2004 Living in Wales Survey

Household Survey Technical Report

**Research Study Conducted for
The Data Unit**

**Byw yng Nghymru
Living in Wales**

March - October 2004

Contents

MORI

MORI

Introduction

1. The Welsh Household and Dwelling Survey, renamed to the Living in Wales Survey (LIW), was last conducted in 1997 and 1998; the Household Survey was carried out in 1997, and the Property Survey, was done in 1998. The Local Government Data Unit (the Data Unit) will use the data to monitor the changing condition of the housing stock in Wales, and to measure work being undertaken to the stock. This survey will be a major source of information to help develop and monitor policies including the repair and development of Wales' housing stock, and other community developments. The 2004 Living in Wales Survey was the first year of the new continuous survey to be carried out across the whole of Wales.

2. The LIW has two separate but linked components: the Household Survey, and the Property Survey. This volume sets out the technical details of the Household Survey, and the Property report is detailed in a separate document.

3. The contract for the management for the survey was awarded to MORI but assistance in the Household Survey for fieldwork and sampling was provided by NOP, another research agency.

The Household Survey

4. The Household Survey is the LIW's survey of individual households with one of the main aims being to provide additional information to complement the Property Survey, but also to provide information about the community, the use of the Welsh language, the health of the members of the household, and the values and opinions of the respondent. There was also a self-completion questionnaire for other members of the household to complete, about the Welsh language, given to those in the household who were reported by the respondent as being able to speak Welsh.

5. The questionnaire in the Household Survey was conducted using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI). This meant a larger questionnaire could be conducted more easily and efficiently by the interviewers, than when using a paper-based questionnaire. It also enables routing and checking to be programmed into the questionnaire, making data collection more accurate and complete.

6. The Household Survey was undertaken first, with approximately a third of these then randomly selected within strata to have a subsequent Property Survey (based on criteria explained in detail in the Property Survey report).

7. A total of 12,635 addresses were issued for the Household Survey, with 612 additionally selected but held back as they did not appear on the VOA website (www.voa.gov.uk) or contained a business name. Originally 12,097 addresses were issued, but due to a higher than expected rate of invalid properties, a further 538 addresses were issued. MORI was responsible for conducting the fieldwork, and its own fieldforce of interviewers undertook 51% of the interviews, with NOP sub-contracted to MORI to carry out the other 49%. In total, 143 interviewers from the two companies administered the CAPI questionnaires across Wales at the pre-selected addresses.

Household Survey Tasks

8. MORI was responsible for the following tasks:

   - The sample

   - Transfer of questionnaire into CAPI including all appropriate routing and edit checks

   - Questionnaire design, in conjunction with the Data Unit

   - Writing full interviewer instructions for the pilot and main survey and debriefing

   - Piloting questionnaire and CAPI fieldwork materials, including personal debriefing

   - Amending the questionnaire and instructions in light of the pilot

   - Designing and issuing contact sheets

   - Providing suitably trained interviewers to undertake interviews at the selected addresses in the sample

   - Training and briefing interviewers on the background to the survey and all survey procedures including the use of the contact sheet and the CAPI questionnaire

   - Ensuring a consistently high standard of briefing with all briefings following the same briefing programme, using the same materials and documentation

   - Ensuring interviewers conduct two dummy interviews prior to commencing interviewing

   - Despatching letters, with explanatory leaflets, to sample addresses in advance of the interviews

- Allocating addresses to interviewers, and setting-up fieldwork monitoring and control procedures

- Dealing with queries and refusals from households

- Undertaking careful fieldwork monitoring procedures to maximise response, and minimise bias in response

- Quality control, including back-checking interviews/interviewers, (each fieldwork company was responsible for back-checking their own interviewers). Back-checking involves contacting respondents by telephone or post to check that they took part in the survey plus checking contact details and some responses to questions

- Booking- in and data entry of contact sheets

- Coding SIC and SOC

- Full validation of contact sheet and CAPI data

- Production of output data in SPSS

The Data Unit's Responsibilities

9. In addition to the overall responsibility of approving the various stages of the survey on behalf of the Welsh Assembly Government, the Data Unit was responsible for the following:

- Input of questionnaire development work and policy requirements

- Provision of specialised briefing materials – including the background to the survey and definitions of disrepair for first impressions scores

- Assistance with design of, and approval of, fieldwork materials, including all letters and leaflets

- Comment on and agree the questionnaire design and validation specification

Timing of the Survey

10. The overall timing of the survey was the following:

Initial questionnaire development	June - November 2003
Pilot briefing, fieldwork and debriefing	January 2004
Main survey briefings	26 February – 18 June 2004
Main and reissue survey fieldwork	12 March – 4 October 2004
Second tranche fieldwork start date	8 May 2004
Data preparation and validation	June – November 2004
Output	December 2004 - February 2005

MORI

Questionnaire Development and Piloting

Unit of Survey

11. At this stage of the LIW survey, the unit of survey was the household. In fact, if the interviewer arrived at the specified address and found that there was more than one household living there, they were required to carry out interviews with up to 3 households, if possible.

12. As well as collecting information about the household, interviewers were required to collect some dwelling information. The condition of the building was used for selecting dwellings for the Property Survey; the directions to the property were to aid the surveyors (if the dwelling was selected for a Property Survey), and help the next interviewer if it was necessary to reissue; and information was also collected for monitoring purposes.

13. The basic additional information collected at each address was:

   - Whether occupied, vacant, derelict, demolished, non-residential property, institution, second or holiday home

   - General condition of the building, specifically its walls, doors and windows, and roof

   - Dwelling type

   - Address identification – whether there were any changes to the LIW address provided and, if there were, whether this was because the address had been split, merged, changed or misspelt

   - Directions, to assist another interviewer if the address needed to be reissued – e.g. for remote rural properties

   - In order to collect the above information, MORI developed detailed contact sheets. A copy is in Appendix 1.

Piloting

14. A full pilot of the questionnaire was conducted in January 2004. In order to ensure that all sections of the questionnaire were tested and that regional variations were taken into account, a purposive sampling system was used. Eight interviewers were selected from across Wales. Their location was matched against nearby geodemographic characteristics

according to MOSAIC code (MOSAIC is a composite indicator produced by Experian, based on Census data and other sources to identify typical characteristics of an area's population). A suitable nearby postcode was selected for each interviewer to ensure a spread of area and household types across the country.

15. A personal briefing was held on 13 January 2004 in Cardiff. A total of 201 addresses were issued, with each interviewer having between 15 and 42 addresses (depending on the amount of time they had committed available to the pilot), and 2 interviewers also had another 11 addresses (sourced by the Data Unit) at which to conduct interviews in Welsh.

16. Interviewers were also given written interviewer instructions, contact sheets, self-completion questionnaires (versions 1 and 2) and a corresponding number of Business Reply Envelopes, spare household letters and household leaflets, a laminated household letter, colour print-outs of photographs (as examples of how to judge the state of repair of the walls, doors, windows and roofs), and a Word version of the questionnaire.

17. The locations for the pilot were: Swansea, Newport, Llandrindod Wells, Wrexham, Gwynedd (Welsh language pilot), Carmarthen (Welsh language pilot), Cardiff and Anglesey. They had a total target of 40-45 achieved interviews. The final number of achieved interviews was 37 with a further 3 done in Welsh to test the translation. The pilot was conducted on CAPI.

18. Amendments to the questionnaire in the light of the pilot experience were agreed by MORI and the Data Unit.

Amendments Following Pilot

19. A personal debriefing was held on 27 January 2004. Interviewers requested space on the contact sheet to write directions or details about addresses difficult to locate.

20. It was recommended that briefings should be amended to stress that the interview would not always be full length (50 minutes), due to routing, and also stress that respondents generally like the survey, as it is interesting.

21. The questionnaire had minor changes to 46 questions. The self-completion wording on the CAPI programme at the end of the questionnaire was also amended. The full list is in Appendix 2.

22. The Data Unit also gave feed back on the household briefing pilot, and this document is in Appendix 3.

MORI

Final Questionnaire

23. The final questionnaire was divided into nine sections, all of which were programmed into CAPI. The questionnaire sections were as follows:

- Household composition

- Welsh language use

- Current accommodation

- Disability

- Home / neighbourhood

- Housing history

- Tenure and housing costs

- Financial

- Values and opinions

Main Survey

Interviewer Briefing

24. MORI was responsible for providing suitable trained and experienced interviewers to undertake the survey. All interviewers were briefed to a consistent briefing programme, and trained in the use of contact sheets and the CAPI questionnaire.

25. A total of 12 main survey briefings were undertaken throughout Wales. A total of 143 interviewers were briefed with each session attended by up to 20 interviewers, their Area Managers and supervisors. All briefings were led by senior MORI or NOP executives, and attended by representatives from the Data Unit. A "master" briefing on 26 February 2004 was attended by all briefing teams to ensure a consistent approach for all subsequent briefings.

26. MORI held 5 briefings between 26 February and 28 April 2004. All briefings lasted for an entire day. A total of 64 interviewers were briefed plus Area Managers and supervisors.

27. In addition NOP undertook 7 briefings between 2 March and 18 June 2004. There were 79 NOP interviewers briefed to work on the survey, plus Area Managers.

28. It was MORI's responsibility to ensure a consistently high standard of briefing, and that all the briefings followed the same briefing programme. The contents of the briefing programme were agreed with the Data Unit, and covered the following:

- Introduction to LIW

- Survey background (MORI / Data Unit)

- Contact procedures, including first impressions and the contact sheet

- Introduction to the Property Survey

- Welsh language self-completion questionnaire

- CAPI questionnaire

- Dummy interview practice

- Progress reporting

MORI

- Field admin issues

29. A copy of the slides used at all the interviewer briefings are in Appendix 4.

Interviewer Instructions

30. In addition to the briefings, interviewers were provided with comprehensive and detailed Interview Instructions written by senior MORI executives, which were amended in the light of the briefings. A copy of the full written interviewer instructions is in Appendix 5. Interviewers were also provided with a paper copy of the questionnaire for familiarisation purposes.

Dummy Interviews

31. Following the briefings, the interviewers were required to conduct and submit two dummy interviews prior to commencing fieldwork in order to further familiarise themselves with the content and flow of the questionnaire.

Welsh Language Interviews

32. Arrangements were put in place to allow any respondent to be interviewed in the Welsh Language. This could be arranged in advance by calling the survey helpline, or by requesting a Welsh speaking interview from the interviewer calling.

33. The questionnaire was translated into Welsh by translators approved by the Association of Welsh Translators (Cymdeithas Cyfieithwyr Cymru – CCC). Once the English version of the questionnaire had been programmed, an export of the CAPI script was sent to the translators. This was necessary as the CAPI subtexts used varied depending on the routing applicable for each interview. These would not be shown in a Word version of the questionnaire. This took approximately six weeks to complete.

34. Once received back at MORI, the translation was input into the CAPI script as the second language option, meaning that the same routing and filtering was used for both languages, and the only difference was the front screen for interviewers.

35. The Welsh language pilot took place after the English pilot. However, upon further testing, amendments were required to the English questionnaire wording, and therefore the Welsh translation as well. The Data Unit and Welsh Language Board also reviewed the translation and requested amendments to ensure the Welsh language used conveyed the same context as the English questionnaire.

36. In total 35 interviews were conducted in Welsh, 19 by MORI interviewers and 16 by NOP interviewers.

Number of Welsh language interviews by Local Authority

Local Authority	Total No. of interviews	No. of Welsh interviews	% of interviews in Welsh
Cardiff	688	1	0.1
Carmarthenshire	332	11	3.3
Ceredigion	291	3	1.0
Conwy	311	6	1.9
Gwynedd	290	14	4.8
All other LAs	5,614	0	0.0
Total No. interviews	**7,526**	**35**	**0.5**

Source: MORI

37. The distribution of where interviewers lived and worked is shown in the following table:

	MORI - interviewer lived	MORI - interviewer worked	NOP - interviewer lived	NOP - interviewer worked
Anglesey		1		
Caerphilly		1		
Cardiff		1		
Carmarthenshire	2	2	1	1
Ceredigion			3	4
Conwy				1
Denbighshire	1			1
Gwynedd	2	2	3	2
Newport	1	1		

Source: MORI

Other Languages

38. Eight contacted householders were unable to speak English or Welsh and no other member of the household or interviewer was available to translate. These comprised one Arabic speaker, one Chinese speaker, one other unknown Asian language speaker and five of undetermined language. One interview was conducted with a Bengali speaker using another member of the household to translate.

Fieldwork

Printing Survey Materials

38. MORI was responsible for the printing of all fieldwork material. The printing requirements for the Household Survey, showing the provisional dates are in Appendix 6.

39. The printing of all contact sheets (Appendix 1), household letters and leaflets, Property Survey leaflets (given out by interviewers when booking an appointment for the Property Survey), and self-completion questionnaires versions 1 and 2, was undertaken by Formara on behalf of MORI. Contact sheets were printed with MORI's address number and tranche number, bar code, check digit, sample type, household number (all were '1' unless there was more than one household at the printed address) and LIW address pre-printed on the front of the questionnaire. Additionally the LIW address was printed on the back of the contact sheet to assist interviewers in making changes to the postal address, where necessary. A Kish Grid was also printed onto the back page, along with instructions, for occasions when interviewers would need to select dwellings or households.

40. Copies of the final survey materials are in Appendices 1, 1a, 5, 7a, 7b, 7c, 7d, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22. An example of a contact sheet with printed information can also be found in Appendix 8.

Contact Procedure

41. An address contact sheet was produced for every address in the sample. The contact sheet was split into sections, the front page included:

- The postal address

- MORI's address number

- Check digit

- Household number (always '1')

- Tranche number

- Sample type

- Interviewer name and number

- Contact record

- Final outcome

- Refusal information

- Estimated household characteristics for refusals

42. All the information completed on the front cover by the interviewer, and the address changes information on the back cover were checked and booked-in at MORI before being scanned and sent via the internet to Data Liberation (a data processing company) for data entry.

43. Where second and third interviews were conducted at the printed address (either due to more than one household living there, or more commonly, due to the address having been converted into separate dwellings) the interviewer used an Additional Contact Sheet, which was the same layout as an ordinary contact sheet, but without any mail-merged data. All data was hand written on by the interviewer.

Linking Address Contact Sheet to Questionnaire

44. Interviewers were asked to send contact sheets back as soon as possible, after they had been worked. As the interviews were carried out on CAPI, interview data was received on a daily basis. In order to link the contact sheet data to the CAPI data the address number was entered, by interviewers, at the beginning of the CAPI interview (with a check to make sure the interviewer was at the correct address).

45. The main reason for obtaining contact sheets back as promptly as possible was to enable reissues to be sent out quickly. Scanning the contact sheets meant that the field office would always have a record, and loss of contact sheets between reissues, due to losing them in the post or interviewers mislaying them, was minimised.

E-Progress

46. For the purposes of daily updates, the e-progress (i.e. an electronic version of the contact sheet) was completed by interviewers. In previous surveys, the field office has only been able to obtain this data from the booked-in contact sheets, and so updates were always at least a few days behind, but for the LIW survey the e-progress was used throughout fieldwork.

47. At the end of each day's fieldwork, the interviewer brought up the e-progress on their CAPI machine and entered the outcome of their visit. The outcomes listed were very similar to the contact sheet, and a screen shot of the e-progress is in Appendix 9.

Interviewer Pack

48. The interviewer packs distributed at the briefings contained the following items:

- Example contact sheet

- Example additional contact sheet

- Paper version of the questionnaire (appendix 18)

- Interviewer instructions

- Main showcards, produced in a bilingual (English and Welsh) format in a comb-bound book with English on one side and Welsh on the other

- Example household letter

- Example household leaflet

- Example property leaflet (appendix 23)

- Colour photographs of the state of repair of windows, doors, walls and roofs (appendix 24)

- Example Welsh self-completion questionnaire for adults

- Example Welsh self-completion questionnaire for children

- Example Business Reply Envelope to give respondents for returning self-completion questionnaires

Notifications

49. In advance of the start of the main survey fieldwork, MORI was responsible for sending out a letter to all sample households, notifying them that the survey was taking place. The letter was written by MORI and approved by the Data Unit and printed on Living in Wales survey letter-headed paper, along with the Welsh Assembly Government and MORI logos.

50. The letters and leaflets were translated into Welsh, and the address and reference information mail-merged onto both the English and Welsh sides of the letters, to ensure the languages were treated equally.

51. Formara printed the letters and the leaflet and enclosed these in a stamped envelope, which was then dispatched to interviewers. This method was used so that the interviewer could post the letter a few days before they were due to visit the property, therefore keeping the letter as fresh in the minds of the potential respondents as possible. A copy of the letter to households and the household leaflet can be found in Appendices 7a and 7b.

52. Before fieldwork began, MORI sent letters to all of the Local Authority Chief Executives, and all Police Authority Chief Constables. The letters explained the survey, fieldwork dates, and included a copy of the letter to be sent to householders and the leaflet. A copy of the letter to Local Authorities is in Appendix 10, and the Police Authority letter is in Appendix 11.

53. A press release was also issued by the Welsh Assembly Government before fieldwork began, and this is in Appendix 12.

Contact Procedure

54. When interviewers attempted to contact respondents at their allocated addresses they were required to complete the contact sheet. This involved completing the dwelling information and selection section (including type of dwelling and selection of dwelling or household where there was more than three at a particular address), the contact screening section (to screen out inappropriate dwellings) and the neighbourhood contact section (this was completed if interviewers were unable to make contact at the selected address).

55. Once the final outcome had been reached, either by a successful interview, refusal, or other outcome, interviewers sent their contact sheet back to Head Office.

Reissues

56. All non contacts and refusals, except for telephone refusals and "hard" ("do not recontact") refusals were reissued to senior interviewers and supervisors for at least one further evening or weekend call. A total of 544 interviews were achieved at the reissue stage, representing 7% of the total number of interviews achieved.

MORI

Fieldwork Monitoring

57. MORI was responsible for implementing meticulous fieldwork monitoring procedures. This included maximising response rate, and minimising bias response, keeping in mind the requirements set out by the Data Unit on response rates. If respondents were not in, interviewers were requested to call again to try and secure the interview. They were requested to call at least 6 times in an attempt to get a response. These calls included at least one call during the evening and one at the weekend, plus one further evening or weekend call. At least 10% of all interviews were back-checked.

58. Interviewers were given their addresses in two tranches, the first of which was used to assess the selection rate and procedure for passing addresses onto the Property Survey. Progress of the survey was monitored by MORI not only in the field by Area Managers and supervisors, but also by the e-progress updates from the interviewers and the constant booking-in of all returned contact sheets. There was also a daily update of successful interviews from the CAPI team.

Booking-In System

59. The booking-in system was an important element of the survey, as although the e-progress was used for daily monitoring of progress, the booked-in contact sheet was regarded as the 'true' final outcome, over-writing any e-progress outcome already received. It is also the booked-in contact sheet data that provides information for subsequent LIW surveys, such as the predicted response rate for the 2005 LIW.

60. The most important aspect of the booking-in was to enable reissuing of addresses to take place, so it was therefore essential that all booking-in was kept up-to-date at both MORI and NOP, to ensure all available contact sheets were ready for reissuing as quickly as possible.

61. The requirements for the booking-in system are set out in Appendix 13. As the contact sheets were returned to the office they were booked-in by the Field department using the barcode, which was a product of the address number, check digit and household number combined. There were two stages of the booking-in process that are detailed later in the report, with the following data transferred from the contact sheet:

- Outcome code (including occupied, vacant, second/holiday home and write-in information)

- Up to 4 refusal codes

- Any address changes

62. Precise details of how the contact sheets were booked-in are detailed below.

63. Data was automatically replicated between NOP and MORI several times per day, which allowed the reports to be updated frequently with accurate data.

Progress Reports

64. A detailed progress report was set up in Excel (in Appendix 17), using links to the main "live" SMS for regular updating. This showed summary outcomes along with detailed progress according to date, sample, region and tenure.

65. Progress reports were emailed to the Data Unit weekly.

Fieldwork Queries

66. A number of queries were received during fieldwork from interviewers, respondents, and interested parties (such as Local Authority Housing departments, or the police acting on queries from the public). Most of these were dealt with by MORI, although the Data Unit also responded to queries received directly by them.

67. NOP interviewers mainly contacted the NOP Research Executives who dealt with their queries or liaised with MORI on their behalf.

Sample Address Not Found

68. There were some cases where the interviewer was unable to locate a particular address. In these instances, the query was passed to a Research Executive who needed to establish why the address could not be found and search on the Postcode Address File (PAF), streetmap or multimap website. Searches were also carried out on the Valuation Office Agency's (VOA) website to check that the address was listed as residential. The information about other addresses in the particular postcode, or directions to the property, and maps, were then passed on to the interviewer.

69. If available, maps were printed out using the ordnance survey grid reference for greater accuracy.

Respondents Contacting the Office

70. There was a dedicated e-mail address for English e-mails liw@mori.com and one for Welsh byngh@mori.com. Likewise, there were two dedicated phone lines direct to the office, one for English speakers and the other for Welsh speakers. The phone line for English speakers was manned during office hours, with an ansaphone for calls outside these hours. These messages were dealt with the following working day. The

phone line for Welsh speakers was diverted to an ansaphone. A Welsh speaking interviewer dialled up the ansaphone and either translated the message for staff in the MORI office, or phoned back the caller.

71. All contacts about specific addresses were registered on the SMS Manager, and it was noted whether this was e-mail, fax, or phone. If the reference number had not been included in the correspondence, the address was looked up in the original sample spreadsheet. The action required was then determined. Refusals were recorded directly in the SMS Manager, including the date and time, method of refusal, any comments, the action taken and who dealt with the refusal. The Field departments were able to access this information directly and run reports, from which they could easily determine which interviewers needed to be informed.

Reason for Contact

72. The main types of telephone call covered:

- Refusals

- Appointments (telephone numbers of respondents were passed onto the relevant interviewer)

- Questions/queries about the survey

- Verifying the interviewer identity

73. Contact with the Data Unit tended to be refusals for various reasons, or queries. E-mails covered appointments, refusals or withdrawal for other reasons.

Strong Refusals and Complaints

74. MORI received 114 refusals from households, which were removed from any further stage in the survey. If an address was removed from the Household Survey, this automatically meant there was no possibility of it having a Property Survey.

75. One householder made a formal written complaint about the information given by the interviewer. MORI investigated the complaint and wrote to the householder apologising for the misunderstanding.

Booking-In

76. After being checked to see if they had been worked fully and correctly coded contact sheets were booked-in. After initial booking-in, all data was 100% verified by another survey assistant. The booking-in system required explicit confirmation of any discrepancies with the earlier entry.

Batch and Despatch

77. All contact sheets were scanned and the images sent over the internet to Data Liberation. Contact sheets were automatically batched and numbered when the scanning was done. Contact sheets tended to be grouped by outcome, so that batches were as consistent as possible.

78. Once Data Liberation received the scans, they data processed the results and sent these back to MORI and NOP, again over the internet.

MORI

Sampling

79. The sample was structured, in agreement with the Data Unit, to provide a Property Survey sample that would be as nationally representative as possible, whilst aiming to deliver at least 300 interviews within each Local Authority, and 7,480 interviews overall.

80. An examination of two possible sample sources for the survey, the small-user PAF and the VOA address lists compiled for Council Tax purposes concluded that PAF made the more reliable sampling frame, although VOA lists identified flats within addresses more accurately in some cases.

81. In summary, if accurate stratification and completeness are of more importance than identifying individual dwellings then PAF is the more sensible choice as a sampling frame.

82. As the flats issue could be overcome by conducting multiple interviews within an address, or by random selection, PAF was decided to be the sample frame of choice. The full discussion paper is contained in Appendix 14.

83. To improve the accuracy of sample stratification by local authority and to provide better locational guidance for rural properties, the actual sample frame used was Ordnance Survey's AddressPoint, which although mainly derived from PAF, additionally associates a precise grid reference to every address. AddressPoint files for Wales were provided to MORI by the Data Unit.

84. In determining the number of addresses to select, we reviewed the 1997 Welsh House Condition Survey response rates, and used these as the basis for our estimates about likely response rates in 2004, bearing in mind the timescales that had elapsed, possible differences in sampling methodologies or sample frame completeness, and the different nature and length of the interview itself.

85. Addresses were selected in January 2004 from AddressPoint. At this stage it was realised that the usual exclusion of addresses with organisation names (just under 6% of addresses in AddressPoint) would remove some addresses that might actually be residential – for example farms where the farm name was in the organisation field. We therefore left these addresses in the sample frame, but subsequently matched them to the VOA address lists. Anywhere we could not make a match within the listed postcode we excluded the address from the sample on the basis that these were almost certainly not residential addresses. For those that were found on the VOA lists (in some instances further cross-referencing against AddressPoint lists was required where matches were ambiguous) it was recorded whether the address was flagged by VOA as composite –

i.e. mixed residential and business use. An analysis of the response rates achieved at these addresses is given in the Response Rate section, below.

86. The addresses were split into two tranches to allow monitoring of Property Survey selection probabilities, further details of which are given in the Property Survey Technical Report. These were constructed by taking a 1 in 4 sample of the postcode-ordered sample and allocating these to the first tranche. The second tranche, issued in early May 2004, comprised the remainder.

87. In July 2004, with 97% of first-tranche addresses having been completed, although reissues were still ongoing, an analysis was made of the number of surveys likely to be completed if the then current response rates were replicated through both tranches. This showed that some areas had higher than expected numbers of invalid properties, and there were also some unexpected variations in refusal rates. To maximise the chances of achieving the target number of interviews in each Local Authority, a third tranche of addresses was targeted at those areas most likely to be under-target. A total of 538 further addresses were issued in 10 Local Authorities, having, again, been checked against VOA lists where organisation names were present.

88. The total number of addresses selected within each Local Authority can be seen in the Response Rates section, below.

Response Rate Report

Survey Response Outcomes

89. Below follows a series of tables showing survey response outcomes.

Table 1: Overall response rates

Summary Response	Total number n	% of addresses selected	% of addresses issued	% of eligible addresses	% of possible addresses[1]
Selected Addresses	**13,247**	**100.0**			
Commercial Properties Not Issued[2]	612	4.6			
Issued Sample	**12,635**	**95.4**	**100.0**		
Invalid Addresses	**1,222**	**9.2**	**9.7**		
Suspected 2nd Home/ Holiday Home	24	0.2	0.2		
Confirmed 2nd Home/ Holiday Home	212	1.6	1.7		
Property vacant	645	4.9	5.1		
Property derelict	40	0.3	0.3		
Property demolished	39	0.3	0.3		
Non-residential property	121	0.9	1.0		
Institution only (no private households)	31	0.2	0.2		
Property not found	110	0.8	0.9		
Valid Addresses	**11,413**	**90.8**	**90.3**	**100.0**	
Non Contact	**1,055**	**8.0**	**8.3**	**9.0**	**7.9**
Some contact, but no interview	351	2.6	2.8	3.1	3.2
Occupier in not answering door	155	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.4
Occupied, but no contact	358	2.7	2.8	3.1	3.3
Unsure if occupied, no contact	167	1.3	1.3	1.5	-
Refusals	**2,562**	**19.3**	**20.3**	**22.4**	**23.2**
Refused before screening	2,074	15.7	16.4	18.2	19.0
Refused after screening	443	3.3	3.5	3.9	34.1
Entry to block refused by warden etc	9	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Telephone Refusals to Head Office	36	0.3	0.3	0.3	-
Other	**316**	**2.4**	**2.5**	**2.8**	
Too ill to participate	207	1.6	1.6	1.8	-
Away during fieldwork	79	0.6	0.6	0.7	-
Unable to speak English/Welsh	8	0.1	0.1	0.1	-
Other	22	0.2	0.2	0.2	-
Successful Interviews[3]	**7,504**	**56.6**	**59.4**	**65.7**	**68.9**

Source: MORI

---

[1] Possible addresses refers to occupied addresses where an interview could have been conducted – i.e. all occupied non-contacts and face-to-face refusals

[2] These were identified by removing all addresses featuring an organisation name unless these could be matched by postcode to an entry on the residential council tax valuations list

[3] This excludes the interviews conducted at additional households identified during screening, as detailed at paragraph 90

MORI

Table 2: Number of calls taken to achieve an interview

Number of calls	% of total interviews
1	30%
2	21%
3	14%
4	9%
5	6%
6	7%
7	4%
8	3%
9	2%
10 or more	3%

Source: MORI

Table 3: Pattern of Interviews across the year, by local authority

Number of interviews per Local Authority by Month of Interview									Total
				Month					
Local Authority	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	
Blaenau Gwent	23	22	39	62	83	81	16	0	**326**
Bridgend	1	48	40	108	44	36	25	0	**302**
Caerphilly	18	40	49	76	129	29	35	0	**376**
Cardiff	38	101	113	183	144	48	61	0	**688**
Carmarthenshire	30	33	40	113	88	16	11	1	**332**
Ceredigion	26	33	56	102	36	11	27	0	**291**
Conwy	18	31	22	75	59	72	33	1	**311**
Denbighshire	17	53	27	88	61	11	22	0	**279**
Flintshire	12	37	41	66	92	19	6	1	**274**
Gwynedd	16	44	45	101	61	15	8	0	**290**
Isle of Anglesey	26	31	39	95	54	40	19	0	**304**
Merthyr Tydfil	3	32	32	68	88	74	16	0	**313**
Monmouthshire	21	49	9	96	85	40	13	0	**313**
Neath Port Talbot	28	27	43	95	111	12	0	1	**317**
Newport	32	28	42	80	87	65	7	0	**341**
Pembrokeshire	40	26	69	91	41	24	25	0	**316**
Powys	20	29	45	121	74	25	7	1	**322**
Rhondda Cynon Taf	22	69	25	103	151	48	23	0	**441**
Swansea	41	72	65	114	145	56	18	1	**512**
Torfaen	7	61	40	109	72	13	9	0	**311**
Vale of Glamorgan	25	13	77	62	54	48	15	1	**295**
Wrexham	39	24	39	84	31	26	29	0	**272**
Total	**503**	**903**	**997**	**2,092**	**1,790**	**809**	**425**	**7**	**7,526**

Source: MORI

MORI

Table 4: Response rates by Local Authority (n)

Local Authority by Summary Outcome

Local Authority	Summary Outcome (Numbers)					Total
	Successful interview	Refused	No contact	Ineligible	Other	
Blaenau Gwent	326	114	46	45	12	543
Bridgend	302	130	50	30	11	523
Caerphilly	376	71	36	26	11	520
Cardiff	685	201	106	89	25	1,106
Carmarthenshire	330	119	59	67	17	592
Ceredigion	291	99	32	81	20	523
Conwy	307	155	65	74	28	629
Denbighshire	278	133	41	55	11	518
Flintshire	274	128	63	21	7	493
Gwynedd	285	97	38	93	20	533
Isle of Anglesey	303	99	41	95	21	559
Merthyr Tydfil	313	93	35	42	5	488
Monmouthshire	313	132	17	26	10	498
Neath Port Talbot	316	70	44	51	24	505
Newport	338	94	29	28	9	498
Pembrokeshire	315	79	31	75	13	513
Powys	322	76	35	61	8	502
Rhondda Cynon Taf	441	177	37	59	14	728
Swansea	512	175	94	77	18	876
Torfaen	310	80	24	31	9	454
Vale of Glamorgan	295	111	31	47	9	493
Wrexham	272	129	77	49	14	541
Total[4]	7,504	2,562	1,031	1,222	316	1,2635

Source: MORI

---

[4] This excludes the interviews conducted at additional households identified during screening, as detailed at paragraph 90

Table 5: Response rates by Local Authority (%)

Local Authority by Summary Outcome

Local Authority	Successful interview	Refused	No contact	Ineligible	Other	Total
Blaenau Gwent	60.0	21.0	8.5	8.3	2.2	100.0
Bridgend	57.7	24.9	9.6	5.7	2.1	100.0
Caerphilly	72.3	13.7	6.9	5.0	2.1	100.0
Cardiff	61.9	18.2	9.6	8.0	2.3	100.0
Carmarthenshire	55.7	20.1	10.0	11.3	2.9	100.0
Ceredigion	55.6	18.9	6.1	15.5	3.8	100.0
Conwy	48.8	24.6	10.3	11.8	4.5	100.0
Denbighshire	53.7	25.7	7.9	10.6	2.1	100.0
Flintshire	55.6	26.0	12.8	4.3	1.4	100.0
Gwynedd	53.5	18.2	7.1	17.4	3.8	100.0
Isle of Anglesey	54.2	17.7	7.3	17.0	3.8	100.0
Merthyr Tydfil	64.1	19.1	7.2	8.6	1.0	100.0
Monmouthshire	62.9	26.5	3.4	5.2	2.0	100.0
Neath Port Talbot	62.6	13.9	8.7	10.1	4.8	100.0
Newport	67.9	18.9	5.8	5.6	1.8	100.0
Pembrokeshire	61.4	15.4	6.0	14.6	2.5	100.0
Powys	64.1	15.1	7.0	12.2	1.6	100.0
Rhondda Cynon Taf	60.6	24.3	5.1	8.1	1.9	100.0
Swansea	58.4	20.0	10.7	8.8	2.1	100.0
Torfaen	68.3	17.6	5.3	6.8	2.0	100.0
Vale of Glamorgan	59.8	22.5	6.3	9.5	1.8	100.0
Wrexham	50.3	23.8	14.2	9.1	2.6	100.0
Total[5]	59.4	20.3	8.2	9.7	2.5	100.0

Source: MORI

[5] This excludes the interviews conducted at additional households identified during screening, as detailed at paragraph 90

2004 Living in Wales Survey for The Data Unit

Table 6: Urban/rural classification by summary outcome (n)

Urban/rural classification combined by Summary Outcome

Urban/rural classification combined		Summary Outcome (Numbers)					Total
		Successful interview	Refused	No contact	Ineligible	Other	
Urban >10k - Sparse	n	176	52	29	28	13	298
Town and Fringe - Sparse	n	257	106	54	99	19	535
Village - Sparse	n	465	145	40	145	28	823
Hamlet & Isolated Dwelling - Sparse	n	353	74	26	107	13	573
Urban >10k – Less Sparse	n	4,482	1,652	671	567	155	7,527
Town and Fringe – Less Sparse	n	1,014	313	134	138	52	1,651
Village – Less Sparse	n	513	140	52	84	20	809
Hamlet & Isolated Dwelling – Less Sparse	n	244	80	25	54	16	419
Total[6]	n	7,504	2,562	1,031	1,222	316	12,635

Source: MORI

Table 7: Urban/rural classification by summary outcome (%)

Urban/rural classification combined by Summary Outcome

Urban/rural classification combined	Summary Outcome (Percentages)					Total
	Successful interview	Refused	No contact	Ineligible	Other	
Urban >10k - Sparse	59.1	17.4	9.7	9.4	4.4	100.0
Town and Fringe - Sparse	48.0	19.8	10.1	18.5	3.6	100.0
Village - Sparse	56.5	17.6	4.9	17.6	3.4	100.0
Hamlet & Isolated Dwelling - Sparse	61.6	12.9	4.5	18.7	2.3	100.0
Urban >10k – Less Sparse	59.5	21.9	8.9	7.5	2.1	100.0
Town and Fringe – Less Sparse	61.4	19.0	8.1	8.4	3.1	100.0
Village – Less Sparse	63.4	17.3	6.4	10.4	2.5	100.0
Hamlet & Isolated Dwelling – Less Sparse	58.2	19.1	6.0	12.9	3.8	100.0
Total[7]	59.4	20.3	8.2	9.7	2.5	100.0

Source: MORI

---

[6] This excludes the interviews conducted at additional households identified during screening, as detailed at paragraph 90

[7] This excludes the interviews conducted at additional households identified during screening, as detailed at paragraph 90

Table 8: Council tax match by summary outcome

Council tax match by summary outcome

			Summary Outcome					Total
			Successful interview	Refused	No contact	Ineligible	Other	
Council Tax match	CT list composite flag	n	41	12	7	22	1	83
		%	49.4	14.5	8.4	26.5	1.2	100.0
	CT list not composite	n	28	15	7	15	2	67
		%	41.8	22.4	10.4	22.4	3.0	100.0
	No organisation name in address	n	7,435	2,535	1,017	1,185	313	12,485
		%	59.6	20.3	8.1	9.5	2.5	100.0
Total[8]		n	7,504	2,562	1,031	1,222	316	12,635
		%	59.4	20.3	8.2	9.7	2.5	100.0

Source: MORI

Multiple flats/household at addresses

90. Where multiple flats or households were found at an address, interviewers were instructed to complete additional contact sheets as necessary and attempt to interview up to three households in total. Additional flats were found at 33 addresses. No addresses were found to contain multiple households with a single dwelling (flat or house).

Table 9: Combined number of flats / households

Combined number of flats/households

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	1,810	13.7	13.7
1	11,404	86.1	99.8
2	22	0.2	99.9
3	4	0	99.9
4	2	0	100.0
5	2	0	100.0
6	3	0	100.0
Total	13,247	100.0	100.0

Source: MORI

91. There were 1,810 addresses where there were 0 households. There were addresses that weren't issued (business addresses), or invalid, such as

---

[8] This table shows household one outcome only, where multiple households were identified (see paragraph 90 above)

MORI

vacant, derelict, demolished, non-residential, holiday homes or property not found.

92. At 33 addresses a total of 96 flats were found, or 63 extra compared to the 33 that could be recorded on the main contact sheets. As interviewers were given random procedures to select three flats only where there were more than three, only 44 of these were eligible for interview. Interviews were conducted at 22 of these 44, giving a total number of interviews of 7,526.

Interviewer Response Rate

93. The following table shows the response rate for each interviewer, but those achieving 3 interviews or less have been excluded, as have addresses where there is no interviewer allocation (such as the invalid business addresses).

Table 10: Response Rate by Interviewer

Company	Issued addresses No.	Successful Interview %	Refused %	No contact %	Ineligible %	Other %
M1	52	57.7	30.8	1.9	7.7	1.9
M2	222	71.6	9.9	9.9	6.8	1.8
M3	272	77.9	7.7	4.8	7.7	1.8
M4	61	47.5	31.1	13.1	8.2	0.0
M5	98	60.2	21.4	2.0	11.2	5.1
M6	110	66.4	8.2	18.2	5.5	1.8
M7	50	36.0	12.0	16.0	34.0	0.0
M8	103	54.4	19.4	10.7	10.7	4.9
M9	61	54.1	24.6	18.0	0.0	3.3
M10	192	60.4	8.3	14.1	12.0	5.2
M11	28	64.3	25.0	3.6	3.6	3.6
M12	35	54.3	31.4	8.6	5.7	0.0
M13	240	55.0	21.7	14.2	6.3	2.9
M14	78	60.3	21.8	9.0	5.1	3.8
M15	205	62.0	8.3	5.9	18.5	5.4
M16	87	55.2	12.6	10.3	20.7	1.1
M17	127	54.3	15.7	1.6	26.8	1.6
M18	174	81.0	11.5	1.1	4.0	2.3
M19	253	60.1	22.9	6.7	6.7	3.6
M20	50	44.0	40.0	10.0	4.0	2.0
M21	123	71.5	12.2	5.7	8.9	1.6
M22	130	50.8	22.3	4.6	16.2	6.2
M23	111	69.4	15.3	1.8	13.5	0.0
M24	24	66.7	16.7	0.0	12.5	4.2
M25	91	60.4	15.4	7.7	7.7	8.8
M26	54	55.6	20.4	7.4	9.3	7.4
M27	42	66.7	28.6	0.0	4.8	0.0
M28	18	27.8	55.6	5.6	11.1	0.0
M29	82	59.8	15.9	2.4	19.5	2.4

Table 10: Response Rate by Interviewer (cont.)

Company	Issued addresses No.	Successful Interview %	Refused %	No contact %	Ineligible %	Other %
M30	33	48.5	24.2	18.2	6.1	3.0
M31	108	37.0	27.8	17.6	12.0	5.6
M32	82	67.1	7.3	7.3	13.4	4.9
M33	140	65.7	14.3	2.9	15.7	1.4
M34	274	51.8	27.4	8.4	11.3	1.1
M35	139	64.7	16.5	7.9	8.6	2.2
M36	164	45.1	20.7	12.2	15.9	6.1
M37	18	61.1	16.7	0.0	22.2	0.0
M38	98	68.4	13.3	7.1	7.1	4.1
M39	148	37.2	29.7	24.3	7.4	1.4
M40	82	65.9	20.7	4.9	8.5	0.0
M41	96	57.3	30.2	3.1	7.3	2.1
M42	397	59.7	16.1	15.1	7.6	1.5
M43	66	50.0	27.3	12.1	4.5	6.1
M44	11	72.7	9.1	0.0	18.2	0.0
M45	81	55.6	21.0	4.9	18.5	0.0
M46	35	51.4	28.6	8.6	8.6	2.9
M47	85	61.2	21.2	1.2	15.3	1.2
M48	36	50.0	25.0	13.9	11.1	0.0
M49	66	31.8	39.4	21.2	4.5	3.0
M50	97	38.1	24.7	23.7	10.3	3.1
M51	35	74.3	14.3	0.0	11.4	0.0
M52	196	57.1	34.2	0.5	7.1	1.0
M53	95	45.3	33.7	5.3	12.6	3.2
M54	122	57.4	27.0	4.9	5.7	4.9
M55	58	56.9	24.1	5.2	10.3	3.4
M56	158	63.9	8.9	7.0	15.2	5.1
M57	197	56.3	19.3	16.2	6.6	1.5
M58	76	42.1	25.0	28.9	3.9	0.0
M59	18	66.7	22.2	0.0	11.1	0.0
M60	57	49.1	26.3	14.0	7.0	3.5
M61	34	73.5	17.6	5.9	2.9	0.0
M62	30	50.0	40.0	3.3	6.7	0.0
N1	99	79.8	17.2	0.0	3.0	0.0
N2	32	50.0	12.5	15.6	18.8	3.1
N3	151	61.6	21.9	5.3	9.3	2.0
N4	47	46.8	31.9	17.0	2.1	2.1
N5	24	45.8	25.0	16.7	12.5	0.0
N6	33	54.5	18.2	3.0	21.2	3.0
N7	133	54.9	15.8	14.3	10.5	4.5
N8	85	54.1	32.9	3.5	5.9	3.5
N9	150	64.7	23.3	3.3	8.7	0.0
N10	115	54.8	33.9	4.3	6.1	0.9
N11	143	63.6	16.1	6.3	10.5	3.5
N12	105	56.2	21.0	1.0	17.1	4.8
N13	37	29.7	29.7	18.9	21.6	0.0
N14	135	64.4	19.3	8.1	5.9	2.2
N15	50	52.0	26.0	4.0	16.0	2.0
N16	50	48.0	32.0	8.0	10.0	2.0

MORI

Table 10: Response Rate by Interviewer (cont.)

Company	Issued addresses No.	Successful Interview %	Refused %	No contact %	Ineligible %	Other %
N17	124	71.0	19.4	4.0	3.2	2.4
N18	18	55.6	16.7	22.2	5.6	0.0
N19	41	63.4	14.6	12.2	7.3	2.4
N20	125	67.2	16.0	5.6	8.8	2.4
N21	134	55.2	26.9	7.5	7.5	3.0
N22	179	71.5	15.6	7.8	5.0	0.0
N23	53	37.7	24.5	9.4	20.8	7.5
N24	105	60.0	23.8	7.6	5.7	2.9
N25	60	66.7	25.0	3.3	5.0	0.0
N26	117	65.0	25.6	5.1	4.3	0.0
N27	103	59.2	17.5	4.9	11.7	6.8
N28	61	55.7	29.5	6.6	8.2	0.0
N29	132	61.4	30.3	3.0	2.3	3.0
N30	18	61.1	27.8	5.6	5.6	0.0
N31	100	59.0	34.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
N32	50	58.0	28.0	0.0	10.0	4.0
N33	29	24.1	34.5	6.9	24.1	10.3
N34	36	58.3	25.0	0.0	13.9	2.8
N35	58	70.7	13.8	12.1	1.7	1.7
N36	76	60.5	19.7	9.2	10.5	0.0
N37	365	74.8	11.0	6.0	6.6	1.6
N38	104	57.7	22.1	9.6	6.7	3.8
N39	177	68.4	15.8	10.2	4.5	1.1
N40	15	46.7	33.3	6.7	6.7	6.7
N41	90	74.4	5.6	3.3	12.2	4.4
N42	104	51.0	14.4	7.7	25.0	1.9
N43	116	62.9	20.7	9.5	5.2	1.7
N44	68	54.4	16.2	17.6	11.8	0.0
N45	46	54.3	21.7	2.2	21.7	0.0
N46	27	48.1	7.4	44.4	0.0	0.0
N47	102	51.0	17.6	11.8	12.7	6.9
N48	83	54.2	20.5	3.6	19.3	2.4
N49	74	64.9	10.8	17.6	2.7	4.1
N50	82	59.8	19.5	8.5	11.0	1.2
N51	27	48.1	33.3	3.7	11.1	3.7
N52	39	35.9	28.2	23.1	7.7	5.1
N53	132	68.2	19.7	6.1	5.3	0.8
N54	105	75.2	14.3	3.8	5.7	1.0
N55	70	71.4	15.7	4.3	8.6	0.0
N56	46	50.0	30.4	15.2	2.2	2.2
N57	78	60.3	23.1	2.6	11.5	2.6
N58	56	67.9	14.3	8.9	7.1	1.8
N59	110	65.5	17.3	3.6	12.7	0.9
N60	37	48.6	35.1	2.7	10.8	2.7
N61	29	62.1	17.2	6.9	13.8	0.0
N62	67	41.8	20.9	9.0	17.9	10.4
N63	82	61.0	14.6	9.8	12.2	2.4
N64	60	50.0	33.3	1.7	15.0	0.0
N65	91	65.9	15.4	1.1	17.6	0.0

MORI

Table 10: Response Rate by Interviewer (cont.)

Company	Issued addresses No.	Successful Interview %	Refused %	No contact %	Ineligible %	Other %
N66	51	51.0	11.8	25.5	11.8	0.0
N67	119	45.4	32.8	13.4	5.9	2.5
N68	69	69.6	24.6	1.4	2.9	1.4
N69	50	52.0	26.0	4.0	18.0	0.0
N70	81	43.2	34.6	1.2	18.5	2.5
N71	77	42.9	31.2	7.8	11.7	6.5
N72	154	55.8	27.9	9.1	5.8	1.3

MORI

Data Entry, Validation and Output

Coding

94. Coding of Household Reference Person and Spouse SIC and SOC categories was conducted during the summer and autumn by MORI Data Services.

Validation and Editing

95. The list of post-survey data validations were specified by MORI and agreed by the Data Unit. These replicated all hard and soft checks from the CAPI interview, as well as adding a small number of extra checks. The complete specification is contained in Appendix 15.

96. The validation was programmed in an extension of the sample management and Property Survey validation systems. The CAPI data was imported into a database along with variable names and labels. The system automatically batch validated all interviews so that only the 15% failing any of the checks needed to be examined. For each form a complete list of the errors failed was presented, and if any changes were deemed to be necessary the data could be changed and the validation checks reapplied to ensure no other inconsistencies were generated. A log of all changes made was kept. The changes to the data were exported and then applied in SPSS syntax to the final data outputs.

Data Outputs

97. An undocumented problem in the In2Quest CAPI software prevented the data being exported directly to SPSS. A work-around using Microsoft Access to export the data and create SPSS files was employed but led to delays in production of data outputs and required additional checking of the data.

98. Final data outputs were produced in SPSS. Data was named and labelled according to conventions agreed with the Data Unit; these are intended to be replicated in future years. Derived variables requested by the Data Unit were created in SPSS syntax, which can be found in Appendix 16. There was no imputation of missing data.

99. In terms of missing data, the only actually missing data was in the Welsh Language section, where 219 respondents were not asked w8/9/10 and 199 who were not asked w14 and could not be recontacted. Additionally s1 (has Household Reference Person (HRP) or spouse/partner ever had a job if not currently working) was added after the start of fieldwork to reduce the number of people being asked employment details unnecessarily – 536 HRPs and 317 spouses were therefore not asked the filter question.

100. The level of response to income questions was within expected ranges. Don't know responses were recorded for total income for 11% of HRPs and 15% of spouses, and refusals were given for 16% of HRPs and 18% of spouses.

Summary of Data Issues

101. There were a few questions asked of 100 people or less, and depending on analysis requirements it may be necessary to review these for future years.

102. In the household grid, the relationship of persons 8 and 9 to the respondent were asked of less than 100 people, and of persons 10 to 15 these were not asked of anyone at all. However, these are only routed to be asked if they are needed, so we would recommend keeping the household grid as it is.

103. There were 99 people who said they had experienced a fire in the last 12 months. The subsequent questions, therefore, were asked only of these people.

104. Only 36 people answered the question 'are you/is your household part of a group of people who own the freehold on this whole house/building?' and 17 people answered 'Do/Does you/ your household personally own the freehold for this whole house/building, and not just your flat/maisonette?'.

105. Thirty three people answered the question 'Which of these best describes the owner of this accommodation?', and of these, 10 people answered 'don't know'.

106. At the question 'Do you (or your partner/spouse) receive any help from Income Support towards your mortgage interest payments (i.e. Income Support for Mortgage Interest (ISMI))?' only 42 people answered 'yes'. Consequently, the following 3 questions were asked of 42 or less people.

107. There were not many questions where data was difficult to collect. There were 31.9% of people who answered 'don't know' to the question 'What council tax band is your home in?'. There was also a high proportion of people stating 'don't know' at the question 'I am now going to read out a list of facilities and services in your local area. For each one please tell me whether you consider your local area services to be good or poor?' For the facility/service 'Schools' 23.4% said 'don't know', and for the facility/service 'arts facilities' 31.2% said 'don't know'.

Grossing

108. The grossing factors for the survey data were calculated by Corrine Moy and David Hussey at NOP under direction from MORI.

109. The calculation of household grossing weights was a two stage process.

Stage 1: Estimation of the number of eligible addresses

110. Before any weighting factors could be calculated, an estimate was needed of the population of eligible addresses in each Local Authority (LA) and thereby in Wales as a whole.

111. This was straightforward to calculate. For each LA, the estimate of the number of eligible addresses was estimated as:

[(Issued addresses – Non-valid addresses) / (Issued addresses + Non-issued addresses)] * Total addresses

112. Where non-valid addresses are those where *all* of the outcomes at an address (i.e. a3, a12 and a13) are either missing or coded as:

> 9. Suspected Second Home/Holiday Home
> 10. Confirmed Second Home/Holiday Home
> 11. Property vacant
> 12. Property derelict
> 13. Property demolished
> 14. Non-residential property
> 15. Institution only (no private households)
> 16. Property not found

113. In other words there had to be at least one valid outcome code at each address for the address to be considered to be valid.

114. For example in Blaenau Gwent we had the following figures:

Total addresses	32,701
Sampled addresses	469
of which:	
Issued addresses	450
Non-issued addresses	19
Non-valid addresses	36

115. So our estimate of the number of eligible addresses was calculated as:

$$[(450 - 36) / (450 + 19)] * 32{,}701 = 28{,}866$$

116. These figures gave us our best estimates of the number of *addresses* to gross up to.

117. The grossing weights for the household level data were established by the following process which involved four distinct steps:

Stage 2: Calculation of grossing weights

Step 1 – calculation of grossing factors to account for probability of selection of addresses (gf1)

118. For each LA, a grossing factor for the probability of selection of addresses (i.e. to gross sampled addresses up to total addresses) was developed (gf1). This was calculated as:

119. Eligible addresses (estimate) / (Issued addresses – Non-valid addresses)

120. For example in Blaenau Gwent the calculation (based on addresses selected in the first two tranches only) was:

$$28,866 / 498 = 57.96$$

121. In actual fact the sample was drawn in two stages, but to avoid creating excessive weights (resulting from the small numbers involved in the second stage), the grossing factors were calculated as if all addresses had been drawn in one go.

Step 2 – calculation of grossing factors to account for probability of selection of households within addresses (gf2)

122. Where there were more than three households at an address, only a maximum of three were selected for interview. If, for example, there were four households found at an address, each one had a 3 in 4 chance of selection. The grossing factor to account for this (gf2) was set to 1 / probability of selection. In our example the grossing factor would be 4/3; otherwise it was set to 1 for all addresses with three or fewer households.

Step 3 – calculation of a response rate at household level (resprate)

123. A response rate was calculated separately for each LA within the following strata. These were the strata where we saw significant variation in response rates;

    property type = 'House' and condition = 'Good' or 'Not seen'

    property type = 'House' and condition = 'Bad' or 'Ugly'

    property type = 'Flat' or 'Other'

    property type = 'Not recorded'

124. The response rates were calculated for each cell as:

Households interviewed / Total valid outcomes at all valid addresses

MORI

125. The strata were chosen after careful consideration of the potential stratification variables. These were LA, property type and overall condition. It was natural to stratify by LA; it was then a question of which other variable(s) to use in conjunction with LA. Sample size was clearly a constraint, as in some LAs the sample comprised only around 300 addresses, hence we could not create too many cells within LA.

126. After examination of response rates, there was clearly a difference within LA between houses and flats/other. There was also a difference, but not as marked, between Good properties and Bad/Ugly properties within LA.

127. It was sensible then to create cells for houses and flats/other within each LA. There were also a substantial number of properties coded as "not recorded", enough to be treated as a separate cell. Finally, houses within each LA were split into Good and Bad/Ugly as there was a significant difference in response rates between these two groups in a number of LAs (those 'not seen' were grouped with Good properties for pragmatic reasons).

128. As an example, let us consider Blaenau Gwent. The response rates were as follows:

Houses	68.5% (n=438)
Houses (Good/not seen)	68.9% (n=399)
Houses (Bad/Ugly)	64.1% (n=39)
Flats/Other	51.4% (n=35)
Not recorded	30.8% (n=26)

129. The figures show a significant difference in response rates between Houses and Flats/Other and a small difference between Good houses and Bad/Ugly houses (as stated this difference was more marked in other LAs).

Step 4 – calculation of a weight to adjust for response rate (respwt)

130. This weight was calculated separately for each LA within the strata described in step 3 and is simply 1 / resprate.

Step 5 – calculation of a final grossing weight (fingross)

131. The final grossing weight was calculated as the product of the weights calculated at steps 1, 2 and 4.

That is,

fingross = gf1 * gf2 * respwt

Step 6 – comparison with population figures & post-stratification

132. The distribution of age by sex from the grossed *person level* data was compared with the latest (mid-2003) population estimates. In percentage terms, the figures were close (within one percentage point) to the distribution indicated by the population figures.

133. The distribution of tenure from the grossed household level data was compared with data from the 2001 census:

	WHDS grossed		Census 2001	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Owner occupied	851,829	72.1	862,293	71.3
Local authority	162,330	13.7	166,002	13.7
Housing Association	58,670	5.0	50,417	4.2
Private rented	108,324	9.2	130,214	10.8
Total	1,181,153	100.0	1,209,048	100.0

Source: MORI

134. The total number of households was slightly smaller (98%) compared with the total census estimate. Overall levels of owner occupancy and households renting from local authority were very close (within one percentage point) to the proportions from the census. However, the proportion of households renting from Housing Associations was somewhat higher whilst the proportion of households renting privately was lower. There was also quite a lot of variation within LA (in the latter two categories) with some figures well below those indicated by the census.

135. For this reason it was decided that the (grossed) data should be weighted by tenure to correct for these differences. This weighting was carried out within LA using the numbers (rather than percentages) from the two surveys.

MORI

136. Two additional weighting factors were generated as a result of this:

tenurewt – weighting factor for tenure within LA

fingros2 = fingross * tenurewt

137. [Fingros2 is incorporated by MORI into the household level data file as variable a17.]

Implications

Sampling

138. The response rates achieved in 2004 have been used to model response rates, and therefore determine the number of addresses issued, in 2005. These should be re-examined each year using the cumulative data set to make increasingly accurate predictions.

139. Because of the number of genuine interviews conducted at the addresses containing organisation names, the practice established in this survey of only excluding such addresses that cannot be matched to an entry on the Valuation Office Agency's domestic Council Tax Valuations list should be continued.

Materials

140. Some 4.7% of valid addresses were missing data on first impressions scores on the contact sheet. For 2005 this information should be moved to the front of the contact sheet to make it easier to complete, and more obvious to spot where the information has not been completed.

141. The leaflets should state that Welsh language interviews are available on request, either in advance by contacting Head Office, or by asking the interviewer who visits the property.

Notifications

142. The press release issued by the Welsh Assembly Government was adapted by one Local Authority, and published. This had a negative effect on response rates in that area. We would recommend a more strict control over the press release in 2005 to minimise the possibility of this reoccurring.

143. Letters were sent to the Chief Constable as each Police Authority and Chief Executive of each Local Authority. The profile of the survey may be raised if more people were notified in advance, such as the Chief Housing Officer, Chief Environmental Health Officer, and Head of Public Relations.

Fieldwork

144. The dummy interviews to be used for briefing purposes need to be fully annotated to ensure all briefers are able to give the required detail of briefing. This has been done for the 2005 survey, worked very effectively, and should be continued in future years.

145. The tranche-based approach caused particular difficulties in establishing a rapid and consistent pattern to fieldwork, because of both the spread of initial addresses and interviewers feeling that it was difficult to achieve enough interviews in a day, and because of the hiatus incurred before the second tranche could be commenced. We recommend that this approach be avoided in the future if possible. Further discussion of the impact of the Property Survey linkages is given in the Property Survey technical report.

Questionnaire and Validation

146. Late changes to the questionnaire by the Welsh Language Board led to a routing problem in the Welsh-language use section which was only picked-up during fieldwork. Client sections need to be designed to a strict and generous timetable in future to ensure adequate testing. The 2005 survey design has followed a stricter timetable and the timetable should be carefully reviewed each year.

147. If the number of different types of rooms within the property is required again then additional checks need to be incorporated to ensure that homes are not recorded with too few bathrooms and/or WCs.

Welsh Translation

148. The number of Welsh interviews conducted was 35: 19 by MORI interviewers and 16 by NOP interviewers. To try and increase this number, future survey materials should make it explicit that Welsh language interviews are available, and should also explain how to request these.

149. The questionnaire was translated after the English pilot was conducted, but before the English version of the questionnaire had been signed off. This led to further translations being required on a number of occasions, which impacted on the time left available for making amendments to the programming. We would recommend in future that no translation takes place until after the English questionnaire is finalised. This also means that the Welsh pilot would be conducted at a later date.

150. The checking of the translation, for accuracy and context, was conducted by the Data Unit and the Welsh Language Board. There were a number of differences of opinion between the Data Unit and the Welsh Language Board regarding this due to different regional interpretations of the Welsh language, which led to some confusion, and errors at MORI. We would recommend that the Data Unit nominate one person or organisation to check the translation.

Timetable

151. The timetable for developing the questionnaire should be changed to give more time for making changes to the CAPI programme, translating the questionnaire into Welsh, and to give longer for testing the CAPI questionnaire.

152. As a result of the above, it is recommended that the development of the topics, liaising with the 'buy-in' clients, developing the Word document, and conducting the English Pilot should be completed earlier in the timetable. The questionnaire should be developed, completed and signed-off in Word before programming begins, ready for the English pilot.

153. Changes to the questionnaire can then be made before translation begins, and the Welsh pilot conducted at a much later date, nearer to the main fieldwork. The translation should be completed, programmed, and then checked (by the Data Unit's translator).

154. Each part of the questionnaire development, programming and testing should be a separate stage, with sign-offs at the end of each stage. This would make the development of the questionnaire more formal, with clearer guidelines regarding the amount of time remaining before fieldwork begins, and the resources required for each stage.

©MORI/J22947

Checked & Approved:

Ben Page

Checked & Approved:

Andy Cubie

Appendices

MORI