contact with sample members.

5.3 Questions on national identity and heritage

We tested two sets of questions pertaining to national identity and heritage. First, we asked for the country of birth for the respondent, their parents and grandparents. Next, we asked about the respondent's sense of "Britishness". We were interested in ensuring that they worked effectively in a survey questionnaire and that respondents could accurately answer these types of questions. The questionnaire first asked the respondent for their own country of birth. They were then asked about the country of birth for their father and mother. Where the father of the respondent was born outside the UK, for a random half of the sample, we followed up with a question about where the respondent's grandparents were born ("and your father's father/father's mother, where was he/she born?"). Similarly, we asked the questions about maternal grandparents in cases where the respondent's mother was born outside the UK, for a random half of the sample.

Item non-response either by answering “Don’t Know” or refusal was relatively infrequent in these data. We did not allow responses of “don’t know” or refusals in answer the questions about the respondent’s own country of birth. Fewer than 1 percent of respondents answered “don’t know” to the questions about parents’ countries of birth. However, a greater proportion of respondents did not know their grandparents’ country of birth. Knowledge about paternal grandparents was more limited than maternal grandparents and less was known about grandfathers generally as compared to grandmothers. Approximately 6.5 percent of respondents did not know where their paternal grandfather was born and about 5.3 percent did not know where their paternal grandmother was born. At the same time, only 3.9 percent did not know their maternal grandfather’s country of birth but only 2.8 percent did not know where their maternal grandmother was born. All things considered, these relatively low levels of item non-response suggest that this is a suitable question to ask at the main stage of *Understanding Society* and likely will give good quality data.

We asked respondents not born in the UK for their country of birth. Of respondents asked this question (just 2.5 percent of the sample), over one-third (38.2 percent) gave an “other country” response. Where a respondent was born in an “other country”, 75 percent said that at least one of their parents were also born in an “other country”. To ensure all countries of birth are coded on the main survey, we will use a look-up table which will enable the interviewer to start to type in the country of birth and select the country quickly from a list. This will give us much richer information on country of birth.

We also asked respondents about “Britishness” at Wave 1 of the IP. We used a initial filter question followed by a question for those who said that they considered themselves to be British in some way. This asked;

> On a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 means 'not at all important' and 10 means 'extremely important', how important is being British to you?

Item non-response was very low on these questions (0.24 percent and 0.3 percent respectively), suggesting that the questions were understood and could be answered. Almost nine out of ten respondents (88.4 percent)

reported feeling British in some way. This proportion is highest in for those born in Wales (98.2 percent), lowest for those born in Scotland (62.2 percent) with those born in England (94 percent), Ireland (70.6 percent) and those born outside the UK (69.2 percent) in between. The average strength of identity (on a 0 to 10 scale) was 7.7, again with those born in Wales being the highest (8.4), those born in Scotland being the lowest (6.7) and those born in England (8.2), outside the UK (7.8) and Ireland (6.9) in between. We noted no obvious problems with the administration of these questions and they will be included at wave 1 mainstage.

5.4 An ethnic minority screening question

A major component of *Understanding Society* is an ethnic minority boost sample. Identifying the relevant ethnic minority groups for this boost sample will require a doorstep screening exercise. For this reason, we require a screening question which is simple to administer and to understand, and that successfully identifies groups to include in the boost sample. We tested a screening question on Innovation Panel Wave 1 which we have later refined as a result of subsequent cognitive testing and piloting.

We tested the following question for use as a doorstep screener:

> Does anyone living at this address come from, or have parents or grandparents from, any of the following ethnic groups or origins?
>
> INTERVIEWER: MIDDLE EASTERN INCLUDES TURKISH, KURDISH, AS WELL AS IRANIAN, IRAQI, ARAB NATIONS, ISRAELI.
>
> 1 Indian
> 2 Pakistani
> 3 Bangladeshi
> 4 Sri Lankan
> 5 East Asian
> 6 Caribbean
> 7 Chinese
> 8 Middle Eastern
> 9 North African
> 10 Sub Saharan African
> 11 Gypsy or Roma or Traveller
> 97 Other minority ethnic group
> 96 No - none of these

We asked this question at the household level and we disallowed missing responses. In the individual interview, we obtained each respondent's ethnicity ("Please look at this card and tell me which of these best describes your ethnic group") to check for 'false negatives'. That is, we were concerned that at the household level we would obtain a "No – none of these" response while someone in the household would self-identify as one of the ethnic groups named on the card. We found evidence of 'false negatives' on the household-level screening question in only 21 out of 1,165 households (1.4 percent). Of these 'false negatives' the respondent identified themselves as "African" or "other Asian" in eight cases; categories which were not available at the household screener question itself.

5.5 The SF-12 battery of health-related questions

The SF-12 is a short-form version of the longer SF-36 battery of health questions. The SF-36 series of health measures is comprised of eight scales measuring various aspects of health which can be combined into summary measures of physical and mental health. Although the SF-12 has twelve questions, rather than thirty-six, the eight health dimensions and two summary measures can be created from it. We tested the SF-12 for respondent usability and to verify that the eight sub-scales and two summary measures these measures produce were comparable with other studies.

This question battery did not suffer from item non-response as 0.06 percent of respondents non-responded to any of the items. This implies that most respondents had no problems answering theses questions. The data did allow us to create the eight subscales and summary measures. Analysis of the mean scale scores by various socio-demographic variables (such as education, job status, car use) demonstrated the expected gradients in health functioning. The results from the analysis by ethnicity gave differences in unexpected directions, however the sample size for this analysis was too small to be able to identify whether this was a serious problem. A comparison with US data shows that the mean physical component scale by age group was as expected. The mean mental component score did not agree with the US data, however this is consistent with other literature and may be a UK

phenomenon. As a result, the SF-12 will be carried at wave 1 on the main sample.

5.6 A measure of Disability

The IP Wave 1 interview included a question designed to identify those with a disability in line with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) definition. The question used is carried on several other surveys but we felt it important to test whether respondents can easily answer the question and the resulting data are comparable to those from other surveys. The question used was:

> Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity? By 'long-standing' I mean anything that has troubled you over a period of at least 12 months or that is likely to affect you over a period of at least 12 months.

Around three in ten (29.1 percent) of respondents declared that they suffer from a long-standing illness (LSI). This proportion is comparable to findings from the Labour Force Survey and the Family Resources Survey (for a working-age population). The proportion of people with an LSI was highest in Wales (31.7 percent) and Scotland (30.9 percent) and lowest in England (28.8 percent). This pattern of regional variation is similar to Census findings, although the levels found in the Innovation Panel were higher because the Census applies a more restricted definition of LSI. Subsequent discussions and advice have resulted in a modification of the wording to include *'mental or physical impairments'* to bring the question in line with the requirements of the DDA.

5.7 The Youth self-completion questionnaire

The Innovation Panel included a paper self-completion questionnaire for children aged 10-15. This questionnaire covered themes and topics such as TV watching, computer use, close friends, relationship with parents, a behavioural screening instrument known as the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), satisfaction with various aspects of life, aspirations for the future, school, siblings, health, nutrition and neighbourhood.

The SDQ contains 25 statements the truth of which the respondent is to report by saying either “not true”, “somewhat true” or “certainly true”. These items factor into five scales: (1) emotional; (2) conduct problems; (3)

hyperactivity/inattention (4) peer relationship problems; and (5) pro-social behaviour. Item non-response on these statements ranged from 2 percent to 7 percent. The scale construction guidelines with the SDQ provide instructions for imputing data where respondents up to 2 items. However, this is a low level of non-response which suggests that young people have little or no trouble answering these questions. The percentage of young people classified as borderline or abnormal was quite high for the 'conduct' and 'hyperactivity' scales. However, this may be due to a different age distribution in the Innovation Panel sample as compared to the samples upon which norms and bandings are usually based. Boys were most likely to be abnormal cases for 'conduct', 'peer' and 'pro-social behaviour' which is as expected.

The youth self-completion questionnaire also carried questions about bullying. We tested these questions because young people may perceive these questions as being sensitive. Item non-response on the questions about school bullying was relatively low, ranging from 1 percent to 6 percent. Few young people admitted to bullying other people, though this is a frequent finding in the literature. For example, the results from Innovation Panel Wave 1 were very similar to those found on the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) for bullying perpetration. We found, however, that rates of being a victim of bullying in the IP Wave 1 were lower than the ALSPAC. As expected, questions on sibling bullying revealed a higher proportion of victims and bullies than those for school bullying.

5.8 The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index

The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) was carried in the adult paper self-completion instrument. As mentioned above, all adults aged 16 and over were asked to complete this self-administered questionnaire. The PSQI is comprised of nineteen items which generate seven subscales measuring subjective sleep quality, sleep latency, sleep duration, habitual sleep efficiency, sleep disturbances, use of sleeping medication and daytime dysfunction.

Item non-response ranged between 2 percent and 5 percent, generally. One item suffered a high non-response rate of 11 percent (frequency of having

trouble sleeping for “some other reason”). Just over one-fifth (21 percent) of respondents gave responses which indicate poor sleep quality. Poor sleep quality correlated with being elderly, in fair or poor health, out of the labour force, living in rent-free accommodation, and not owning a car or owning just one car as opposed to more than one. These findings reflect what we would expect from the literature on sleep quality. Comparable to findings elsewhere, the global sleep quality score obtained from this index showed that about 44 percent of respondents had significant sleep disturbances. A sub-set of the sleep questions will be carried at wave 1 on the main sample.

5.9 Respondent feedback

In addition to substantive survey items, we ask respondents for their feedback on the interview itself through a self-completion questionnaire. Interviewers asked respondents to complete and post back the questionnaire in a Freepost envelope. We implemented these procedures to maintain confidentiality and to assure the respondent that the interviewer would not see what they had written. The respondent feedback form carried twenty items about the specific interview in which they had just participated and twelve items about their attitudes to surveys in general. The resulting feedback data could be linked to the respondent’s main survey data through their serial and person numbers included on the feedback form.

The response rate on the feedback forms was quite low, although high for a mail-back questionnaire, with 42.4 percent of interviewed individuals returning a feedback form. We found quite a wide interviewer variation in the number of forms returned, with some interviewers having no forms returned from their households at all. This suggests that some interviewers may not have been distributing the feedback form at the end of the interview. Also, on around 17 percent of forms information such as the serial number, person number and/or date of birth was missing or incorrect, suggesting that interviewers failed copy these pieces of information correctly onto the forms before giving them to respondents to complete. After checking and cleaning these paper instruments, only about 5.3 percent of returned forms could not be matched to the substantive interview data. Failure to hand out feedback forms or to forget

or incorrectly write identifiers on the forms seems unrelated to respondent characteristics although particular geographic areas may be under-represented in the resulting data due to this aspect of interviewer error.

Individual respondent characteristics may affect returning feedback forms, however. Certain types of respondents may be more likely to return a leave-behind self-completion instrument which may lead to response bias. Since we have information on people who returned the form as well as those who were interviewed but did not return the form, we can estimate the extent of such non-response bias. Those most likely to return the forms were women, older respondents, those with a first degree or higher qualification, those who were employed or out of the labour force (rather than unemployed), those who gave their consent to the DWP benefits linkage and those who were rated by interviewers as having “very good” co-operation. Compared to the “White British” ethnic group, Indian and Pakistani respondents were less likely to return their forms, whilst Caribbean and other (non-African) Black respondents were more likely. We believe that the response rate to the feedback form could have been increased through improved interviewer briefing. A re-design of the feedback form may also reduce the number of errors or missing serial numbers.

Since those who were rated by the interviewer as having “very good” co-operation were more likely to return their feedback forms, it should be borne in mind that the results of the form are likely to be skewed towards those who are most enthusiastic and co-operative. This effect is exacerbated by the fact that those who responded to the feedback form are themselves respondents to the survey interview. Those who are less co-operative towards survey organisations would be less likely to take part in the IP Wave 1 and would, if they take part, be less likely to complete and return the feedback form.

The data from the respondent feedback instrument suggest that most of the respondents felt quite positively towards the survey. Around two-thirds of respondents said that they like to give their help when they are asked while a similar proportion reported that they trusted the motives of the survey organisation. Over half (56 percent) thought that the survey seemed relevant

to them and just under half (46 percent) thought that they might enjoy the survey. Just under three in ten (28 percent) said that they thought that parts of the survey were too personal. Similar proportions said that they found parts of the survey too difficult (17 percent) or that it took too much time (16 percent). Considering surveys in general, respondents clearly held positive opinions towards surveys. About 89 percent agreed that “surveys are useful ways to gather information” (89 percent) while about 85 percent believe that “a lot can be learned from information gathered from surveys”. The methodological issues behind survey response were also appreciated, with three-quarters of the respondents saying that “survey respondents try hard to respond accurately” (75 percent), “survey participants are likely to give their true opinion” (70 percent) and “ordinary, representative people are interviewed in surveys” (63 percent). On the other side of the scale, 8 percent thought that surveys stopped people from doing more important things and just 4.5 percent agreed that “surveys are a complete waste of time”.

5.10 Interviewer observations on the interview

At the end of the individual interview, the interviewer completes a small number of administrative questions obtaining various details of the interview setting as well as the interviewer’s evaluation of how the interview was conducted. In over half of the interviews (52.5 percent) someone else was present apart from the respondent and interviewer. In three-quarters of these cases (75.8 percent) the other person did not influence any of the answers given by the respondent at all. In one-fifth (19.9 percent) of the cases where there was someone else present, the respondent was “a little” influence. In only 4.3 percent of cases where someone other than the interviewer was present did the other person have a “fair amount” or “a great deal” of influence. The type of influence was mostly where the other person helped the respondent with the recall of dates or amounts (4.5 percent of all interviews) or where the respondent sought help or conferred with others (3.4 percent). In some cases the other person answered directly for the respondent (2.4 percent) or changed the respondent’s answers (0.7 percent).

Interviewers rated the respondent's cooperation. Eight out of ten respondents were rated as having "very good" co-operation (81 percent), with most of the rest (14.6 percent) having "good" cooperation. Interviewers rated just 3.9 percent of respondents as having "fair" co-operation and 0.4 percent as having "poor" co-operation. Interestingly, survey cooperation was unrelated to the incentive treatment group allocated to them. At the same time, respondent cooperation was not related to interview length. However, respondents in England were significantly more cooperative than respondents in Wales or Scotland. About 82.4 percent of English respondents were rated "very good", followed by 74.6 percent of respondents in Wales and 63.8 percent of respondents in Scotland. These observations have proved useful predictors of attrition on the BHPS (Uhrig, 2008) so will be included on the main survey.

5.11 Information carried on the administrative address record form (ARF)

Field administration of the sample was facilitated with an Address Record Form (ARF) for each sampled address. Interviewers used the ARF to record details about the calls made to sampled addresses, to designate which households to interview in the event of a multi-household address and to record information on the eligibility of households and the outcome of the interview attempt. A number of interviewer observations about the type of address and the surrounding area where the sampled address was located were carried. These items included:

- type of area (inner city, town centre, suburban, rural etc)
- the predominant building type in the area (terraces, semi-detached, detached, flats etc)
- the particular building type of the sample address
- the number of floors in the dwelling at the address
- the floor of the structure on which the household lives
- any physical barriers to the household
- the physical condition of the building
- state of the immediate area (boarded-up houses, abandoned cars, litter in the street etc)
- the maintenance of the address compared to others in the same street

- a description of the area (well-off/affluent, middle class, poor, very poor areas)
- the ethnic mix of the area
- the internal condition of the address (clean and tidy, clean and messy, not very clean, dirty)

We found contact and cooperation rates were associated with various aspects of the dwelling unit and surrounding area as observed by interviewers. Interviewers obtained a higher household contact rates amongst addresses in rural areas largely due to fewer refusals and fewer ineligible address (e.g., businesses) in rural areas. Given contact, respondent cooperation did not vary by area urbanicity. Non-contact was approximately 2.5 times higher for properties with any poor conditions (e.g. an unkempt garden) as compared to well-kept properties. Non-contact was also more likely in flats and high rise dwellings as compared to other dwelling types. Once contact has been made, we found that individual refusal was unrelated to the characteristics of the dwelling unit or its surrounding area.

6. Implications for survey design at wave 1

The evidence from both the experimental and data quality assessment elements of the Innovation Panel have directly influenced the design and fieldwork operations planned for the main wave 1 survey. The ability to properly test differing incentive strategies provided the evidence needed to make the decisions about incentive levels and how these should be delivered to respondent at wave 1 to maximise response rates. The experimental designs on question wording and format also provided the evidence we needed to make decisions and justify those decisions in the design of the questionnaire. Assessing the quality of other measures and comparing these to external sources, validated and provided confidence that the questions could be asked reliably at wave 1 of the panel study. And the additional information gathered about the context of the interview and the views of respondent has enabled a better understanding of the fieldwork process and respondent reactions to the survey process.

This paper provides only a summary of some of the key findings to date. Inevitable, the analysis has produced a raft of new methodological questions

which we hope to address in future waves of the Innovation Panel for Understanding Society.

Appendix A – Tables

Table 1 Household level response rates by incentive group

	£5 per adult	£10 per adult	£5 becoming £10	*All*
Productive HH	55.7%	61.4%	60.7%	59.0
Refusal HH	28.0%	27.3%	27.6%	27.6
Non-contact HH	5.9%	2.8%	4.7%	4.6
Other non-productive HH	10.4%	8.5%	7.0%	8.8
N Households	832	836	833	2501*

*Base is eligible addresses and those of unknown eligibility

Table 2 Proportion of productive households fully cooperating for each incentive treatment group

	£5 per adult	£10 per adult	£5 becoming £10	X^2 (*p*-value)
Any productive HH	84.9%	88.5%	87.2%	2.9 (> 0.10)
Full and proxy in HH	84.4%	87.9%	87.0%	2.7 (> 0.10)
Full and partials in HH	72.9%	79.1%	79.9%	8.1 (< 0.05)
Only full interviews in HH	72.7%	78.6%	79.7%	7.7 (< 0.05)

Note: Shown are the proportions of households participating. “Any productive HH” includes full interviews, partial interviews, proxy interviews and partial proxy interviews. “Full and proxy in HH” includes only full and proxy interviews amongst household members. “Full and partials in HH” includes only full and partial interviews amongst household members.

Table 3 Response distributions of unearned income sources, comparison to BHPS Wave 16

	BHPS	IP-V1	IP-V2	IP-V3	X^2 for BHPS vs IP-V1	X^2 for BHPS vs IP-V2	X^2 for BHPS vs IP-V3
NI retirement pension	20.6%	21.8%	21.5%	19.2%	0.883	0.448	1.070
Pension from previous employer	13.3%	13.3%	12.5%	11.7%	0.000	0.432	1.782
Pension from spouse's ex employer	3.5%	3.7%	3.6%	2.6%	0.121	0.028	2.111
Private pension / annuity	4.0%	4.6%	2.0%	2.4%	0.805	**8.711**	**5.863**
Widow / war widows pension	0.8%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	1.767	**4.821**	1.544
Widowed mothers allowance	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.601	0.553	2.349
Pension credit	3.1%	3.9%	3.1%	2.2%	1.747	0.211	2.753
Severe disablement allowance	0.8%	1.1%	0.3%	0.6%	0.858	2.345	0.434
Industrial injury allowance	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	**4.341**	**5.576**	**4.117**
Attendance allowance	2.2%	1.2%	1.1%	0.8%	**4.327**	**4.715**	**7.499**
Invalid care allowance	0.8%	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	**5.701**	0.715	0.811
War disability pension	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.003	0.263	1.646
Incapacity benefit	2.8%	2.0%	2.7%	2.0%	2.373	0.269	2.344
DLA (care)	3.3%	2.8%	1.6%	1.3%	0.533	**6.759**	**9.923**
DLA (mobility)	3.3%	3.4%	2.0%	2.1%	0.045	**4.456**	**4.000**
DKA (dk)	1.1%	1.1%	3.0%	2.8%	0.021	**21.091**	**16.519**
DLA (all collapsed)[a]		5.4%	3.0%	2.8%		**8.666**	**7.811**
Income support	3.9%	4.6%	3.8%	4.3%	1.106	0.146	0.441
Job seekers allowance	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%	0.015	0.026	0.069
National Insurance Credits[b]		0.1%	0.3%	0.2%			
Child benefit	19.1%	17.6%	18.1%	17.7%	1.223	0.637	1.112
Child benefit (lone parent)[c]	1.6%						
Child tax credit	10.5%	11.9%	12.5%	13.4%	1.903	3.534	**7.153**
Working family tax credit	5.5%	3.1%	5.2%	4.8%	**10.009**	1.162	1.689
Maternity allowance	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.062	1.966	0.630
Housing benefit	6.2%	8.2%	6.9%	5.5%	**6.198**	1.192	1.448
Council tax benefit	10.4%	9.3%	9.6%	6.5%	1.181	0.686	**13.524**
Other state benefit	0.4%	0.8%	2.0%	1.7%	2.139	**29.073**	**23.135**
Educational grant	1.2%	1.0%	0.1%	0.6%	0.316	**8.093**	2.259
Trade union payments	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.361	0.332	0.347
Maintenance or alimony	1.9%	1.2%	0.3%	0.7%	2.995	**11.394**	**6.807**
Payments from relations	0.9%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.944	**7.896**	**8.293**
Rent from lodgers	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.3%	1.046	**5.618**	1.671
Rent from other property	2.9%	1.9%	0.5%	1.2%	3.355	**15.946**	**8.195**
Foster allowance	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	**3.872**	1.101	1.666
Sickness or accident insurance	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.323	0.738	0.764
Any other payment	0.7%	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.075	5.910	1.026

Notes:
X^2 values with $p < 0.05$ are shown in **bold.**
[a] DLA components are collapsed together and compared with IP-V1, since IP-V1 does not differ from BHPS W16 in distribution across the components.
[b] National Insurance credits are not queried in BHPS W16.
[c] Child benefit (lone parent) is subsumed within Child Benefit in the IP.

Table 4 Maximum likelihood estimates from an ordered probit model of various factors regressed on 7-point or 11-point job satisfaction measures

	10-Point		7-Point	
	Coeff	St Err	Coeff	St Err
Female	0.16	0.10	0.04	0.10
Age < 25 vs 25-59	-0.23	0.16	0.11	0.17
Age > 60 vs 25-59	0.08	0.21	0.41**	0.20
Married vs Other	0.16	0.12	0.02	0.12
Cohabiting vs Other	0.03	0.14	-0.35**	0.15
Born Abroad	-0.06	0.16	0.27	0.19
Excellent Health	0.16*	0.09	0.11	0.10
Degree vs No Degree	-0.36*	0.18	-0.60***	0.23
Compulsory Education vs No Degree	-0.19	0.18	-0.59***	0.21
Other Education vs No Degree	-0.10	0.18	-0.44**	0.21
Gross Hourly Pay	0.00	0.00	0.02**	0.01
Part-Time Employee	0.07	0.12	0.15	0.12
Permanent Employment	-0.13	0.18	-0.07	0.24
Manager	0.01	0.10	0.16	0.11
Sample N	526		500	
Likelihood-ratio X2	21.28		39.27	
Prob > X2	0.09		0.00	

Notes: * $p < 0.10$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$

Appendix B – Questionnaire Sections

Unearned Income Sources
Treatment Group 1

---

* **BenPenG1** *

SHOWCARD 12

I am going to show you four cards listing different types of income and payments. Please look at this card and tell me if you are currently receiving any of the types of income or payments shown, either just yourself or jointly?

INTERVIEWER: IF YES ASK 'Which ones?', PROBE 'Any others?' UNTIL FINAL 'NO' REPEAT FOR EACH CARD IN TURN

1 NI Retirement/State Retirement (Old Age) Pension
2 A pension from a previous employer
3 A pension from a spouse's previous employer
4 A Private Pension / Annuity
5 A Widow's or War Widow's Pension
6 A Widowed Mother's Allowance / Widowed Parent's Allowance / Bereavement Allowance
7 Pension Credit (includes Guarantee Credit & Saving Credit)
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 7

NOTES Note revised wording – current receipt

---

* **BenDisG1** *

SHOWCARD 13

1 Severe Disablement Allowance
2 Industrial Injury Disablement Allowance
3 Disability Living Allowance: Care Component
4 Disability Living Allowance: Mobility Component
5 Disability Living Allowance: Components not known
6 Attendance Allowance
7 Carer's Allowance (formerly Invalid Care Allowance)
8 War Disablement Pension
9 Incapacity Benefit
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 9

NOTES Note revised wording – current receipt

---

* **BenSupG1** *

SHOWCARD 14

1 Income Support
2 Job Seeker's Allowance
3 National Insurance Credits
4 Return to Work Credit
5 Child Benefit (including Lone-Parent Child Benefit payments)
6 Child Tax Credit
7 Working Tax Credit (includes Disabled Person's Tax Credit)
8 Maternity Allowance
9 Housing Benefit / Rent Rebate or Allowance
10 Council Tax Benefit
11 Any other state benefit, allowance or credit
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 11

NOTES Note revised wording – current receipt

---

* **BenPayG1** *

SHOWCARD 15

1 Educational Grant (not Student Loan or Tuition Fee Loan
2 Trade Union / Friendly Society Payment
3 Maintenance or Alimony
4 Payments from a family member _not_ living here
5 Rent from boarders or lodgers (not family members) living here with you
6 Rent from any other property
7 Foster Allowance / Guardian Allowance
8 Sickness or Accident Insurance
9 Any other regular payment
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 9

NOTES Note revised wording – current receipt

*** NFA_G1 ***

*** Universe*** BenPenG1 <> 1 & ((SEX = 1 & HGAGE > 64) | (SEX = 2 & HGAGE > 59))

Can I just check, do you currently receive the State Retirement Pension?

1 Yes, receives pension (inc. joint receipt)
2 No, does not receive

Notes bhps NFA

***NFB_G1** *

Universe ((A1 in BenPenG1) OR (NFA_G1 = 1)) & NOT ((((((A2 in BenPenG1) | (3 in BenPenG1)) | (4 in BenPenG1)) | (5 in BenPenG1)) | (6 in BenPenG1)) | (7 in BenPenG1))

Do you currently receive Pension Credit?

1 Yes, receives pension credit (inc. joint receipt
2 No, does not receive

NOTES bhps NFB

---

* **NFC_G1** *

Universe (JbStat = 8 | Health = 1) & JBHAS = 2 & JBOFF = 2 & A96 in BenDisG1

Can I just check, do you currently receive disability benefits of any kind?

1 Yes
2 No

NOTES bhps NFC

---

* **BenAlG1** *

Universe (JbStat = 8 | Health = 1) & JBHAS = 2 & JBOFF = 2 & A96 in BenDisG1 & NFC_G1 = 1

SHOWCARD 16

Which ones do you receive?

INTERVIEWER: CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1 Severe Disablement Allowance
2 Industrial Injury Disablement Allowance
3 Disability Living Allowance: Care Component
4 Disability Living Allowance: Mobility Component
5 Disability Living Allowance: Components not known
6 Attendance Allowance
7 Carer's Allowance (formerly Invalid Care Allowance)
8 War Disablement Pension
9 Incapacity Benefit

Maximum number of mentions: 9

NOTES bhps NFD

---

* **NFE_G1** *

Universe (JbStat = 3 Unemployed) & NOT ((1 in BenSupG1) | (2 in BenSupG1))

Can I just check, do you currently receive any benefits such as Income Support or Job Seeker's Allowance?

INTERVIEWER: CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1 Yes, Income Support
2 Yes, Job Seeker's Allowance

3 No, receive none of these

Maximum number of mentions: 2

NOTES bhps NFE
---
* **NFF_G1** *

Universe ((PSex = 2 Female) & (NChUnd18Resp > 0)) & NOT (A5 IN BenSupG1)

Can I just check, do you currently receive Child Benefit?

1 Yes, receives child benefit
2 No not receiving (no children eligible)

NOTES bhps NFF
---
* **NFG_G1** *

Universe ((A7 in BenPenG1) | (5 in BenDisG1)| (9 in BenDisG1) | (1 in BenSupG1) | (2 in BenSupG1) | (NFB_G1 = 1) | (NFC_G1 = 1) | (A1 in NFE_G1) | (2 in NFE_G1)) & NOT (A9 in BenSupG1)

Can I just check, do you currently receive Housing Benefit?

1 Yes, receives Housing Benefit
2 No not receiving Housing Benefit

NOTES bhps NFG

Treatment Group 2

***Computed TFTax ***

Universe Region IN [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales]

---
* **BTypeG2** *

Universe Group3 = 2

First, which of the following types of benefits or other payments are you currently receiving either just yourself or jointly?

INTERVIEWER: ASK EACH AND CODE

1 Unemployment-related benefits, or National Insurance Credits?
2 Income Support
3 Sickness or disability benefits
4 Any sort of pension including State Pension
5 Child Benefit
6 Any other family related benefits or payments
7 [Housing or Council Tax Benefit / Rent or Rate Rebate]
8 Tax credits

9 Some other state benefit
10 Any other payment including education grants, rent from property, alimony or maintenance
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 10

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

---

* **BenUnempG2** *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (A1 in BTypeG2)

Are you currently receiving any of the following either just yourself or jointly... READ OUT...

1 Job Seeker's Allowance
2 Or National Insurance Credits?
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 3

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

---

* **BenDisG2** *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (A3 in BTypeG2)

Which of the following are you currently receiving either just yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

1 Incapacity Benefit
2 Severe Disablement Allowance
3 Carer's Allowance
4 Disability Living Allowance 5 Attendance Allowance

6 Industrial Injury Disablement Benefit
7 War Disablement Pension
8 Or sickness and Accident Insurance?
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 9

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

---

* **BenDLAg2** *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (A3 in BTypeG2 & A4 in BenDisG2)

Which of the following Disability Living Allowance components, do you currently receive the following either just yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

1 Care component
2 Or Mobility Component?

96 None of these
3 (Don't know components)

Maximum number of mentions: 4

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

---

*__Computed WarDisTxt__ *

Universe Group3 = 2 & A4 IN BTypeG2 & BenDisG2 = RESPONSE

---

* __BenPenG2__ *

Universe Group3 = 2 & A4 in BTypeG2

Can I just check, which of the following are you currently receiving either just yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

1 NI Pension or State Retirement (Old Age) Pension?
2 A pension from a previous employers
3 A pension from a spouse's previous employer
7 Pension Credit including Guarantee Credit & Saving Credit?
4 A private pension or annuity
5 A Widow's or War Widow's Pension?
6 A Widowed Mother's or Parent's Allowance, or Bereavement Allowance
8 [/ Or War Disablement Pension?] (NOT WarDisTxt)
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 9

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

---

* __NISERPS__ *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (A4 in BTypeG2) & (A1 in BenPenG2)

You say you receive the State Retirement Pension. Does this include any income from the State Earnings Related Pension Scheme, also known as SERPS?

1 Yes
2 No

NOTES bhps NF4

---

* __BenCTCg2__ *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (A5 in BTypeG2)

Are you receiving the Child Tax Credit either just yourself or jointly?

1 Yes
2 No

---
* **BenFamG2** *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (A6 in BTypeG2)

which of the following family related benefits are you currently receiving either just yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

1 Foster Allowance or Guardian Allowance
2 Maternity Allowance
3 Maintenance or Alimony
4 Or any payments from a family member not living with you?
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 5

NOTES Adapted from LFS tel

---
*__Computed PenCredTxt__ *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (A8 in BTypeG2) & (BenPenG2 = RESPONSE

---
*__Computed ChTaxCred__ *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (A8 in BTypeG2) & (A5 in BTypeG2)

---
* **BenTaxG2** *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (A8 in BTypeG2)

Which of the following tax credit payments are you currently receiving either just yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

1 Working Tax Credit, including Disabled Person's Tax Credit
2 Council Tax Benefit
3 [/ Pension Credit including Guarantee Credit or Saving Credit] (If PenCredTxt)
4 [/ Or Child Tax Credit?] (If ChTaxCred)
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 5

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

---
*__Computed TFHou__ *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (Region in [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales])

---
*__Computed TFCou__ *

Universe Group3 = 2 & (Region in [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales])

---
*__Computed TFRen__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 2 & (Region in [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales])

---
*__Computed TFRat__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 2 & (Region in [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales])

---
* __BenHouG2__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 2 & (A7 in BTypeG2)

Which of the following housing related benefits are you currently receiving?... READ OUT...

1	[Housing Benefit /] (If TFHou)
2	[Council Tax Benefit /] (If TFCou)
3	[/ Rent or Rate Rebate] (If not TFRen)
4	[/ Or Rate Rebate?] (If not TFRat)
96	None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 5

__*NOTES**__ Adapted from LFS tel
---
*__Computed PrivPen__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 2 & (A10 in BTypeG2) & (BenPenG2 = RESPONSE)

---
*__Computed MaintAlim__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 2 & (A10 in BTypeG2) & (BenFamG2 = RESPONSE)

---
*__Computed PayFam__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 2 & (A10 in BTypeG2) & (BenFamG2 = RESPONSE)

---
* __BenStaG2__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 2 & (A10 in BTypeG2)

[And / Aside from the types of payments we have been discussing] Which of the following types of payments are you currently receiving either yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

INTERVIEWER: ASK EACH AND CODE

1 [/ A private pension or annuity] (if PrivPen)
2 Education Grant other than a Student Loan or Tuition Fee Loan either yourself or jointly
3 Trade Union or Friendly Society Payment
4 [/ Maintenance or Alimony] (If MaintAlim)
5 [/ Payments from a family member not living with you] (If PayFam)
6 Rent from Boarders or Lodgers (not family members) living here with you
7 Rent from any other property
8 Or any other regular payment?
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 9

NOTES Adapted from LFS tel

Treatment Group 3

---

* **Benefit_G3** *

Universe Group3 = 3

First, are you currently receiving any State Benefit or Tax Credit (including State Pension, Allowances, Child Benefit or National Insurance Credits)?

1 Yes
2 No

NOTES Adapted from LFS tel

---

* **Payment_G3** *

Universe Group3 = 3

[Aside from any State Benefit or Tax Credit, are / Are] you currently receiving any other sort of regular payment such as from an employment or private pension, maintenance or alimony, an education grant, rent from property, sickness or accident insurance?

1 Yes
2 No

NOTES For UKHLS

***Computed TFTax** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (Benefit_G3 = 1) & (Region in [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales])

---

* **BTypeG3** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (Benefit_G3 = 1)

Which of the following types of benefits are you currently receiving either just yourself or jointly?

INTERVIEWER: ASK EACH AND CODE

1 Unemployment-related benefits, or National Insurance Credits?
2 Income Support
3 Sickness or disability benefits
4 State Pension
5 Child Benefit
6 Any other family related benefits
7 [Housing or Council Tax Benefit / Rent or Rate Rebate] (If TFTax)
8 Tax credits
9 Some other state benefit
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 9

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

---

* **BenUnempG3** *

Universe Group3 = 1 & (A1 in BTypeG3)

Are you currently receiving any of the following either just yourself or jointly... READ OUT...

1 Job Seeker's Allowance
2 Or National Insurance Credits?
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 3

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

---

* **BenDisG3** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A3 in BTypeG3)

Are you currently receiving any of the following either just yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

1 Incapacity Benefit
2 Severe Disablement Allowance
3 Carer's Allowance
4 Disability Living Allowance
5 Attendance Allowance
6 Industrial Injury Disablement Benefit
7 Or War Disablement Pension?
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 8

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

---
* **BenDLAg3** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A3 in BTypeG3) & (A4 in BenDisG3)

Which of the following Disability Living Allowance components do you currently receive either just yourself or jointly? ... READ OUT...

1 Care component
2 Or Mobility Component?
96 None of these
3 (Don't know components)

Maximum number of mentions: 4

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

***Computed WarDisTxt** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A4 in BTypeG3) & BenDisG3 = RESPONSE)

---
* **BenPenG3** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A4 IN BTypeG3)

Can I just check, are you currently receiving any of the following either just yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

1 NI Pension or State Retirement (Old Age) Pension?
2 A Widow's or War Widow's Pension?
4 Pension Credit including Guarantee Credit & Saving Credit?
3 A Widowed Mother's or Parent's Allowance, or Bereavement Allowance
5 [/ Or War Disablement Pension?] (If WarDisTxt)
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 6

NOTES Adapted LFS tel
---
* **NISERPS** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A4 in BTypeG3) & (A1 in BenPenG3)

You say you receive the State Retirement Pension. Does this include any income from the State Earnings Related Pension Scheme, also known as SERPS?

1 Yes
2 No

NOTES bhps NF4
---

* **BenCTCg3** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A5 in BTypeG3)

Are you receiving the Child Tax Credit either just yourself or jointly?

1 Yes
2 No

---
* **BenFamG3** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A6 in BTypeG3)

Are you currently receiving the following family related benefits either just yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

1 Foster Allowance or Guardian Allowance
2 Or Maternity Allowance?
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 3

NOTES Adapted LFS tel

***Computed PenCredTxt** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A8 in BTypeG3) & (BenPenG3 = RESPONSE

***Computed ChTaxCred** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A8 in BTypeG3) & ((A5 in BTypeG3) | (BenCTCg3 = RESPONSE)

---
* **BenTaxG3** *

Universe Group3 = 3 & (A8 in BTypeG3)

Which of the following tax credit payments are you currently receiving either just yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

1 Working Tax Credit, including Disabled Person's Tax Credit
2 Council Tax Benefit
3 [/ Pension Credit including Guarantee Credit or Saving Credit] (If PenCredTxt)
4 [/ Or Child Tax Credit?] (If ChTaxCred)
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 5

NOTES Adapted LFS tel
---

*__Computed TFHou__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 3 & (Region in [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales])

---
*__Computed TFCou__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 3 & (Region in [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales])

---
*__Computed TFRen__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 3 & (Region in [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales])

---
*__Computed TFRat__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 3 & (Region in [1 England, 3 Scotland, 2 Wales])

---
* __BenHouG3__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 3 & (A7 in BTypeG3)

Which of the following housing related benefits are you currently receiving?... READ OUT...

1 [Housing Benefit /] (If TFHou)
2 [Council Tax Benefit /] (If TFCou)
3 [/ Rent or Rate Rebate] (If not TFRen)
4 [/ Or Rate Rebate?] (If not TFRat)
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 5

__*NOTES**__ Adapted from LFS tel

__* BenStaG3__ *

__*Universe**__ Group3 = 3 & Payment_G3 = 1

[Aside from the types of payments we have been discussing / And] Which of the following types of payments are you currently receiving either yourself or jointly?... READ OUT...

INTERVIEWER:ASK EACH AND CODE

1 A pension from a previous employer?
2 A pension from a spouse's previous employer
3 A private pension or annuity
4 Education Grant other than a Student Loan or Tuition Fee Loan
5 Trade Union or Friendly Society Payment
6 Maintenance or Alimony
7 Payments from a family member not living with you

8 Rent from Boarders or Lodgers (not family members) living here with you
9 Rent from any other property
10 Sickness or Accident Insurance
11 Or any other regular payment?
96 None of these

Maximum number of mentions: 12

NOTES Adapted for UKHLS

Consumption Questions

Treatment Group 1

***XpAll_G1 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 1

The next question deals with the expenses of your household. Apart from your housing costs and utility bills, about how much has your household spent on *all other expenses in the last month*, such as food, clothing, transport and entertainment costs?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New as per IFS suggestion but revised to exclude items already collected

---

Treatment Group 2

***XpAll_G2 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 2

The next question deals with the expenses of your household. Apart from your housing costs and utility bills, about how much has your household spent on *all other expenses in the last month*? Please include food eaten at home and food eaten outside the home, alcohol and tobacco, clothing and footwear for all household members, medicines and health expenses, car and public transport costs, telephone and internet costs, entertainment, leisure activities and hobbies.

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New as per IFS suggestion but revised to exclude items already collected

---

Treatment Group 3

***XpFood1_G3 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 3

Can you tell me approximately how much your household has spent on food and groceries at a grocery store or supermarket in the *last month*?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New from CEX

***XpFood2_G3 ***

Universe If XPFood1_G3 > 0

About how much of this amount was for non-food items, such as paper products, detergents, home cleaning supplies, pet foods and alcoholic beverages?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New from CEX

***XpFood3_G3 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 3

In the past month, have you or any members of your household purchased any food or non-alcoholic beverages from places other than grocery stores or supermarkets, such as the bakers, butcher, delicatessen, home delivery, vegetable or farmer's markets?

INTERVIEWER: EXCLUDE FOOD EATEN OUT AT RESTAURANTS OR CAFES OR TAKE AWAYS

1 Yes
2 No

Notes New from CEX

***XpFood4_G3 ***

Universe If XPFood3_G3 = 1

About how much has your household spent on food at these places in the *last month*?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New from CEX

***XpFdOut_G3 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 3

And can you tell me approximately how much you (and members of your household) spent on meals or food purchased outside the home in the *last month*?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New from CEX

***XpAlTob_G3 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 3

About how much have you (and members of your household) spent on the following items in the *last month*. Firstly alcohol and tobacco?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New as per IFS suggestion but revised to exclude durable items

---

***XpClFtw_G3 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 3

Clothing and footwear for all household members?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New as per IFS suggestion but revised to exclude durable items

---

***XpHealth_G3 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 3

Medicines, prescriptions and other health expenses?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New as per IFS suggestion but revised to exclude durable items

---

***XpTrans_G3 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 3

Car and public transport costs?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New as per IFS suggestion but revised to exclude durable items

---

***XpTel_G3 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 3

Telephone, including landline, mobile and internet costs?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New as per IFS suggestion but revised to exclude durable items

---

***XpRec_G3 ***

Universe Ask Group3 = 3

Entertainment, leisure activities and hobbies?

INTERVIEWER: IF DON'T KNOW ASK FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN AMOUNT IN £

0 - 99,997

Notes New as per IFS suggestion but revised to exclude durable items

---

References

Akerloff, G. A., Rose, A. K. and Yellen, J. L. (1988) 'Job switching and job satisfaction in the US labor market', Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2: 495-594.

Attanasio, O., Banks, J., Blundell, R., Brewer, M., Browning, M., Crossley, T. F., Emmerson, C., Goodman, A. and Muriel, A. (2006) 'Institute for Fiscal Studies Submission to the ESRC consultation on the proposals for Understanding Society': Institute for Fiscal Studies.

Bottazzi, R., Crossley, T. and O'Dea, C. (May 2008) 'UKHLS Innovation Panel consumption questions: Preliminary analysis': Institute for Fiscal Studies.

Browning, N., Crossley, T. F. and Weber, G. (2003) 'Asking consumption questions in general purpose surveys', Economic Journal, 113(491)Nov: F540-F567.

Church, A. H. (1993) 'Estimating the Effect of Incentives on Mail Survey Response Rates - a Meta-analysis', *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 57(1)Spr: 62-79.

Clark, A., Georgellis, Y. and Sanfey, P. (1998) 'Job satisfaction, wage changes and quits: Evidence from Germany', *Research in Labor Economics,* 17: 95-122.

Clark, A. E. (2001) 'What really matters in a job? Hedonic measurement using quit data', *Labour Economics,* 8(2)May: 223-242.

Conti, G. and Pudney, S. (forthcoming) 'If you're happy and you know it, clap your hands! Questionnaire design, survey process and econometric studies of satisfaction', Colchester: Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex; Colchester.

Dykema, J., Lepkowski, J. M. and Blixt, S. (1997) 'The Effect of Interviewer and Respondent Behavior on Data Quality: Analysis of Interaction Coding in a Validation Study', in L. Lyberg*, et al.* (eds) *Survey Measurement and Process Quality*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Freeman, R. B. (1978) 'Job Satisfaction as an Economic Variable', *American Economic Review,* 68(2): 135-141.

Jenkins S. P. (2000)*The Distribution of Income by Sectors of the Population* ISER Working Paper, *No.* 2000-18, Colchester: University of Essex.

Jenkins, S. P. and Micklewright, J. (2007)*New Directions in the Analysis of Inequality and Poverty* ISER Working Paper, *No.* 2007-11, Colchester: University of Essex.

Johnson, S. M., Smith, P. C. and Tucker, S. M. (1982) 'Response Format of the Job Descriptive Index - Assessment of Reliability and Validity by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix', *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 67(4): 500-505.

Laurie, H. (2007) 'The effect of increasing financial incentives in a panel survey: An experiment on the British Household Panel Survey, Wave 14',

Levy-Garboua, L., Montmarquette, C. and Simmonet, V. (2001) 'Job satisfaction and quits: Theory and evidence from the German Socio-Economic Panel', *Cirano Working Paper, No.* 2001s-41, Montreal:

Lynn, P. and Sturgis, P. (1997) Boosting Survey response through a Monetary Incentive and Fieldwork procedures: An Experiment. Survey Methods Newsletter, 17 (3) pp 18-22.

Preston, C. C. and Colman, A. M. (2000) 'Optimal number of response categories in rating scales: reliability, validity, discriminating power, and respondent preferences', *Acta Psychologica,* 104(1)Mar: 1-15.

Ryu, E., Couper, M. P. and Marans, R. W. (2006) 'Survey incentives: Cash vs. in-kind; face-to-face vs. mail; Response rate vs. nonresponse error', *International Journal of Public Opinion Research,* 18(1)Spr: 89-106.

Singer, E., Van Hoewyk, J., Gebler, N., Raghunathan, T. and McGonagle, K. (1999) 'The Effect of Incentives on Response Rates in Interviewer-Mediated Surveys', *Journal of Official Statistics,* 15(2): 217-230.

Uhrig, S.C. Noah (2008) *The Nature and Causes of Attrition in the British Household Panel Study* ISER Working Paper, *No.* 2008-05, Colchester: University of Essex.

Weng, L. J. (2004) 'Impact of the number of response categories and anchor labels on coefficient alpha and test-retest reliability', *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 64(6)Dec: 956-972.