

2005 Living in Wales Survey

Household Survey Technical Report

Research Study Conducted for
The Data Unit



March - August 2005

Contents

Introduction	1
The Household Survey	1
Household Survey Tasks	2
The Data Unit's Responsibilities	3
Timing of the Survey	3
Questionnaire Development and Piloting	4
Unit of Survey	4
Piloting	5
Amendments Following Pilot	5
Welsh Pilot	6
Final Questionnaire	6
Main Survey	8
Interviewer Briefing	8
Interviewer Instructions	9
Dummy Interviews	9
Welsh Language Interviews	9
Other languages	11
Fieldwork	12
Printing Survey Materials	12
Contact Procedure	12
Linking Address Contact Sheet to Questionnaire	13
E-Progress	13
Interviewer Pack	14
Notifications	14
Contact Procedure	15
Reissues	16
Fieldwork Monitoring	17
Booking-In System	17
Progress Reports	18
Fieldwork Queries	18
Sample Address Not Found	18

Respondents Contacting the Office	18
Reason for Contact	19
Strong Refusals and Complaints	19
Booking-In	20
Batch and Despatch	20
Sampling	21
Response Rate Report	22
Survey Response Outcomes	22
Multiple flats/household at addresses	27
Interviewer Response Rate	28
Data Entry, Validation and Output	32
Coding	32
Validation and Editing	32
Data Outputs	32
Summary of Data issues	32
Grossing	34
Stage 1: Estimation of the number of eligible addresses	34
Stage 2: Calculation of grossing weights	35
Implications	41
Sampling	41
Materials	41
Notifications	41
Fieldwork	41
Questionnaire	42
Welsh Translation	42
Timetable	42

Appendices



- Appendix 1 – Contact sheet MORI
- Appendix 2 – Contact sheet GfK NOP
- Appendix 3 – CAPI changes post pilot
- Appendix 4 – Briefing slides
- Appendix 5 – Interviewer Instructions
- Appendix 6 – Printing specification
- Appendix 7 – Additional Contact Sheet
- Appendix 8 – Contact sheet printed
- Appendix 9 – Household letter
- Appendix 10 – Leaflet
- Appendix 11 – Showcards English
- Appendix 12 – Showcards Welsh
- Appendix 13 – 2005 LIW questionnaire
- Appendix 14 – First impressions photos
- Appendix 15 – Self-completion questionnaire - Adult
- Appendix 16 – Self-completion questionnaire - Child
- Appendix 17 – eProgress
- Appendix 18 – Outer envelope
- Appendix 19 – Local Authority letter
- Appendix 20 – Police Authority letter
- Appendix 21 – Press release
- Appendix 22 – Booking-in specification
- Appendix 23 – Excel sms report
- Appendix 24 – CAPI validations specification
- Appendix 25 – Derived variables syntax

Introduction

1. The Living in Wales Survey (LIW) in 2005 was the second year of a continuous survey, which took the form of an omnibus survey. The Local Government Data Unit (the Data Unit) will use the aggregated data as a major source of information to help the circumstances of households. It will help to monitor progress in reaching published targets and inform future policy and resource requirements and assess emerging standards. The survey was carried out across the whole of Wales.
2. The contract for the management for the survey was awarded to MORI. Assistance in the household survey for fieldwork and sampling is provided by GfK NOP.

The Household Survey

3. The Household Survey is the LIW's survey of individual households, providing information about the community, the use of the Welsh language, the health of the members of the household, internet usage, environmental issues, equality, volunteering 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. One version, given to adults, covered aspects of employment, and a shorter version omitting these questions was given to children (3-15 year olds).
4. As with the 2004 survey, the questionnaire in the Household Survey was administered using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI). This enables a larger questionnaire to be conducted more easily and efficiently by the interviewers, than when using a paper-based questionnaire. Routing and checking can be programmed into the questionnaire, making data collection more accurate and complete.
5. A total of 12,709 addresses were issued for the Household Survey. MORI was responsible for conducting the fieldwork, and its own fieldforce of interviewers undertook 51% of the interviews, with GfK NOP sub-contracted by MORI to carry out the other 49%. In total, 164 interviewers from the two companies administered the CAPI questionnaires across Wales at the addresses selected.

Household Survey Tasks

6. 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 each 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 in full
- Full validation of contact sheet and CAPI data
- Production of output data in SPSS

The Data Unit's Responsibilities

7. 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

8. The overall timing of the survey was as follows:

Initial questionnaire development	June - October 2004
Pilot briefing, fieldwork and debriefing	October - November 2004
Amendments and translation	November 2004 – January 2005
Welsh language pilot	February 2005
Briefings	28 February – 21 June 2005
Main and reissue survey fieldwork	14 March – 14 August 2005
Data preparation and validation	June – November 2005
Output	November 2005 - February 2006

Questionnaire Development and Piloting

Unit of Survey

9. The unit of survey for the LIW was the household. In keeping with the methodology used in the 2004 survey, 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.

10. As well as collecting information about the household, interviewers were required to collect some dwelling information including first impressions of the condition of the properties. Although in 2004 this data was subsequently used for selecting dwellings for the Property Survey it was not necessary for this purpose in the 2005 survey, however interviewers continued to collect the data to enable monitoring of the condition of properties each year.

11. The basic additional information collected at each address was unchanged from that collected in 2004 and 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

 - Interviewers estimate of the age of a property

 - 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

 - The contact sheet used to collect the above information was largely the same as that used in 2004. The layout was altered following feedback at the pilot de-brief, to encourage completion of the “First Impressions” section.

Piloting

12. A full pilot of the questionnaire was conducted in November 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.
13. A personal briefing was held on 21 October 2004 in Cardiff. A total of 70 addresses were issued, with each interviewer having either 10 or 5 addresses. The two interviewers with 5 addresses each took part in the Welsh language pilot a few months later.
14. This pilot differed from the 2004 survey, in that this was purely to test the English CAPI questionnaire. It was decided that this should be tested, amended and signed-off before translating the questionnaire into Welsh.
15. Interviewers were also given written Interviewer Instructions, printed contact sheets, blank additional 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), showcards and a Word version of the questionnaire.
16. The locations for the pilot were: Anglesey, Bangor, Cardiff, Carmarthenshire, Brecon, Swansea, the Valleys and Wrexham. The final number of achieved interviews was 35. A further 3 interviews were achieved in English at the time of the Welsh language pilot.
17. MORI and the Data Unit agreed amendments to the questionnaire, made in the light of the pilot experience, before Welsh translation commenced.

Amendments Following Pilot

18. A personal debriefing was held on 9 November 2004. Interviewers requested a new layout for the contact sheet that would be more 'user-friendly' on the doorstep than the version used in 2004. The "First impressions" section was moved to the front page, and the Final Outcome was moved to the back page. Refusal code 3 ("Don't want visit by surveyor") was removed. A new refusal code was created: "Not interested in helping Welsh Assembly". This was done as a result of anecdotal evidence from interviewers, who said that this often arose as a reason for refusal. A copy of the MORI contact sheet is in Appendix 1 and the GfK NOP contact sheet is in Appendix 2.

19. Interviewers asked that the Interviewer Instructions included further information on the PAF and VOA address search resources.
20. It was suggested that printing an indication of the contents on the outer envelope may encourage respondents to read the enclosed letter. The DU and MORI agreed to print the LIW logo on all envelopes.
21. The questionnaire had minor changes to 20 questions, and it was decided that the fire and smoke alarm questions used in the 2004 survey would be put back into the questionnaire for the 2005 survey. The full list is in Appendix 3.

Welsh Pilot

22. Once amendments had been made to the English CAPI questionnaire, an rtf version of the questionnaire was exported and sent for translation. A small pilot of the Welsh version of the questionnaire was conducted in February 2005. Feedback was obtained through telephone conversations with the interviewers, and mainly focussed on the flow of the Welsh translation and minor spelling or showcard errors. Six interviews were achieved.
23. However, further amendments were made to the English version after the questionnaire had been sent for translation, so there was still some overlap of questionnaire development.

Final Questionnaire

24. The final questionnaire was divided into fourteen sections, all of which were programmed into CAPI. The questionnaire sections were as follows:
 - Household composition
 - Welsh language use
 - Current accommodation
 - Disability and caring responsibilities
 - Volunteering
 - Quality of life
 - Transport
 - Equalities
 - The environment

- Internet usage
- Housing history
- Tenure and housing costs
- Financial
- Values and opinions

Main Survey

Interviewer Briefing

25. 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.
26. A total of 13 main survey briefings were undertaken throughout Wales. A total of 164 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 GfK NOP executives, and attended by representatives from the Data Unit. A “master” briefing on 28 February 2005 was attended by all briefing teams to ensure a consistent approach for all subsequent briefings. Of the 164 interviewers who were briefed, over half of them (87) had worked on the 2004 LIW survey.
27. MORI held 5 briefings between 28 February and 10 March 2005. All briefings lasted for an entire day. GfK NOP undertook 4 briefings between 3 March and 11 March 2005. There were 3 mop-up briefings between 6 April and 27 April 2005, where interviewers from both companies attended. In addition, GfK NOP held 3 further briefings between 17 May and 21 June 2005.
28. A total of 83 MORI interviewers were briefed plus Area Managers and supervisors, and 81 GfK NOP interviewers briefed to work on the survey, plus their Area Managers.
29. 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
 - Making contact and securing participation
 - CAPI questionnaire
 - Dummy interview practice

- Welsh language self-completion questionnaire
- Progress reporting
- Field admin issues

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

Interviewer Instructions

31. In addition to the briefings, interviewers were provided with comprehensive and detailed Interview Instructions written by senior MORI executives. These were largely based on the 2004 Interviewer Instructions, with updates for the new sections of questions. They were also amended following feedback from the pilot 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

32. Following the briefings, the interviewers were required to each 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

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

34. To boost the number of interviews completed in Welsh, and to ensure that respondents knew this option was available, a section was added to the LIW leaflet sent to respondents stating this.

35. As was done in 2004, 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 four weeks to complete.

36. 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.

37. 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 reviewed the translation and requested amendments to ensure the Welsh language used conveyed the same context as the English questionnaire.
38. In 2004, 35 interviews were conducted using the programmed Welsh CAPI, 19 by MORI interviewers and 16 by GfK NOP interviewers. This increased in 2005 to 69 interviews, 47 by MORI and 22 by GfK NOP. The total number of interviews conducted in Welsh using the Welsh CAPI, and in Welsh using the English CAPI (translated by the interviewer) was 116 interviews, 79 by MORI and 37 by GfK NOP. This occurred where the interview started in English but the respondent changed to speaking Welsh. It also happened when the interviewer and respondent found the Welsh CAPI too difficult to understand and preferred to use their regional dialect.

Number of Welsh language interviews by Local Authority

Local Authority	Total No. of interviews	No. of Welsh interviews – using Welsh CAPI	No. of Welsh interviews – not using Welsh CAPI	% of interviews in Welsh
Carmarthenshire	317	23	7	9.4
Ceredigion	360	3	11	3.9
Conwy	347	6	0	1.7
Denbighshire	380	6	0	1.6
Gwynedd	339	12	19	9.1
Isle of Anglesey	348	4	8	3.4
All other LAs	5,695	15	2	0.3
Total	No. 7,786	69	47	1.5
interviews				

Source: MORI

39. MORI had four Welsh speaking interviewers and GfK NOP had 8. They often worked in more than 1 Local Authority, and the distribution of where interviewers lived and worked is shown in the following table:

	MORI - interviewer lived	MORI - interviewer worked	GfK NOP - interviewer lived	GfK NOP - interviewer worked
Cardiff	-	-	-	1
Carmarthenshire	1	1	2	2
Ceredigion	-	-	1	1
Conwy	-	1	-	1
Denbighshire	1	1	-	-
Gwynedd	2	3	3	3
Isle of Anglesey	-	2	-	-
Pembrokeshire	-	-	1	1
Powys	-	-	1	1
Swansea	-	-	-	1

Source: MORI

Other languages

40. As in 2004, there were eight householders unable to speak English or Welsh. Two were Polish, 1 was Slovak, 1 was Cantonese and 4 were unknown. Only one interview was conducted in another language. The interview was conducted on CAPI, and the householder's son translated the questions into Bengali.

Fieldwork

Printing Survey Materials

41. 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.
42. The printing of all contact sheets, household letters and leaflets, 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, 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 printed onto the second page, along with instructions, for occasions when interviewers would need to select dwellings or households.
43. Copies of the final survey materials are in Appendices 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18. An example of a contact sheet with printed information can also be found in Appendix 8.

Contact Procedure

44. 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')
 - Sample type
 - Grid reference
 - Interviewer name and number
 - Contact record
 - Dwelling information and selection

45. Following interviewer feedback, the layout was amended for the 2005 main stage of fieldwork, so the second page included:
- Household selection
 - Kish selection
46. The third page remained the same as in 2004, and page 4 included:
- Address changes
 - Final outcome
 - Refusal information
 - Estimated household characteristics for refusals
47. All the contact information completed on the front cover by the interviewer, and the address changes, final outcome and refusal information on the back cover were checked and booked-in at MORI before all pages were transferred to Data Liberation (a data processing company) for full data capture.
48. 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 (Appendix 7), 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

49. As was the process in the 2004 survey, interviewers were asked to send contact sheets back as soon as possible, after they had been worked on. 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).
50. 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 so loss of contact sheets between reissues, due to losing them in the post or interviewers mislaying them, was minimised.

E-Progress

51. For the purposes of daily updates, the e-progress (an electronic version of the contact sheet) was completed by interviewers each day. This means

that the field office has up-to-date information about each interviewer's progress throughout fieldwork.

52. At the end of each day's fieldwork, the interviewer opened the e-progress form on their CAPI machine and entered the outcome of each visit made. The outcomes listed were very similar to the contact sheet, and a screen shot of the e-progress is in Appendix 17.

Interviewer Pack

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

- Example contact sheet (Appendix 1 or 2)
- Example additional contact sheet (Appendix 7)
- Paper version of the questionnaire (Appendix 13)
- Interviewer Instructions (Appendix 5)
- 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 (Appendices 11 and 12)
- Example household letter (Appendix 9)
- Example household leaflet (Appendix 10)
- Colour photographs of the state of repair of windows, doors, walls and roofs (Appendix 14)
- Example Welsh self-completion questionnaire for adults (Appendix 15)
- Example Welsh self-completion questionnaire for children (Appendix 16)
- Example Business Reply Envelope to give respondents for returning self-completion questionnaires

Notifications

54. 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.

55. 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.
56. Formara printed the letters and the leaflet and enclosed these in a first class stamped envelope. The envelope had the Living in Wales logo printed in colour on the front, to make it stand out from other mail householders might receive. These were 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 9 and 10, and the envelope is in Appendix 18.
57. Before fieldwork began, MORI sent letters to all of the Local Authority Chief Executives, Chief Housing Officers, Chief Environmental Health Officers, and where possible the Press and Communications Officers. MORI also wrote to 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 Authority departments is in Appendix 19, and the Police Authority letter is in Appendix 20.
58. A press release was also issued by the Welsh Assembly Government before fieldwork began, and this is in Appendix 21.

Contact Procedure

59. 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 were 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).
60. 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

61. Non contacts and refusals, except for telephone refusals and “hard” (i.e. “do not recontact”) refusals were reissued to senior interviewers and supervisors for further evening or weekend calls. A total of 570 interviews were achieved at the reissue stage, representing 7% of the final number of interviews achieved.

Fieldwork Monitoring

62. MORI was responsible for implementing meticulous fieldwork monitoring procedures. Those used in 2004 were again employed in 2005. 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 at the properties, 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. These calls were required to span a minimum of a three week period. At least 10% of all interviews were back-checked.
63. Unlike the 2004 survey, interviewers were given their addresses in one batch. This resulted in interviewers working their sample at a steadier rate, and fieldwork being completed earlier than in 2004. 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

64. 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, overwriting any e-progress outcome already received. It is also the booked-in contact sheet data that provides information for subsequent LIW surveys, for example, the 2004 data informed decisions about likely Local Authority response rates for the 2005 survey.
65. The most important aspect of the booking-in process was to enable reissuing of addresses to take place. It was therefore essential that all booking-in was kept up-to-date at both MORI and GfK NOP, to ensure all available contact sheets were ready for reissuing as quickly as possible.
66. The requirements for the booking-in system are set out in Appendix 22. 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
67. Precise details of how the contact sheets were booked-in are provided below.
68. Data was automatically replicated between GfK NOP and MORI several times per day, which allowed the reports to be updated frequently with accurate data.

Progress Reports

69. A detailed progress report was set up in Excel (see Appendix 23), 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. This was the same as the 2004 report, without the Property survey sections on the Overall achieved, Weekly target, Progress Chart, Daily target, and UA summary worksheet
70. Progress reports were emailed to the Data Unit on a weekly basis.

Fieldwork Queries

71. A number of queries were received during fieldwork from interviewers, respondents, and other interested parties (such as Local Authority Housing departments, or the police responding to queries from the public). Most of these were dealt with by MORI, although the Data Unit also responded to queries received directly.
72. GfK NOP interviewers mainly contacted the GfK NOP Research Executives who dealt with their queries or liaised with MORI on their behalf.

Sample Address Not Found

73. 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.
74. If available, maps were printed out using the ordnance survey grid reference to aid the interviewer.

Respondents Contacting the Office

75. There was a dedicated e-mail address for English e-mails (liw@mori.com) and one for Welsh (bywycymru@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 answerphone for calls outside these hours. These messages were dealt with the following working day. The phone line for Welsh speakers was diverted to an answerphone. A Welsh speaking interviewer dialled up the answerphone and either translated the message for staff in the MORI office, or phoned back the caller.

76. 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

77. 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

78. 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

79. MORI received 54 refusals from households, which were removed from any further stage in the survey. This is less than half the number that were received in 2004.
80. One householder made a complaint about an interviewer's visit. The householder had phoned to refuse but the message had not been received by the interviewer in time to prevent them calling at that address. MORI investigated the complaint and wrote to the householder apologising.

Booking-In

81. After being checked to see if they had been worked on 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

82. 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.
83. Once Data Liberation received the scans, they data processed the results and sent these back to MORI and GfK NOP, again over the internet.

Sampling

84. The sample was structured, in agreement with the Data Unit, to deliver at least 300 interviews within each Local Authority per year, 1,000 over 3 years, and 7,480 interviews overall per year.
85. Ordnance Survey's AddressPoint was used to improve the accuracy of sample stratification by local authority and to provide better locational guidance for rural properties. Although this is mainly derived from PAF (Postcode Address File), it additionally associates a precise grid reference to every address. AddressPoint files for Wales were provided to MORI by the Data Unit for use on this project.
86. In determining the number of addresses to select, we reviewed the 2004 Living in Wales Survey response rates, and used these as the basis for our estimates about likely response rates in 2005, bearing in mind there would not be a Property Survey element, which may have affected response rates, and certainly affected the release of addresses to interviewers and thus the flow of their work (i.e. the use of the Tranche-based approach).
87. Addresses were selected in January 2005 from AddressPoint. In order that we did not remove organisation names where an address might actually be residential – for example farms where the farm name was in the organisation field, we left these addresses in the sample frame, but subsequently matched them to the VOA address lists. Where 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 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.
88. The total number of addresses selected within each Local Authority can also 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	% of addresses selected	% of addresses issued	% of eligible addresses	% of possible addresses ¹
Selected Addresses	13,309	100.0			
Commercial Properties Not Issued ²	600	4.5			
Issued Sample	12,709	95.5	100.0		
Invalid Addresses	1,222	9.2	9.6		
Suspected 2nd Home/ Holiday Home	15	0.1	0.1		
Confirmed 2nd Home/ Holiday Home	254	1.9	2.0		
Property vacant	625	4.7	4.9		
Property derelict	46	0.3	0.4		
Property demolished	33	0.2	0.3		
Non-residential property	106	0.8	0.8		
Institution only (no private households)	15	0.1	0.1		
Property not found	128	1.0	1.0		
Valid Addresses	11,487	86.3	90.4	100.0	
Non Contact	973	7.3	7.7	8.5	8.9
Some contact, but no interview	435	3.3	3.4	3.8	4.0
Occupier in not answering door	98	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9
Occupied, but no contact	359	2.7	2.8	3.1	3.3
Unsure if occupied, no contact	81	0.6	0.6	0.7	-
Refusals	2,382	17.9	18.7	20.7	21.7
Refused before screening	1,685	12.7	13.3	14.7	15.3
Refused after screening	632	4.7	5.0	5.5	5.8
Entry to block refused by warden etc	11	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Refusals to Head Office	54	0.4	0.4	0.5	-
Other	367	2.8	2.9	3.2	
Too ill to participate	262	2.0	2.1	2.3	-
Away during fieldwork	86	0.6	0.7	0.7	-
Unable to speak English/Welsh	8	0.1	0.1	0.1	-
Other	11	0.1	0.1	0.1	-
Successful Interviews³	7,765	58.3	61.1	67.6	70.7

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

Table 2: Number of calls taken to achieve an interview

Number of calls	% of total interviews
1	29%
2	24%
3	15%
4	11%
5	7%
6	5%
7	3%
8	2%
9	2%
10 or more	2%

Source: MORI

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

Local Authority	Number of interviews per Local Authority by Month of Interview						Total
	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	
Blaenau Gwent	41	114	39	76	57	2	329
Bridgend	24	141	93	78	51	19	406
Caerphilly	28	99	97	41	42	15	322
Cardiff	84	99	48	30	23	22	306
Carmarthenshire	45	98	64	96	39	3	345
Ceredigion	44	122	77	81	41	5	370
Conwy	42	66	83	97	60	5	353
Denbighshire	36	111	69	116	42	9	383
Flintshire	47	121	91	67	34	3	363
Gwynedd	56	109	95	72	33	1	366
Isle of Anglesey	34	83	96	78	67	2	360
Merthyr Tydfil	12	125	117	52	39	1	346
Monmouthshire	33	132	84	70	32	8	359
Neath Port Talbot	14	102	45	125	76	5	367
Newport	105	89	58	25	31	11	319
Pembrokeshire	52	106	120	49	24	5	356
Powys	28	147	132	49	30	0	386
Rhondda Cynon Taf	0	56	133	78	42	13	322
Swansea	18	72	81	54	44	38	307
Torfaen	16	75	70	149	22	5	337
Vale of Glamorgan	50	119	43	92	67	8	379
Wrexham	85	131	62	82	22	2	384
Total⁴	894	2,317	1,797	1,657	918	182	7,765

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

Source: 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	329	93	41	72	23	558
Bridgend	406	98	43	50	11	608
Caerphilly	322	61	29	24	7	443
Cardiff	306	92	40	35	13	486
Carmarthenshire	345	124	38	81	14	602
Ceredigion	370	122	42	83	18	635
Conwy	353	147	73	77	46	696
Denbighshire	383	144	74	66	23	690
Flintshire	363	158	72	55	16	664
Gwynedd	366	95	31	124	24	640
Isle of Anglesey	360	140	38	94	21	653
Merthyr Tydfil	346	101	32	38	15	532
Monmouthshire	359	112	41	27	8	547
Neath Port Talbot	367	95	38	30	24	554
Newport	319	80	44	29	11	483
Pembrokeshire	356	95	28	66	5	550
Powys	386	52	31	49	8	526
Rhondda Cynon Taf	322	93	37	37	16	505
Swansea	307	107	44	53	16	527
Torfaen	337	85	48	26	10	506
Vale of Glamorgan	379	106	46	42	17	590
Wrexham	384	182	78	49	21	714
Total⁵	7,765	2,382	988	1,207	367	12,709

Source: MORI

⁵ 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	Summary Outcome (Percentages)					Total
	Successful interview	Refused	No contact	Ineligible	Other	
Blaenau Gwent	59.0	16.7	7.3	12.9	4.1	100.0
Bridgend	66.8	16.1	7.1	8.2	1.8	100.0
Caerphilly	72.7	13.8	6.5	5.4	1.6	100.0
Cardiff	63.0	18.9	8.2	7.2	2.7	100.0
Carmarthenshire	57.3	20.6	6.3	13.5	2.3	100.0
Ceredigion	58.3	19.2	6.6	13.1	2.8	100.0
Conwy	50.7	21.1	10.5	11.1	6.6	100.0
Denbighshire	55.5	20.9	10.7	9.6	3.3	100.0
Flintshire	54.7	23.8	10.8	8.3	2.4	100.0
Gwynedd	57.2	14.8	4.8	19.4	3.8	100.0
Isle of Anglesey	55.1	21.4	5.8	14.4	3.2	100.0
Merthyr Tydfil	65.0	19.0	6.0	7.1	2.8	100.0
Monmouthshire	65.6	20.5	7.5	4.9	1.5	100.0
Neath Port Talbot	66.2	17.1	6.9	5.4	4.3	100.0
Newport	66.0	16.6	9.1	6.0	2.3	100.0
Pembrokeshire	64.7	17.3	5.1	12.0	0.9	100.0
Powys	73.4	9.9	5.9	9.3	1.5	100.0
Rhondda Cynon Taf	63.8	18.4	7.3	7.3	3.2	100.0
Swansea	58.3	20.3	8.3	10.1	3.0	100.0
Torfaen	66.6	16.8	9.5	5.1	2.0	100.0
Vale of Glamorgan	64.2	18.0	7.8	7.1	2.9	100.0
Wrexham	53.8	25.5	10.9	6.9	2.9	100.0
Total⁶	61.1	18.7	7.8	9.5	2.9	100.0

Source: MORI

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

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	188	76	35	30	10	339
Town and Fringe - Sparse	n	337	113	51	102	20	623
Village - Sparse	n	574	144	40	143	20	921
Hamlet & Isolated Dwelling - Sparse	n	437	76	27	106	14	660
Urban >10k – Less Sparse	n	4,308	1,356	621	530	208	7,023
Town and Fringe – Less Sparse	n	1,061	379	128	150	52	1,770
Village – Less Sparse	n	606	166	57	81	34	944
Hamlet & Isolated Dwelling – Less Sparse	n	254	72	29	65	9	429
Total⁷	n	7,765	2,382	988	1,207	367	12,709

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		55.5	22.4	10.3	8.8	2.9	100.0
Town and Fringe - Sparse		54.1	18.1	8.2	16.4	3.2	100.0
Village - Sparse		62.3	15.6	4.3	15.5	2.2	100.0
Hamlet & Isolated Dwelling - Sparse		66.2	11.5	4.1	16.1	2.1	100.0
Urban >10k – Less Sparse		61.3	19.3	8.8	7.5	3.0	100.0
Town and Fringe – Less Sparse		59.9	21.4	7.2	8.5	2.9	100.0
Village – Less Sparse		64.2	17.6	6.0	8.6	3.6	100.0
Hamlet & Isolated Dwelling – Less Sparse		59.2	16.8	6.8	15.2	2.1	100.0
Total⁸		61.1	18.7	7.8	9.5	2.9	100.0

Source: MORI

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

⁸ 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	62	9	3	13	1	88
		%	70.5	10.2	3.4	14.8	1.1	100.0
	CT list not composite	n	33	7	3	12	1	56
		%	58.9	12.5	5.4	21.4	1.8	100.0
	No organisation name in address	n	7,670	2,366	982	1,182	365	12,565
		%	61.0	18.8	7.8	9.4	2.9	100.0
Total⁹		n	7,765	2,382	988	1,207	367	12,709
		%	61.1	18.7	7.8	9.5	2.9	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. A total of 87 additional dwellings were found: additional flats were found at 37 addresses, additional houses at 45 addresses, and 5 where the property type was not recorded. Six addresses had more than one household.

Table 9: Combined number of flats / households

Combined number of flats/households			
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	1,813	13.6	13.6
1	11,434	85.9	99.6
2	43	0.3	99.8
3	9	0.1	99.9
4	2	0	100.0
5	3	0	100.0
7	2	0	100.0
8	1	0	100.0
10	1	0	100.0
13	1	0	100.0
Total	13,309	100.0	100.0

Source: MORI

⁹ This table shows household one outcome only, where multiple households were identified (see paragraph 90 above)

91. There were 1,813 addresses where there were 0 households. These were addresses that weren't issued (business addresses), or invalid, such as vacant, derelict, demolished, non-residential, holiday homes or property not found.

Interviewer Response Rate

92. 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	Successful	Refused	No	Ineligible	Other
	addresses	Interview		contact		
	No.	%	%	%	%	%
M1	48	94.1	2.0	0.0	3.9	0.0
M2	26	83.9	9.7	0.0	6.5	0.0
M3	54	62.8	20.9	0.0	12.8	3.5
M4	18	64.3	10.7	0.0	21.4	3.6
M5	33	94.3	2.9	0.0	2.9	0.0
M6	24	66.7	11.1	8.3	13.9	0.0
M7	17	70.8	0.0	0.0	29.2	0.0
M8	55	55.6	20.2	4.0	17.2	3.0
M9	10	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
M10	12	63.2	15.8	0.0	21.1	0.0
M11	170	86.3	5.1	5.6	3.0	0.0
M12	45	91.8	4.1	0.0	2.0	2.0
M13	34	54.8	22.6	1.6	17.7	3.2
M14	74	84.1	1.1	0.0	13.6	1.1
M15	59	89.4	4.5	0.0	6.1	0.0
M16	10	83.3	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0
M17	26	50.0	19.2	23.1	5.8	1.9
M18	108	47.0	33.0	11.3	7.4	1.3
M19	69	75.0	6.5	3.3	14.1	1.1
M20	32	52.5	21.3	3.3	21.3	1.6
M21	12	80.0	6.7	0.0	13.3	0.0
M22	19	90.5	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0
M23	29	39.2	50.0	2.7	1.4	6.8
M24	28	96.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
M25	27	84.4	0.0	0.0	15.6	0.0
M26	117	66.1	19.8	2.8	9.6	1.7
M27	30	75.0	17.5	0.0	7.5	0.0
M28	65	55.6	14.5	2.6	26.5	0.9
M29	26	96.3	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
M30	48	77.4	0.0	4.8	14.5	3.2
M31	35	81.4	0.0	0.0	18.6	0.0
M32	165	71.7	10.9	10.4	6.1	0.9
M33	63	90.0	2.9	0.0	7.1	0.0
M34	48	24.7	30.4	38.1	3.6	3.1
M35	96	62.3	14.3	5.2	14.3	3.9

Company	Issued	Successful	Refused	No	Ineligible	Other
	addresses	Interview		contact		
	No.	%	%	%	%	%
M36	19	73.1	7.7	0.0	15.4	3.8
M37	65	73.0	6.7	12.4	7.9	0.0
M38	83	82.2	4.0	1.0	12.9	0.0
M39	18	85.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0
M40	57	90.5	1.6	0.0	7.9	0.0
M41	122	76.3	4.4	1.9	15.6	1.9
M42	40	65.6	11.5	0.0	23.0	0.0
M43	29	61.7	25.5	4.3	6.4	2.1
M44	18	56.3	31.3	3.1	3.1	6.3
M45	84	60.4	23.7	2.2	9.4	4.3
M46	25	80.6	3.2	3.2	9.7	3.2
M47	31	30.1	48.5	13.6	4.9	2.9
M48	58	82.9	4.3	0.0	10.0	2.9
M49	27	93.1	3.4	0.0	3.4	0.0
M50	64	50.0	30.5	5.5	12.5	1.6
M51	30	93.8	3.1	0.0	3.1	0.0
M52	82	70.1	12.8	6.0	11.1	0.0
M53	105	40.7	25.6	27.1	4.7	1.9
M54	21	87.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
M55	37	58.7	20.6	7.9	3.2	9.5
M56	67	59.3	26.5	0.9	10.6	2.7
M57	62	62.6	28.3	1.0	4.0	4.0
M58	5	62.5	0.0	0.0	37.5	0.0
M59	70	68.0	19.4	1.9	10.7	0.0
M60	16	94.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
M61	173	68.9	12.7	9.6	6.4	2.4
M62	36	54.5	33.3	1.5	9.1	1.5
M63	107	59.4	20.0	8.9	11.1	0.6
M64	49	80.3	14.8	0.0	3.3	1.6
M65	25	31.3	31.3	15.0	20.0	2.5
M66	83	90.2	3.3	0.0	5.4	1.1
M67	24	96.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
M68	29	69.0	23.8	0.0	7.1	0.0
M69	125	41.1	41.1	10.9	3.6	3.3
M70	8	72.7	18.2	0.0	9.1	0.0
M71	47	77.0	3.3	0.0	19.7	0.0
M72	6	35.3	17.6	0.0	47.1	0.0
M73	30	88.2	0.0	0.0	11.8	0.0
M74	29	80.6	0.0	0.0	19.4	0.0
M75	23	79.3	6.9	0.0	13.8	0.0
M76	74	40.4	39.3	13.7	4.4	2.2
M77	59	77.6	2.6	0.0	19.7	0.0
M78	15	75.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	0.0
M79	12	85.7	7.1	0.0	7.1	0.0
N1	30	61.2	10.2	12.2	16.3	0.0
N2	73	76.0	11.5	5.2	6.3	1.0
N3	15	78.9	5.3	10.5	5.3	0.0
N4	47	77.0	6.6	0.0	14.8	1.6
N5	60	65.9	11.0	8.8	14.3	0.0
N6	16	94.1	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0

Company	Issued	Successful	Refused	No	Ineligible	Other
	addresses	Interview		contact		
	No.	%	%	%	%	%
N7	54	63.5	5.9	15.3	14.1	1.2
N8	112	67.9	15.8	11.5	4.2	0.6
N9	47	55.3	15.3	23.5	3.5	2.4
N10	38	57.6	10.6	13.6	18.2	0.0
N11	54	62.1	27.6	9.2	1.1	0.0
N12	64	67.4	22.1	5.3	5.3	0.0
N13	107	48.4	20.4	19.9	10.0	1.4
N14	55	53.4	12.6	15.5	17.5	1.0
N15	43	78.2	7.3	1.8	12.7	0.0
N16	39	67.2	8.6	13.8	10.3	0.0
N17	207	57.8	19.6	6.4	13.1	3.1
N18	44	63.8	13.0	0.0	23.2	0.0
N19	25	67.6	10.8	10.8	10.8	0.0
N20	17	56.7	10.0	6.7	26.7	0.0
N21	111	59.4	15.0	16.0	8.0	1.6
N22	6	66.7	22.2	0.0	11.1	0.0
N23	4	57.1	14.3	0.0	28.6	0.0
N24	30	61.2	18.4	0.0	18.4	2.0
N25	6	31.6	21.1	15.8	26.3	5.3
N26	9	90.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
N27	101	76.5	8.3	6.8	7.6	0.8
N28	98	82.4	7.6	4.2	5.9	0.0
N29	41	73.2	5.4	14.3	5.4	1.8
N30	47	82.5	1.8	0.0	15.8	0.0
N31	54	72.0	10.7	5.3	9.3	2.7
N32	31	60.8	9.8	15.7	11.8	2.0
N33	83	77.6	6.5	1.9	11.2	2.8
N34	37	67.3	14.5	3.6	14.5	0.0
N35	95	64.2	5.4	25.7	4.1	0.7
N36	66	70.2	18.1	2.1	5.3	4.3
N37	305	81.1	9.3	2.9	5.3	1.3
N38	44	81.5	3.7	0.0	14.8	0.0
N39	49	77.8	3.2	7.9	11.1	0.0
N40	41	74.5	1.8	7.3	10.9	5.5
N41	36	78.3	15.2	0.0	4.3	2.2
N42	34	61.8	10.9	7.3	18.2	1.8
N43	38	74.5	19.6	0.0	5.9	0.0
N44	29	60.4	31.3	0.0	8.3	0.0
N45	59	88.1	1.5	1.5	9.0	0.0
N46	53	72.6	4.1	9.6	11.0	2.7
N47	291	64.7	15.3	9.3	9.8	0.9
N48	25	69.4	5.6	2.8	19.4	2.8
N49	33	71.7	4.3	17.4	4.3	2.2
N50	48	53.3	8.9	3.3	32.2	2.2
N51	43	58.9	16.4	12.3	8.2	4.1
N52	41	55.4	9.5	9.5	14.9	10.8
N53	13	50.0	19.2	0.0	23.1	7.7
N54	122	66.7	14.8	10.9	7.7	0.0
N55	36	57.1	22.2	9.5	7.9	3.2
N56	11	84.6	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.0

Company	Issued	Successful	Refused	No	Ineligible	Other
	addresses	Interview		contact		
	No.	%	%	%	%	%
N57	38	73.1	21.2	0.0	5.8	0.0
N58	37	62.7	22.0	1.7	5.1	8.5
N59	45	90.0	6.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
N60	57	82.6	7.2	5.8	4.3	0.0
N61	35	97.2	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0
N62	29	61.7	17.0	8.5	12.8	0.0
N63	9	90.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
N64	74	52.9	33.6	5.7	7.9	0.0
N65	37	67.3	18.2	5.5	5.5	3.6
N66	37	52.1	18.3	0.0	25.4	4.2
N67	29	52.7	18.2	5.5	23.6	0.0
N68	38	58.5	23.1	9.2	6.2	3.1
N69	39	63.9	0.0	13.1	19.7	3.3

Data Entry, Validation and Output

Coding

93. 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

94. 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 24.
95. The validation was programmed in an extension of the sample management and Property Survey validation systems used in the 2004 survey. The CAPI data was imported into a database along with variable names and labels. The system automatically batch validated all interviews so that only those 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

96. Final data outputs were produced in SPSS. Data was named and labelled according to conventions agreed with the Data Unit; these were replicated from 2004. Derived variables requested by the Data Unit were created in SPSS syntax, which can be found in Appendix 25. There was no imputation of missing data.
97. 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

98. 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.
99. In the household grid there were no households with 12 or more people, and those with 7 to 11 households numbered less than 100. Consequently, the questions based on the household grid, such as employment status, religion, citizenship, etc, were asked a fewer number

of times, as necessary. However, these are all only routed to be asked if they are needed, so we would recommend keeping the household grid as it is.

100. Only 24 people said they shared rooms with other households. Seven of these shared a kitchen-diner, 15 shared a living room, 18 shared a bathroom with WC, 3 shared a bathroom without WC, 5 shared a WC, 1 shared a study/office, 16 shared a kitchen, and 1 shared a shower room. Two of these people said that they live with households who pay them rent.
101. Only 30 people were eligible to answer the question about who provided them with support for caring. All of the precodes were used.
102. Less than 100 people were eligible to answer the 'Local'/'Regional'/'National' question regarding their involvement in voluntary groups.
103. There were 91 people who said they had called the fire brigade, and answered about the type of fire in the last 12 months.
104. A number of people who answered the question 'And which language would you prefer your child to be taught in?' (QOL39) said they would like this to be bilingual. If this question is asked again, we would recommend an extra precode be created for this.
105. A number of people said 'other' when asked where their previous home was. A lot of the answers given were 'who' or 'type of accommodation' rather than location. This is a briefing issue for interviewers and should be highlighted for future surveys.
106. Less than 100 people answered the reason about why they moved to their current property.
107. There were 33 people who were related to someone else living in the household who was the owner of the property. This is only routed to as necessary and we would recommend keeping this question.
108. Only 35 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?'.
109. Fifty-eight people answered the question 'Which of these best describes the owner of this accommodation?' and of these, 18 people answered 'don't know'.
110. 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 2 people answered 'yes', and

21 people in total answered this question. Consequently, the following 3 questions were asked of 21 or less people.

111. Less than 100 people answered the income from self-employment questions.
112. There were not many questions where data was difficult to collect. There were 27.5% 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' 22.1% said 'don't know', and for the facility/service 'arts facilities' 21.4% said 'don't know'.

Grossing

113. The grossing factors for the survey data were calculated by Corrine Moy and Karsten Shaw at GfK NOP under direction from MORI.
114. The calculation of household grossing weights was a two stage process.

Stage 1: Estimation of the number of eligible addresses

115. 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.
116. This was straightforward to calculate. For each LA, the estimate of the number of eligible addresses was estimated as:

$$\left[\frac{\text{Issued addresses} - \text{Non-valid addresses}}{\text{Issued addresses} + \text{Non-issued addresses}} \right] * \text{Total addresses}$$

117. 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

118. 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.

119. For example in Isle of Anglesey we had the following figures:

Total addresses	33,929
Sampled addresses	675
of which:	
Issued addresses	653
Non-issued addresses	22
 Non-valid addresses	 96

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

$$[(653 - 96) / (653 + 22)] * 33,929 = 27,998$$

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

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

Stage 2: Calculation of grossing weights

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

123. 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:

$$\text{Eligible addresses (estimate)} / (\text{Issued addresses} - \text{Non-valid addresses})$$

124. For example in Isle of Anglesey the calculation was:

$$27,998 / (653-96) = 50.27$$

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

125. 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)

126. 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' or missing

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

property type = 'Flat' or 'Other'

property type = 'Not recorded'

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

Households interviewed / Total valid outcomes at all valid addresses

128. The strata used were defined on the same basis as for 2004. The method used to select them is described below.

129. 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.

130. 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.

131. 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).

132. As an example, let us consider Isle of Anglesey. The response rates were as follows:

Houses	64.9% (n=450)
Houses (Good/not seen)	65.7% (n=428)

Houses (Bad/Ugly)	50.0% (n=22)
Flats/Other	38.1% (n=21)
Not recorded	69.0% (n=87)

(2005 data used for this example)

133. 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.

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

134. This weight was calculated separately for each LA within the strata described in step 3 and is simply $1 / \text{resprate}$.

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

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

136. That is,

$$\text{fingross} = \text{gf1} * \text{gf2} * \text{respwt}$$

Step 6 – comparison with population figures & post-stratification

137. The distribution of tenure from the grossed *Household level* data was compared with data from the 2001 census and scaled up to estimate the household count in 2005. This estimate was created by using the dwelling stock estimates produced by the Welsh Assembly. A factor representing the April 1 2005 data compared with the April 1 2001 data was created and applied to the census data. This was calculated separately for each tenure type and LA. The census data was also used to calculate the proportion of owner-occupiers and those privately renting from the dwelling stock data as this is not distinguished in the dwelling stock data.

138. Using Isle of Anglesey as an example, the 2005 (April 1st):

Rented from local authorities: 3,949

Rented from registered social landlords (housing association): 518

Owner-occupied, privately rented and other tenures: 27,736

139. From the 2001 Census, we have:

Total Owner Occupied Households = Owner occupied:
Owns outright + Owner occupied: Owns with a mortgage
or loan + Owner occupied: Shared ownership

$$= 9,875 + 9,339 + 71$$

$$= 19,285$$

Total households privately renting and other = Rented
from: Private landlord or letting agency + Rented from:
Other

$$= 2,696 + 1,558$$

$$= 4,254$$

140. Therefore, Total owner-occupied and privately renting and other = 19,285
+ 4,254 = 23,539

141. So the estimated proportion of households who are privately renting and
other tenures is $4,254 / 23,539 = 18.07\%$

142. And hence the proportion of households who are owner-occupiers is
81.93%.

143. So, returning to the dwelling stock data.

Owner-occupied, privately rented and other tenures: 27,736

144. Using the proportions calculated from the census, we estimate that:

$$\text{Owner-occupied} = 27,736 * 81.93\% = 22,724$$

$$\text{Privately renting and other tenures} = 27,736 - 22,724 = 5,012$$

145. The equivalent calculation was conducted upon the 2001 dwelling stock data and the following estimates achieved:

$$\text{Rented from local authorities: } 4,664$$

$$\text{Rented from registered social landlords: } 459$$

$$\text{Owner-occupied: } 21,774$$

$$\text{Privately renting and other: } 4,797$$

146. Factors for the increase between 2005 and 2001 were then calculated for each LA by tenure. For the Isle of Anglesey, the factors were:

$$\text{Rented from local authorities: } 3,949 / 4,664 = 0.847$$

$$\text{Rented from registered social landlords: } 518 / 459 = 1.129$$

$$\text{Owner-occupied: } 22,724 / 21,774 = 1.045$$

$$\text{Privately renting and other: } 5,012 / 4,797 = 1.045$$

147. These factors were then applied to the census counts of households in order to gain an estimate of the household counts for 2005 to be used as post stratification targets for the 2005 LIW data.

148. For Isle of Anglesey, this worked out as follows:

$$\text{Rented from local authorities: } 0.847 * 4,396 = 3,722$$

$$\text{Rented from registered social landlords: } 1.129 * 421 = 475$$

$$\text{Owner-occupied: } 1.045 * 19,285 = 20,153$$

$$\text{Privately renting and other: } 1.045 * 4,254 = 4,446$$

149. This was repeated for each LA, leading to the figures in the right hand side in the table below.

	LIW grossed		Census 2001	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Owner occupied	886,454	73.8	905,557	72.9
Local authority	154,453	12.9	139,330	11.2
Housing Association	59,377	4.9	59,663	4.8
Private rented	100,444	8.4	136,706	11.0
Total	1,200,728	100.0	1,242,499	100.0

Source: MORI

150. The total number of households was slightly smaller (96.6%) compared with the census estimate adjusted for dwelling stock count. Overall levels of owner occupancy and households renting from local authority were close to the proportions from the total estimated. The proportion of households renting from Housing Associations was very close but the proportion of households renting privately was considerably lower. However, there was considerable variation in the proportion of housing association and private rented households by LA.

151. 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 so that the total estimate reflected the estimate of the adjusted census data.

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

$$\text{tenurewt} = \text{weighting factor for tenure within LA}$$

$$\text{fingros2} = \text{fingross} * \text{tenurewt}$$

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

Implications

Sampling

153. The response rates achieved in 2005 have been subsequently used to model response rates, and therefore inform the number of addresses issued in 2006. These should be revisited each year using the aggregate data set to make increasingly accurate sampling predictions.
154. Because of the number of genuine interviews conducted at the addresses containing organisation names, the practice established in 2004 in this survey (and used also in 2005) 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

155. In 2004, 4.7% of valid addresses were missing data on first impressions scores on the contact sheet. For 2005 this information was 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 recorded. The amount of missing data on these variables was reduced to 1% as a result. This approach should continue for the 2006 design.
156. The leaflets stated that Welsh language interviews are available on request, either in advance by contacting Head Office, or by asking the interviewer who visits the property, in 2005. Whether or not this was the cause, the number of interviews conducted in Welsh increased in 2005, so we would suggest leaving this information on the 2006 leaflet.

Notifications

157. A strict control over the survey press release in 2006 is recommended to ensure consistent information is released.
158. Letters were sent to the Chief Constable at each Police Authority and Chief Executive of each Local Authority. In order to raise the profile of the survey additional local authority staff were notified (the Chief Housing Officer, Chief Environmental Health Officer, and Head of Public Relations), and this practice should continue in 2006.

Fieldwork

159. 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.

160. The *Scenarios Exercise* given to interviewers during the briefings, regarding refusals and best practice for persuading householders to take part, worked well and should be used again in 2006.
161. Having the Welsh language pilot later than in the 2004 timetable was very helpful in ensuring the questionnaire was substantially developed before translation into the Welsh language. We would recommend keeping this timetable for the 2006 survey.

Questionnaire

162. In 2005 the Welsh language pilot was moved back by a few months. It proved more practical to develop the English language questionnaire first, test and amend it, before translating it. However, there was still a substantial amount of cross-over, meaning the English questionnaire was still being developed and changed after the Welsh language pilot. We would recommend having a more structured timetable for questionnaire development, with clear stages, deadlines and sign-offs, to minimise this in future.

Welsh Translation

163. The number of Welsh language interviews conducted on the Welsh CAPI was 69: 47 by MORI interviewers and 22 by GfK NOP interviewers. To try and increase this number, future survey materials should continue to make it explicit that Welsh language interviews are available, and should also explain how to request these.

Timetable

164. The timetable for questionnaire development was divided into more specific sections in 2005 compared to 2004. This gave more time for making changes to the CAPI programme, translating the questionnaire into Welsh, and gave longer for testing the CAPI questionnaire.
165. This was achieved by developing the topics, liaising with the 'buy-in' clients, and developing the Word document earlier in the timetable before programming began for the English pilot. Delaying the Welsh language pilot until as much as possible of the English language CAPI had been developed before translation also reduced time spent retranslating sections of text.
166. Although this was a marked improvement on the development and translation of the 2004 questionnaire, there was still some over-lap in development, so we would recommend a more detailed timetable for 2006. 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/J22998

Checked & Approved:

.....
Ben Page

Checked & Approved:

.....
Andy Cubie

Appendices



Appendix 1	Contact sheet MORI
Appendix 2	Contact sheet GfK NOP
Appendix 3	CAPI changes post pilot
Appendix 4	Briefing slides
Appendix 5	Interviewer Instructions
Appendix 6	Printing specification
Appendix 7	Additional contact sheet
Appendix 8	Contact sheet printed
Appendix 9	Household letter
Appendix 10	Leaflet
Appendix 11	Showcards English
Appendix 12	Showcards Welsh
Appendix 13	2005 LIW questionnaire
Appendix 14	First impressions photos
Appendix 15	Self-completion questionnaire - Adult
Appendix 16	Self-completion questionnaire - Child
Appendix 17	eProgress
Appendix 18	Outer envelope
Appendix 19	Local Authority letter
Appendix 20	Police Authority letter
Appendix 21	Press release
Appendix 22	Booking-in specification
Appendix 23	Excel sms report
Appendix 24	CAPI validations specification
Appendix 25	Derived variables syntax