

**UKHLS**

*Wave 1 Technical Report*

**Authors :** Richard Boreham, Diana Boldysevaite, Caroline Killpack

**Date :** January 2012

**Prepared for:** Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex

---

# Content

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Overview of methodology .....	1
1.3	Branding .....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Sample Design .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	GP sample design.....	3
2.1.1	Selecting PSUs.....	3
2.1.2	Sampling addresses .....	4
2.1.3	Sample month allocation.....	4
2.2	Ethnic Minority Boost (EMB) sample design .....	5
2.2.1	Selecting PSUs.....	5
2.2.2	Selecting addresses.....	6
2.2.3	Low density areas .....	7
2.3	General Population Comparison (GPC) sample .....	7
2.4	Sampling households and individuals within households .....	7
2.4.1	GP and GPC samples .....	7
2.4.2	EMB sample .....	8
	Sources.....	10
<b>3</b>	<b>Developing Survey Instruments .....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Piloting .....	11
3.2	Survey Instruments.....	11
3.2.1	CAPI structure .....	12
3.2.2	Household questionnaire .....	12
3.2.3	Individual CAPI interview .....	12
3.2.4	Proxies .....	13
3.2.5	Self-completions .....	13
3.2.6	Consent forms.....	14
<b>4</b>	<b>Translations.....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	Translated languages .....	15
4.1.1	Languages covered by formal translations .....	15
4.1.2	Languages covered by informal translations .....	16
4.2	Translating of Survey Materials .....	16
4.2.1	Translating Survey Documents .....	16
4.2.2	Translating the CAPI Instrument.....	16
4.3	Accredited bilingual interviewers and interpreters.....	17
4.4	Identifying translation requirements during fieldwork .....	17
4.4.1	Materials to establish translation requirement.....	18
4.4.2	Household level translation requests .....	18
4.4.3	Individual level translation requests.....	18
<b>5</b>	<b>Fieldwork .....</b>	<b>20</b>

<b>5.1</b>	<b>Fieldwork Design .....</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1.1	Screening points .....	20
5.1.2	Interviewing points .....	20
5.1.3	Re-issue strategy.....	21
5.1.4	Screening Fieldwork Period .....	22
5.1.5	First Issue Fieldwork Period .....	22
5.1.6	Re- issue Fieldwork period.....	22
5.1.7	Partial re-issues.....	22
5.1.8	Coverage targets.....	23
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Training interviewers .....</b>	<b>24</b>
5.2.1	Briefing schedule .....	24
5.2.2	Briefing content .....	24
5.2.3	Interviewer Materials .....	25
5.2.4	General Population Address Record Form (ARF) .....	27
5.2.5	Ethnic Minority Boost ARF .....	28
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Contacting procedures.....</b>	<b>29</b>
5.3.1	Informing the police .....	29
5.3.2	Contact in advance .....	29
5.3.3	Advance mailing experiment .....	29
5.3.4	On the doorstep.....	30
5.3.5	During the interview .....	31
5.3.6	Keeping in touch with respondents.....	31
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Monitoring Fieldwork .....</b>	<b>32</b>
5.4.1	Progress reporting .....	32
5.4.2	Translations .....	32
5.4.3	Maximising response .....	33
5.4.4	Fieldwork quality control.....	33
5.4.5	Safety, consent and confidentiality issues.....	34
5.4.6	Fieldwork complaints.....	35
<b>6</b>	<b>Response rates .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Household response .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Individual response.....</b>	<b>39</b>
6.2.1	Response to interview .....	39
6.2.2	Adult Self-completions .....	42
6.2.3	Youth Self-Completion.....	43
<b>7</b>	<b>Data Preparation .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Data keying and scanning .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>7.2</b>	<b>Data coding and editing.....</b>	<b>50</b>
7.2.1	SIC and SOC coding .....	50
7.2.2	Cleaning of address information.....	50
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>Fieldwork Documents.....</b>	<b>51</b>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

This report provides a detailed account of the methodology of wave 1 of Understanding Society: the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS).

UKHLS is a major longitudinal household panel study designed to provide valuable new information about the beliefs, experiences, behaviours and lives of people in the UK; it is known to respondents as Understanding Society. UKHLS both replaces and incorporates the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), which consists of 18 waves of influential and well-used longitudinal data. UKHLS is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) from the largest single investment in academic social research resources ever launched in the UK. It is led by the Scientific Leadership Team at the UK Longitudinal Studies Centre (ULSC) based within the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) at the University of Essex. The first five waves of the survey are being conducted by a consortium of the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) and the Central Survey Unit (CSU) in the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency.

## 1.2 Overview of methodology

The sample for the first wave of the study consists of two groups: the General Population (GP) sample, selected from the Postcode Address File (PAF) in Great Britain (GB) and the Land and Property Services Agency (LPSA) list of domestic properties in Northern Ireland (NI); and a boost sample of minority ethnic groups (EB). All individuals aged 10 years and over defined as members of the household were eligible for interview. A third sample group, the Innovation Panel (IP) consists of c.1500 households. The IP is a forerunner to the main UKHLS survey and was conducted twelve months before the start of wave 1. The IP is designed to allow methodological research to inform the fieldwork process for the main stages of the survey. The total target UKHLS sample was 40,000 households<sup>1</sup>.

The UKHLS interview at wave 1 consisted of a number of elements: a household questionnaire; an individual questionnaire for adults; a paper self-completion questionnaire (one for those aged 16 and over and another for youths aged 10-15); and consents for linking to administrative records. The household and individual adult questionnaires were administered by computer aided personal interviewing (CAPI). The household interview consisted of three parts: enumerating members of the household, relationships between household members and a general household questionnaire.

---

<sup>1</sup> This includes the BHPS sample who were surveyed separately at Wave 1.

The adult interview covered a broad range of topics, including: family, relationships, fertility and child-birth history; health, disability and caring; employment, finance and personal consumption; ethnicity, discrimination, politics and the environment; beliefs, values and attitudes; and migration history, harassment and remittances (for the EB sample only). A shorter interview was attempted with a proxy informant if the eligible sample member was unable to participate because of temporary absence from the household. Both adults and children were asked for consent to link to health and educational administrative records. Youth self-completion questionnaires included questions about health, behaviours, school, neighbourhood, families, hopes and concerns.

Respondents enumerated in the household at wave 1 form the baseline for the longitudinal waves of the study, i.e. wave 2 onwards, at which point sample members of the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) and Northern Ireland Household Panel Survey (NIHPS) will also be added. Households will be interviewed annually.

UKHLS data will be used to understand how individuals respond to changing social and economic circumstances, to inform debates for policy makers, academics across a wide range of disciplines, and the media. Preliminary findings from the first year of wave 1 of the study can be found in *Understanding Society: Early findings from the first wave of the UK's household longitudinal study* (McFall & Garrington, 2011). Further publications are available from the *Understanding Society* website, [www.understandingsociety.org.uk](http://www.understandingsociety.org.uk).

### **1.3 Branding**

Public Zone, a pro-social communications agency, was commissioned to design a respondent-friendly brand to minimise non-response and attrition. In collaboration with ESRC, ISER and NatCen, the *Understanding Society* name, logo and style guide were developed.

## 2 Sample Design

Sample for wave 1 of UKHLS consisted of the following components:

- General Population (GP) sample;
- Ethnic Minority Boost (EMB) sample; and
- General Population Comparison (GPC) sample

The rest of the chapter discusses each component in greater detail.

### 2.1 GP sample design

The GP sample was based on a proportionally stratified, clustered, equal probability sample of residential addresses drawn to a uniform design from the small user Postcode Address File (PAF) (version Royal Mail postcode update 45). The sample covered the whole of Britain, including north of the Caledonian Canal – a total of 47,520 addresses from 2,640 areas or sample points.

In Scotland, England and Wales the sample was drawn in two stages. The first stage involved selecting the Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) - postcode sectors or groups of postcode sectors<sup>2</sup>. The second stage selected Delivery Points (DPs) (addresses) within each PSU.

The Northern Irish sample<sup>3</sup> was drawn separately from the Land and Property Services Agency's list of domestic properties and was an unclustered sample.

#### 2.1.1 Selecting PSUs

The PSUs were selected by following these steps:

##### Stratification

The sample was stratified to provide a modest improvement to the precision of estimates.

- Firstly, the PSUs were sorted into twelve regions: the nine Government Office Regions (GORs) in England, with inner and outer London treated separately, plus Scotland and Wales. Each region was then divided into three bands based on the proportion of household reference persons with a non-manual occupation (National Statistics socio-economic classification categories 1 and 2) according to data from the 2001 Census of Population. This produced 36 strata (12 regions x 3).

---

<sup>2</sup> Postcode sectors with fewer than 500 addresses were grouped with neighbouring sectors in order to reduce clustering and were treated as a single PSU.

<sup>3</sup> 2,400 addresses

- Next, each of the 36 thus created stratum was divided into three approximately equal-sized bands based on population density (number of private households, based on 2001 Census data, divided by area of PSU in hectares), totaling to 108 bands (36 x 3).
- Finally, each of the 108 bands was sorted by minority ethnic density (proportion of the population classified as non-white, according to 2001 Census data).

The stratification variables (GOR, social class, population density and ethnic minority density) were chosen for their likely correlation with key survey measures.

### Selection

Once stratified, the PSUs were then selected using systematic random sampling with probability proportional to the number of DPs<sup>4</sup> within each sector. The DP count was cumulated down the complete ordered list of PSUs. A sampling interval,  $I$ , was generated where  $I = \text{total DP count}/2640$ . A random start,  $R$ , between 1 and  $I$  was generated and 2640 PSUs selected by taking those containing the  $R$ th,  $(R+I)$ th,  $(R+2I)$ th,... DPs, working down the cumulative total.

### 2.1.2 Sampling addresses

Having selected the PSUs, the next stage was to select DPs within the sampled PSUs. Within each sampled sector, 18 PAF addresses were selected using systematic random sampling<sup>5</sup>, by using an interval of  $M/18$ , and a random start between 1 and  $M/18$ , where  $M$  was the DP count for the PSU. This gave a sample of 47,520 DPs.

Addresses that had been selected for other NatCen studies in the past three years were excluded prior to selection to avoid interviewers re-visiting previously contacted households. This totalled to 1.5% of DPs on the PAF. Similarly, addresses already selected for the BHPS were also excluded before sampling, to avoid selecting them twice.

### 2.1.3 Sample month allocation

The PSUs in England, Wales and Scotland were systematically allocated to 24 monthly samples by listing sectors in the order of selection from the stratified sampling frame and then allocating to months by repeating the following balanced pattern: 18, 8, 24, 2, 11, 15, 5, 21, 16, 7, 22, 1, 10, 13, 4, 19, 17, 9, 23, 3, 12, 14, 6, 20. The monthly samples were referred to as “January, Year 1” .... “December, Year 2.” Each sample month contained 110 PSUs.

Due to a relatively small sample size, in Northern Ireland, the GP sample was allocated to twelve monthly samples (200 addresses per month). Wave 1 for the Northern Ireland sample was

---

<sup>4</sup> Expanded by the MOI in Scotland

<sup>5</sup> After expansion by the MOI in areas of high MOIs

supposed to take place between January and December 2009; however, in practice, the fieldwork was spread over only 11 months, as fieldwork did not start until February 2009. The January sample was issued in February. The February sample was split between February (35 addresses) and March (165 addresses). The other ten monthly samples were all issued in the intended month. In future waves, each of the 12 monthly samples will be issued to field in the allocated month.

## 2.2 Ethnic Minority Boost (EMB) sample design

### 2.2.1 Selecting PSUs

The specific objective of UKHLS was to interview at least 1,000 adults from each of the five selected target communities: Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, Black Caribbeans and Black Africans<sup>6</sup>. To achieve this, the initial first estimate of the selection procedure suggested selecting 44,000 addresses for screening from the 3,145 postal sectors that were estimated to contain relatively high proportions of target EM groups, based on 2001 Census data and more recent Annual Population Survey data. It was decided to confine the EMB sample to sectors where the estimated density exceeded 5%. Thus selected sectors constituted approximately 35% of the sectors in Great Britain and covered between 82% and 93% of the population of each of the five target EM groups.

To improve efficiency<sup>7</sup>, it was later decided to sub-sample sectors with very small expected assignments – reducing the number of such sectors, and conversely increasing the size of the assignments in each remaining small sector. Thus, the 3,145 sectors were divided into four strata based on the expected number of ethnic minority households that would be identified by the sampling and screening procedures (see Berthoud et al, 2009 for more details). The following rules were applied in the stratification process:

- In the stratum where a yield of 3 or more households was expected, all sectors were included in the boost sample.
- In the other three strata, sectors were sub-sampled at rates of 1 in 4, 1 in 8 or 1 in 16 respectively.

---

<sup>6</sup> Bangladeshis are the smallest of these five ethnic minority groups, and it was decided to design the sample in such a way as to aim to achieve an estimated 1,000 interviews with adult members of that community, but at least 1,100 interviews with members of the four larger groups (Berthoud et al 2009).

<sup>7</sup> In order to constrain the number of sectors that might have just one or two eligible sample households (or even none).



The total number of postal sectors thus selected for inclusion in the EMB sample was 771, each with a sampling fraction. Of these, just 6 were in Scotland and 7 in Wales; the remaining 758 were in England, with a concentration in London (412 sectors).

### 2.2.2 Selecting addresses

To improve the efficiency of fieldwork allocations, for sectors where more than 100 addresses would be selected for screening, the address list was split in half to make two assignments, each of less than 100. Where the initial selection would be more than 200, the list was split in three. Sectors with very small expected selections were grouped with near neighbours to impose a minimum assignment size<sup>8</sup>. Assignments were then allocated at random into 24 equal groups, to be covered in each of the 24 months of the wave 1 fieldwork period (January 2009-December 2010).

Addresses were selected from each sector's PAF address lists in the normal way, applying the fractions laid down by the previous steps to the list of addresses stratified in postcode order, from a random start number. The number of addresses selected per postal sector ranged from 15 to 103.

In sectors selected for both the GP and EMB samples, a single systematic sample of the required total number of addresses was selected and subsequently allocated in a systematic way to the two samples, thus ensuring that both are spread throughout the whole sector.

A review of the outcome of the first five months of fieldwork suggested that the number of interviews with Bangladeshis was lower than expected, and that it would fall short of the 1,000 target over the two year period. It was therefore decided to issue more addresses in areas of very high Bangladeshi concentration. In each of the 18 sectors with the highest concentration, additional addresses were selected, 1½ times as many as had been selected in the first draw (so that the total issued addresses in those sectors was 2½ times the original figure). These extra assignments were allocated at random across the remaining 12 months of fieldwork, January-December 2010.

Northern Ireland was not covered by the boost sample, as so few members of the target minority groups live there.

---

<sup>8</sup> A PSU (as originally selected) was defined as 'small' if either the expected number of issued addresses was less than 15 or the expected number of achieved interviews was less than 2 and the expected number of issued addresses was less than 50. A 'small' PSU could be merged with a neighbouring PSU if their centres (defined by O/S reference) were within 15km of each other.

### 2.2.3 Low density areas

Because EMB sample was restricted to postcode sectors with a non-white population density of 5% or higher, this meant that the sample of ethnic groups was not representative as it would not include ethnic groups living in low density areas. To correct this, any adult defined as belonging to an ethnic group during the interview and living in a low density area, automatically got additional 5 minutes of questions asked of the EMB sample. This happened in fewer than 1,000 interviews over the whole survey.

## 2.3 General Population Comparison (GPC) sample

The General Population Comparison (GPC) sample is a subsample of the GP sample. The GPC sample consisted of one sampled address in 40% of the PSUs in the main GB sample<sup>9</sup> - of the 2,640 main sample points, 1,584 consisted of 18 main sample addresses and the other 1,056 consisted of 17 main sample addresses and one GPC sample address. All persons in the GPC sample were designated as members of this sub-sample, regardless of ethnic group membership.

GPC sample respondents were asked additional survey questions (approximately 5 minutes' worth of extra questions) that were also asked of the EMB sample but not the GP sample to allow comparative analysis. All members of the GPC sample were also considered members of the GP sample, so analysis of the GP sample should include these sample members.

## 2.4 Sampling households and individuals within households

### 2.4.1 GP and GPC samples

At each selected address, the final stage of sampling was done by field interviewers, who had to identify whether a persons could be defined as sample member or not. At each sampled address, all resident persons and those away in institutions at the time of wave 1 fieldwork were deemed UKHLS sample members.

Where addresses contained multiple dwellings or households, up to three were selected at random for inclusion using a Kish grid procedure<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> The 40% of postal sectors were allocated systematically after sorting PSUs by the original stratification within sample months.

<sup>10</sup> At addresses that were expanded by the MOI, if there was more than one household present (which was usually the case), one household was randomly selected from those at the address, unless the number found at the address was between 1.5 and 2.5 times the MOI, in which case two were selected, or greater than 2.5 times the MOI, in which case three were selected.

## 2.4.2 EMB sample

For the EMB sample, the procedures were slightly more complex. At addresses with more than three dwellings or households, dwellings/households were selected in the same way as for the GP sample. However, within each household, rather than automatically including all resident persons as sample members, three additional steps were applied:

- A “screen” was carried out to identify whether there were any persons from target ethnic groups in the household;
- A selection was applied to different groups order to select only a desired proportion into the sample. The selection fractions were changed for the second year of the survey<sup>11</sup>. The selection fractions were as follows:

Group	Selection Fraction	
	Year 1	Year 2
Indian	51%	70%
Mixed Indian	100%	100%
Pakistani	55%	100%
Bangladeshi	100%	100%
Sri Lankan	100%	100%
Caribbean/West Indian	91%	100%
Mixed Caribbean/West Indian	100%	100%
North African	82%	100%
Black African	82%	100%
African Asian	82%	100%
Chinese	100%	100%
Far Eastern <sup>12</sup>	30%	100%
Turkish	100%	100%
Middle Eastern/Iranian <sup>13</sup>	30%	100%

- In households, included in the sample following the two previous steps, all members of target ethnic groups were defined as EMB sample members (including children and those living away in institutions); persons of other ethnic groups (including white) were not included as part of the EMB sample. The latter were interviewed as temporary

---

<sup>11</sup> For the additional sampled addresses in the 18 high concentration Bangladeshi areas in year 2, 100% of Bangladeshis were eligible for inclusion in the survey, but no other ethnic groups found at addresses in these areas were eligible.

<sup>12</sup> Includes Filipino, Thai, Malaysian, Japanese, Vietnamese, Singaporean, Indonesian, Korean, Burmese.

<sup>13</sup> Includes Israeli, Palestinian, Lebanese, Syrian, Jordanian, Yemeni, Saudi, Iraqi, Afghani, other Gulf states.

sample members at wave 1 and for so long as they remain co-resident with at least one EMB sample member.

The procedures used for carrying out these steps are set out in the interviewer field documents included in Appendix B.

## Sources

Lynn, P. (2009) Sample Design for Understanding Society, Understanding Society Working Paper Series No. 2009 – 01. Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex. Available from <http://research.understandingsociety.org.uk/publications/working-paper/2009-01>.

Berthoud, R., Fumagalli, L., Lynn, P. and Platt, L. (2009) Design of the Understanding Society ethnic minority boost sample, Understanding Society Working Paper 2009-02. Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex. Available from <http://research.understandingsociety.org.uk/publications/working-paper/2009-02>.

## 3 Developing Survey Instruments

### 3.1 Piloting

Prior to UKHLS Wave 1 going into field in January 2009, two pilot studies and a dress rehearsal were carried out to test the questionnaire content and procedures. The first pilot, involving 70 respondents, took place in March - April 2008. The aim of the pilot was to test screening and other core questions, specifically those related to the ethnicity strand, and to make the necessary improvements to the questionnaire content and procedures. A second pilot which took place in June 2008 tested translated questionnaires in Bengali and Punjabi, to ensure that the interviews could technically be carried out in the translated languages, i.e. whether the laptops were able to run the program, and also to see if interviewers or respondents encountered any problems using the translated questionnaires. This pilot involved interviews with 50 respondents.

In addition to the two pilots, a survey of 100 households was carried out in August- September 2008, which tested the data collection instruments and procedures.

### 3.2 Survey Instruments

Data collection instruments at W1 included:

- 15 min (average) CAPI household questionnaire (including the enumeration of the household – approximately 5 min);
- 32.5 min (average) Individual Adult CAPI questionnaire for all aged 16+ (general population sample);
- 37.5 min (average) Individual Adult CAPI questionnaire for all aged 16+ (ethnic boost sample and general population comparison sample);
- 7 min (average) Adult Paper Self-Completion questionnaire for all aged 16+;
- 10 min (average) Youth Paper Self-Completion questionnaire for all aged 10-15; and,
- 10 min (average) CAPI proxy questionnaire.

CAPI instruments were programmed using Blaise software. Blaise is particularly suitable for large scale and complex surveys, such as UKHLS, as its Computer Assisted Interviewing (CAI) scripts have an in-built hierarchical block structure that effectively makes all questionnaires modular. Also, it allows for text-fills to be generated from any questions or variables already processed as part of the questionnaire instrument.

### **3.2.1 CAPI structure**

The CAPI instrument contained two slots – a slot for the screening questionnaire for EB sample and a slot for the main questionnaire for all sample types. The CAPI structure for the main questionnaire consisted of 5 parallel blocks, as indicated below:

- Household questionnaire
- Individual questionnaire (one block per adult, aged 16+)
- Self-completions (one block covering all adults and all children 10-15 in the household)
- Consent Help
- Admin

### **3.2.2 Household questionnaire**

The household interview consisted of three elements: enumerating respondents in the household, establishing relationships between household members (both covered as part of the household grid) and a household questionnaire. Where possible, the household interview was conducted with either the household reference person (HRP) or their spouse/partner and took 5 minutes on average, although this varied considerably depending on the household size. The household questionnaire took approximately 10 minutes.

### **3.2.3 Individual CAPI interview**

All adults (16+), if enumerated as part of the household and present during the fieldwork period, were asked to complete a CAPI interview. The average length of the interview was 32.5 minutes, or 37.5 minutes, if the respondent was in the ethnic boost sample.

Where another household member had to interpret for the respondent (in cases where the respondent had language difficulties but did not speak one of the languages into which we translate), the interview took slightly longer.

Analysis of timings data for the first six months of fieldwork (January to June) indicated that the CAPI questionnaire was taking much longer than anticipated, lasting on average 42 minutes per individual interview. As a result, cuts to the questionnaire content were required to bring the interview length in line with the original specification. The analysis to determine which questions should be removed from the interview was undertaken by ISER. ISER also investigated whether any questions could have show cards, rather than being a read out format, and whether any question routing could be amended to only ask a sub group of the sample, hence shortening the overall interview length for the majority of respondents.

These cuts were implemented in July 2009 with interviewers receiving a detailed note outlining exactly which questions had been removed or had routing changes made, and which questions now had show cards. The questionnaire documentation includes details of the questions that were included in each version of the survey.

The individual questionnaire included a broad range of topics covering the following main topic areas:

- Family, relationships, fertility, child-birth history
- Health, disability and caring
- Employment, finance and personal consumption
- Ethnicity, discrimination, religion, politics, environment
- Beliefs, values and attitudes
- Migration history, harassment and remittances (ethnic boost sample only)

At the end of the individual questionnaire, respondents were asked for their contact details and also to provide a contact details for a stable contact – a person who we may contact in case we cannot get in touch with them the following year. Respondents were also asked for their consent to link to their health and education records.

### **3.2.4 Proxies**

In such instances where the individual was enumerated as part of the household but were away or could not be contacted during the survey period, a proxy interview was sought, as a last resort.

The proxy interviews were carried out with should be carried out with a nominated proxy, a close relative, or another adult in the household who knows the respondent well. All proxy informants should be 16 years old or above.

### **3.2.5 Self-completions**

All adults (16+) and children aged 10-15 were asked to fill in a paper self-completion questionnaire. Verbal consent was sought from the parent or responsible adult before administering self-completions to those aged 10 to 15. All self-completions, including youth, were handed out with a plain confidentiality envelope to protect the confidentiality of their answers.

Respondents were encouraged to fill-in their self-completions during the interviewer's visit or have them ready for collection by the interviewer in a few days time. They could also opt to return the questionnaires by post to the office, however this was accepted as a last resort, and in such cases return envelopes were left with the respondent.

The adult self-completion contained questions on feelings and behaviour, sleeping habits, the environment, neighbourhood, friendships and relationships. The youth questionnaire contained questions on health, behaviour, school, neighbourhood, family, hopes and concerns. Copies of both questionnaires are included in the appendices.



### **3.2.6 Consent forms**

We asked for consent to link to health and educational administrative records for adults and children. For children, consent was obtained from their responsible adult (either a natural mother or father; for children with no natural parents in the household, the interviewers were asked to record who the responsible adult was during the enumeration of the household).

Respondents were provided with a leaflet explaining which health and education records we would be linking to. Copies of consent forms and leaflets can be found in Appendix A.

## 4 Translations

This chapter will cover the translations element of the study, focusing on the languages translated, the process for establishing translation requirements in the field, the materials used to aid this and the overall quality assurance procedures applied to translations.

Previous evidence suggests that ethnic minority groups are especially less likely to take part in social surveys or continue in longitudinal studies. This is further complicated for UKHLS as a significant minority of respondents have English as a second language, or can not speak English at all resulting in an acute language barrier. As a result, a process was designed to ensure that these respondents could participate in the study and we could interview them.

UKHLS approached translations in an innovative and fresh manner, moving away from the previous mode of delivering translations using paper questionnaires and progressing into the development of a translated CAPI programme. In theory, this advancement would allow for standardised delivery of translations and potentially reduce interview length as the data would be recorded electronically. Furthermore, when captured in this mode there would be no need for further data entry mechanisms to be employed resulting in translated interview data being processed and delivered alongside the main batch.

Translations were dealt with in two ways on UKHLS: those requiring formal translation, and those that could be dealt with informally. Formal translations required that both the CAPI and survey materials were translated into particular languages, and accredited bi-lingual interviewers or interpreters conducted the interview. Informal translations did not require these stipulations and could be undertaken by a family member, neighbour or close relative.

### 4.1 Translated languages

The decision over which languages to formally translate into was taken by ISER, following their analysis of previous studies that have offered translations, such as Citizenship, Longitudinal Survey of Young People In Education and the Health Survey for England.

#### 4.1.1 Languages covered by formal translations

There were nine languages where a formal translation process was followed: Arabic, Bengali, Cantonese, Gujarati, Punjabi Gurmukhi, Punjabi Urdu, Somali, Urdu and Welsh.

These languages were chosen having been identified as the most widely spoken by the ethnic minority groups within the sample, and where English may also not be spoken readily by these ethnic groups. For example, Hindi is one of the most widely spoken language in the UK, but as the majority of Hindi speakers also speak English it was not one of the nine nominated languages.

### 4.1.2 Languages covered by informal translations

As there was no requirement to formally translate the CAPI and survey materials into other languages, informal translations were allowed for people who spoke these other languages. These translations were dealt with by family members, neighbours, or close friends who translated the English questions and answers into the required language.

## 4.2 Translating of Survey Materials

### 4.2.1 Translating Survey Documents

The survey materials that required translation underwent a rigorous checking process. The original translation of the documents was outsourced to a translation agency specialising in multi language services such as translations, proof reading and type setting. Once translated, the text was checked by checkers working through a separate translation agency who proof read the translation to check for errors or queries. The checkers would log these comments in a central spreadsheet which was passed back to the original agency for review. If there was stalemate between the checker and the original translator, an independent translator would review and decide on whether an amendment was needed<sup>14</sup>. The translated text was transferred to the survey material templates and formatted before being further proof read by the original translation agency to make sure the sentence construction was correct.

Whilst this quality assurance process was necessary to guarantee that the translation of these languages was standardised, it was very time consuming and required constant management. Due to other issues regarding the English questionnaire development and the considerable burden this placed on internal project resources, translations were not ready for the start of the main fieldwork period in January, but started instead in July.

### 4.2.2 Translating the CAPI Instrument

Translations for CAPI were done using a centralised web database specifically developed for NatCen called the Language Management Utility (LMU). Accounts were set up for translators, checkers and administrators for each of the nine languages, which allowed access to different levels of functionality within the LMU. The translation process was controlled by assigning a status to each question that required translation. The different statuses were:

1. Awaiting translation
2. Translated – ready for proofreading
3. Proofread – ready for checking
4. Checked – comments to review

---

<sup>14</sup> In practice, all queries about translations were resolved between the translating and the checking agencies.

## 5. Translation completed

Once the CAPI programme had been translated it was tested on an interviewer laptop by a bilingual interviewer. This was to check that the functions of the multi language programme were operating correctly, such as the toggle facility which allowed the interviewer to switch between English and the translated language during the interview, and that the language characters displayed accurately. The majority of issues were resolved, however there were a couple of questions that were more complicated to solve and would have further delayed the launch of the translations system. In this situation, interviewers were notified that they should toggle to the English version of the question and translate verbatim during the interview. Feedback was also requested from interviews following the launch of the translations programme to check whether the process worked in practice and that there were no unidentified issues to resolve. Interviewers were also asked to suggest where amendments could be made to streamline the process for Wave 2.

### **4.3 Accredited bilingual interviewers and interpreters**

For formal translation requests, only NatCen accredited bi-lingual interviewers or interpreters were permitted to conduct the actual interview. Interviewers were put through a robust accreditation process involving a number of tests and were assessed by a panel of independent agency interpreters. Each interviewer was required to complete oral and reading tests, a comprehension test in both English and the language they were being assessed for, followed by a dummy interview where they translated the English text and answers verbatim into the language being assessed and visa versa.

Bilingual NatCen interviewers were trained to manage the CAPI and so were able to conduct the interview themselves without additional support. The NatCen interpreters did not have experience of using a CAPI and so they were accompanied by an English only speaking NatCen interviewer to help manage the technical aspects of the questionnaire. Furthermore, the accompanying interviewer could use their doorstep and interview skills in building rapport, and provide a level of quality assurance. If a NatCen bilingual interviewer or interpreter was not available to cover the appointment, an agency interpreter accompanied the English speaking NatCen interviewer.

### **4.4 Identifying translation requirements during fieldwork**

Interviewers identified language requirements at both the household level, where the complete household required translation, and at the individual level.

#### **4.4.1 Materials to establish translation requirement**

Interviewers used a combination of different materials to communicate with the respondent to identify the translation needs (formal/ informal).

The first document was the Address Record Form (ARF), either GP or EB, which guided interviewers through the process of making contact, establishing eligibility and determining whether people would require a formal or informal translation. Along with the ARF, interviewers used the ARF Translation Card and Translation Booklet.

The ARF translation Card, a double sided A4 card, was handed to respondents who did not speak English and the interviewer could not communicate with. The front side of the card listed the sentence “I speak (language)” in 33 different languages including the 9 languages mentioned earlier.

If the respondent pointed to the one of the 9 translated languages, the interviewer was required to administer the Translation Booklet and turn to the relevant page for that language. On the page was a paragraph providing some background on the study, inviting the respondent to participate in UKHLS, and asking for a contact telephone number so an interpreter could contact them to discuss the study further and arrange an appointment. Interviewers were required to record the information (language spoken, outcome and telephone number) on the ARF and later in the CAPI admin.

If the respondent did not speak one of the 9 languages, and the interviewer could not find an English speaking household member or neighbour to communicate on their behalf, they were required to turn over the ARF Translation Card and show the back. This side listed the sentence “Your participation in the study is not required. Thank you for your time.” in 24 different languages. Interviewers were required to complete the ARF as appropriate and later transfer the information to the CAPI admin.

#### **4.4.2 Household level translation requests**

Household level translation requirements were identified by interviewers when screening the ethnic boost sample, and by attempting to make contact with their GP sample addresses. Whilst interviewers were only establishing eligibility of households through screening and not inviting participation at that stage, it became apparent when attempting to undertake screening that language barriers were present. If the screener was not going to be interviewing at that address, they could leave notes on the ARF to indicate that a translation would be required.

#### **4.4.3 Individual level translation requests**

Interviewers were advised to make contact with an English speaking member of the family, or neighbour, when encountering language communication barriers. In these situations, interviewers

were able to establish whether an individual respondent required a translation and in which language, through conversing with the English speaker. If the language required was not one of the 9 languages, the interviewer could ask the English speaker to translate informally on their behalf. In these situations, the interviewer used the English CAPI version rather than the multi language application and administered the documents as they were.

If the required translation was one of the 9 languages then interviewers had to follow the formal procedure of returning the case to the office for issue to an accredited bilingual interviewer or interpreter. If the interviewer themselves had undertaken accreditation through NatCen in one of the 9 languages, they were able to proceed with the interview using the multi language application and if they had the translated survey materials.

For cases where the interviewer was unable to carry out the interview, because there was no individual to act as an informal translator or they needed to refer the case to an accredited bilingual interviewer, they were required to assign an individual level outcome code and indicate what further action was required.

# 5 Fieldwork

## 5.1 Fieldwork Design

### 5.1.1 Screening points

The UKHLS sample included an Ethnic Minority Boost and interviewers were required to screen ethnic boost addresses for eligibility, using the ethnic boost ARFs.

Screening points were larger than the interviewing points, with a minimum of 60 addresses and a maximum of 90 addresses. However, in some areas where there were large screening assignments, these were broken into sub assignments of 35 addresses each and dealt with by a screening squad.

For screening, interviewers could be involved in one of three ways:

- as a lone screener, where they would focus on screening their allocated point and not conduct any interviewing at the addresses;
- as a screener-interviewer, where they would screen their allocated points, and also arrange appointments and conduct interviews at the eligible addresses;
- as part of a screening squad, where they would screen their allocated addresses and return the ARFs to their squad leader who would co-ordinate entering the screening information into the CAPI slots before allocation to the appropriate interviewer.

If working as a lone screener, the interviewer was to enter to the screening details into the CAPI admin slot then return the cases and ARFs to Brentwood who would notify the area manager to allocate to the next interviewer.

### 5.1.2 Interviewing points

In England, Wales and Scotland, the sample was grouped into interviewer assignments or points within each fieldwork month. These points were defined in consultation with NatCen's fieldwork managers to reflect local geography, but addresses in some, particularly rural, areas were widely spread. The size of the assignments was set at 18 addresses due to the strict coverage milestones.

Work was allocated 3 weeks before the start of each fieldwork month to make sure that any unallocated work was identified and dealt with immediately and to prevent a delay to the start of fieldwork. To prevent overburdening interviewers, rules were also applied to allocations:

- Interviewers could only work on one interviewing point per fieldwork month;
- Interviewers were only allowed to work on two consecutive fieldwork months at any given time; and

- Interviewers were not allowed to work on a UKHLS point and a National Travel Survey point within the same fieldwork month<sup>15</sup>.

Hit squads of experienced interviewers were also available in each area to step in and take on assignments where the original interviewer had struggled or for unforeseen circumstances, such as interviewer sickness. This strategy was implemented to ensure that assignments were covered within the allocated month.

### 5.1.3 Re-issue strategy

There was a higher level of reissues on UKHLS than there would be on a standard NatCen survey, which was mostly due to the response rate for the initial fieldwork period being substantially below the target response rate. There was a 4 stage process for determining which cases would be reissued.

Firstly the following outcome codes were excluded from being reissued.

110: Completed household questionnaire and at least one individual interview  
 210: Completed household questionnaire but no individual interviews  
 410: Office refusal  
 440: Refusal during interview (unproductive partial)  
 541: Language difficulties with hhold as a whole  
 620: OFFICE APPROVAL ONLY: Inaccessible  
 630: Unable to locate address  
 660: Screener not completed due to non-contact (boost sample only)  
 710: Not yet built/under construction  
 720: Demolished/derelict  
 730: Vacant/empty housing unit  
 740: Non-residential address (e.g business, school, office, factory etc)  
 750: Address occupied, no resident household (e.g. occupied holiday/weekend home)  
 760: Communal establishment/institution - no private dwellings  
 770: Resident household, not eligible for survey  
 790: Other ineligible  
 860: Refusal to complete screener (boost sample only)  
 870: Screener not completed due to lack of knowledge (boost sample only)

In the admin block of the CAPI, interviewers were asked to code whether any of the following had happened. If so, these cases were also withdrawn from the set to be reissued.

All household members mentally incapable  
 All household members physically incapable  
 Household recently bereaved  
 Household recently suffered critical/terminal illness  
 Violent or threatening behaviour towards interviewer

Next, operations staff in Brentwood checked for any other interviewer verbatim comments in the admin block to see whether they should withdraw further cases from reissuing. Then finally, reissues were restricted to postcodes where there were 3 or more potential addresses to be reissued.

<sup>15</sup> NTS is a large scale PAF survey with strict coverage milestones that clashed with UKHLS. It would have been too burdensome for interviewers to work on both at the same time.



#### **5.1.4 Screening Fieldwork Period**

Screening was scheduled to take place two weekends before the start of the interviewing phase, beginning on a Wednesday and finishing the following Monday. The total screening phase lasted 6 days and was to include at least 1 weekday, 2 evenings and 1 weekend. No interviewing was allowed before the official first issue date even if the household was eligible and being dealt with by a screener-interviewer.

Due to high non contact rates within the ethnic boost sample, the screening period was increased in July 2009 from 6 days to 12 days. This allowed interviewers more time to make calls at the address before having to code the cases out.

#### **5.1.5 First Issue Fieldwork Period**

Wave 1 launched with each fieldwork month beginning on the 8<sup>th</sup> and ending on the 7<sup>th</sup> of the following month (i.e.: interviewing for JA1 began on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2009 and finished on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2009).

However, in January 2010 the first issue deadlines were extended to allow interviewers longer to cover the cases, and to reduce the non contact rate. The adjustment to the fieldwork dates mirrored the Wave 2 fieldwork timetable, so that interviewers would find it easier to manage their workloads if covering both waves. The first issue fieldwork period was increased from 4 to 6 weeks.

#### **5.1.6 Re- issue Fieldwork period**

Originally, there was only a week break between the end of first issue and the start of re-issues (i.e.: JA1 re-issues would begin around the middle of February). This proved quite difficult to manage operationally due to the large volume of re-issues to be processed and the limited time in which to allocate the cases and prepare re-issue materials. This was extended to three weeks in January 2010 to allow greater time for these processes to be completed.

#### **5.1.7 Partial re-issues**

An internal system was developed to enable the re-issue of partially productive households as the original systems had not been designed to do this. Following the implementation of this system, partial households eligible for re-issue were processed via this route from the June 2010 monthly sample onwards.

In addition the re-issue of partials was also applied retrospectively and these cases were dealt with by the Telephone Unit (TU). TU interviewers contacted the partially productive households to give individuals who were previously a non-contact the opportunity to take part in a telephone

interview. TU interviewers were briefed on the background to the process and the practical approach of contacting the respondents.

The TU used the existing CAPI programme as it would have taken too much time and resource to develop a CATI-specific version and the associated systems to process the cases. As a result of this decision, there were a couple of procedures that the TU needed to follow in order to deliver the CAPI programme via telephone.

The individual interview used a series of show cards at different questions which required TU interviewers to read out all answer options at these places. Two particular questions had to be tweaked to function in a different mode: asking a respondent's educational qualifications and their level of job satisfaction. Interviewers were given a handout with the amended script which they were to refer to at the corresponding questions within the interview.

Modifications to the contact and co-operation procedures were also required as TU interviewers were only allowed to contact the household using the household contact number, and were specifically attempting to contact those individuals who had not previously been interviewed. The management of this sample was also modified as it could not be managed using the CATI systems, which meant that interviewers worked from a series of fact sheets rather than a dial screen. The TU supervisor had to manage the appointments carefully by collating and reviewing the fact sheets, and ensure that interviewers were able to cover the cases.

Fieldwork lasted for six weeks, starting on 22<sup>nd</sup> July to 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010, covering cases from JA2 to MY2. Thank you letters and incentives were sent out after the interviews, and this was explained to respondents at the end of their interview.

### **5.1.8 Coverage targets**

Due to the large sample size, and the survey design of UKHLS as an annual interview, strict coverage targets were implemented to ensure fieldwork was covered on time within each month.

The coverage targets for each assignment were as follows:

- At least one trip transmitted back by 11<sup>th</sup> of the month (Day 4)
- Every address visited by 14<sup>th</sup> of the month (Day 7)
- 50% of addresses transmitted back by 21<sup>st</sup> of the month (Day 14)
- 80% of addresses covered and transmitted back by 28<sup>th</sup> of the month (Day 21)
- 100% of addresses covered and transmitted back by end of fieldwork month

Extensions were not allowed, even for appointments, to prevent fieldwork slipping behind timetable. Those cases that were eligible were re-issued back to interviewers during the re-issue period.

In January 2010, coverage targets were streamlined across all waves of UKHLS to enable closer monitoring of progress, and the identification of potential issues. The revised targets were:

- 50% of addresses covered and transmitted by 50% of fieldwork;
- 75% of addresses covered and transmitted by 75% of fieldwork;
- 100% of addresses covered and transmitted by end of fieldwork.

## 5.2 Training interviewers

### 5.2.1 Briefing schedule

The first set of NatCen briefings began in December 2008, in preparation for the launch of the fieldwork in January 2009. The briefings were held at locations spanning the UK namely Birmingham, Bristol, Derby, Glasgow, Leeds, London, and Manchester, and were front loaded to make sure enough interviewers were briefed to cover all points in the early fieldwork months. From March onwards, the frequency and size of the briefings reduced to 2-3 briefings per month.

As mentioned previously, once the study had been in field for a number of months, the decision was taken for Project Managers to lead the briefings in areas as and when they were required. This began in November 2009 and continued until December 2010.

### 5.2.2 Briefing content

All interviewers were required to attend a briefing before starting work on the study. A total of 118 briefings were conducted, starting in December 2008. Initially all briefings were led by researchers from NatCen with contributions from a member of the research team at ISER. However, due to the lower numbers of interviewers requiring briefing towards the end of year 1, Project Managers took over the briefings and briefed interviewers when required. Project Managers had all attended a conference on the study before the main briefings began, providing an overview of the survey and key points that would enable them to manage the interviewers. The number of interviewers at each briefing varied at the beginning of year 1, with numbers settling around 12 interviewers per briefing by six months into fieldwork.

All briefings for NatCen interviewers had a Briefing Manager from NatCen's field force. The role of the Briefing Manager was to oversee and control the briefing, ensure its smooth running, deal with any inappropriate behaviour, including unnecessary interruptions and digressions by interviewers, and to monitor the quality of the dummy interviews. In addition they were responsible for covering all aspects of interviewer administration. The Briefing Manager was also responsible for carrying out the risk assessment for the venue. If there was a mixture of new and experienced interviewers attending the briefing, a Briefing Assistant was also present to support the Briefing Manager in their role.

Each briefing lasted one day, and covered the following topics:

## UKHLS standard briefing

### Overview of UKHLS

- Background to study
- Communications & branding

### Survey design

- Description of the sample
- Fieldwork timetable and coverage targets
- Assignments

### Contact and Co-operation Procedures

- First contact with address
- Advance mailing and doorstep materials
- Maximising response & co-operation rates
- Address Record Form (ARF): including multiple selection of Dwelling Unit's (DU)/ households

### Ethnic Boost sample

- Screening and eligibility
- Address Record Form (ARF)
- Translations

### Interview Process

- Overview of instruments
- Eligibility and enumeration of household members
- SOC/ SIC coding
- Elements of longitudinal surveys: spelling, contact details, stable contact
- Paper self-completions: youth (10-15 years) and adults (16+ years)
- Incentives

### Data linkage consents

- Overview of data linkage: adult health and education, child health and education
- Administration of consent form and information leaflet

### CAPI questionnaire

- Overview of content, proxies, household grid, extra ethnicity questions, and admin
- Practice of CAPI interview

### Review

- Summary of key points
- Question and answer session

Interviewers were also given a number of practice cases and asked to conduct practice interviews to familiarise themselves with the questions, especially the household questionnaire, sensitive questions, extra ethnicity questions and admin block.

Interviewers covering the Northern Ireland sample were briefed by NISRA representatives, and covered the standard briefing outlined above.

### 5.2.3 Interviewer Materials

Interviewers were supplied with the following materials for use on the study:

### **Advance materials to be sent to respondents**

Advance cards (and postage-paid envelopes)

Incentives

### **Contact and doorstep documents**

GP Address Record Form (ARF) x3 – selected address/ selection of multiple DU's and households

EB Address Record Form (ARF) x 3 – eligibility and selection of ethnic boost addresses/ DU's/ households

Information leaflet- 'All you need to know about Understanding Society'

Appointment card

ARF Screening Card

ARF Translation Card

ARF Translation Booklet

### **Interview Documents**

Showcards

Poole postage paid envelopes

Voucher receipt form

Participant's handbook

Participant's folder

UKHLS pen

UKHLS magnet

Change of address card

Change of address card envelope

### **Data linkage**

Health data linkage information leaflet

Education data linkage information leaflet

Consent Form A- adult health

Consent Form B- children health

Consent Form C- under 25's education

Consent Form D- children education

Consent flow chart

### **Self-completion questionnaire**

Adult paper self- completion

Youth self- completion (England, Scotland & Wales)

Self- completion plain envelopes

### **Interviewer instructions**

Project instructions


Interviewers working on the Northern Ireland sample were provided with copies of the above documents, although there was no ethnic boost in Northern Ireland and hence no need for EB ARFs and there was a Northern Irish version of the youth self completion with different questions about religion.

### 5.2.4 General Population Address Record Form (ARF)

There were three ARFs for use on the GP sample (GP1, GP2, and GP3). These were standard PAF ARFs with sections for address observations, the selection of extra Dwelling Units (DU's) and households, questions on eligible households, further information on unproductive households and final outcome. There was an additional section on establishing translation requirements.

Three ARFs were issued as it was possible that interviewers would be required to select a household from multiple dwelling units or households at the issued address. GP1 was the standard ARF used for the issued address where no selection was required. GP2 and GP3 were used for additional DU's and households, and followed a similar format to GP1 but did not include address observation questions.

The sample information on the ARF was provided on one label attached to the front page. The first label (address label) was printed with NatCen's serial number, NatCen's field area, allocated fieldwork month, sample type, issued address, grid reference for issued address and whether the address was in either the GP Comparison sample or in a low density area



An additional selection label was also on the front of the ARF GP1. This label contained the serial number and DU/ household selection grid for situations where interviewers encountered multiple DU's or households.

```

SN: 5000-01-1-Q

DUHH: 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
SEL1: 3 5 3 5 2 3 4 3 10
SEL2: 2 2 2 2 8 5 7 10 12
SEL3: 1 4 5 1 7 4 10 9 7

```

As well as the sample information, the ARF contained space for interviewers to record all attempts made to contact the respondents, observations on the issued address, multiple selection, establishing translation requirements, recording a final household outcome and a section on further information for unproductive households.

### 5.2.5 Ethnic Minority Boost ARF

Screening was undertaken to establish eligibility of ethnic boost households. Interviewers were required to screen using the Ethnic Boost ARFs, and the information provided on the selection label.

The Ethnic Boost sample had a separate set of ARFs to the GP sample, primarily due to the screening of these addresses and the various response targets between the ethnic groups within this sample. There were 3 ARFs for the Ethnic Boost- EB1, EB2, and EB3. The ARFs followed the structure of the general population sample ARFs, with the exception that they also included a screening section to establish household eligibility. EB1 was for the issued address, with EB2 and EB3 for use when interviewers were undertaking multiple selections of DU's and households.

ARF EB1 also included two labels - one for the address details which contained identical information to that on ARF GP1; the other label was the selection grid but this also included the eligibility number used for screening as shown on the label below

```

SN: 5000-01-1-Q
ELIGIBILITY NUMBER: 60

DUHH: 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
SEL1: 3 5 3 5 2 3 4 3 10
SEL2: 2 2 2 2 8 5 7 10 12
SEL3: 1 4 5 1 7 4 10 9 7

```

## 5.3 Contacting procedures

### 5.3.1 Informing the police

NatCen's interviewers were required to check in at the local police station before they started work. They were asked to tell the police what the survey was about, give them a copy of the police letter and explain how long they would be working in the area. Interviewers were also asked to make a note of the name of the officer to whom they spoke and the date of their call so that they were fully covered in the event of any query or complaint to the police.

The reason interviewers were asked to contact the police was to reassure respondents, as well as other people interviewers come into contact with, that the police are aware the interviewer is working in the area.

### 5.3.2 Contact in advance

Interviewers were required to send a mailing before the start of the initial fieldwork period to each of their issued addresses in their assignment. The content of the mailing differed depending on the sample type, i.e.: GP or EB, due to the different eligibility rules for each.

The GP mailing contained:

- Advance card (GP version)
- Advance card envelope (with stamp)
- Incentive (£10 high street gift voucher)<sup>16</sup>

The EB mailing contained:

- Advance card (EB version)
- Advance card envelope (with stamp)

In both mailings, interviewers were required to sign the bottom of the cards and check that each envelope contained the right items. Each advance card and envelope also had a serial number label to ensure that the correct mailing was going to the right sample address.

Interviewers posted the envelopes 2-3 days before making a personal visit at the start of fieldwork to allow enough time for the addresses to receive them.

### 5.3.3 Advance mailing experiment

Following disappointing response rates in the first six months of year 1 fieldwork, an experiment was undertaken on one month's sample to investigate the effect of enclosing the survey

---

<sup>16</sup> As not all EB addresses were eligible for participation, the incentive was not sent as part of the advance mailing but administered when the interview took place.



information leaflet ('All you need to know about Understanding Society') in the advance mailing. The experiment was designed to run on the JU1 GP sample only, with odd serial numbers receiving the standard advance mailing and even serial numbers receiving the advance mailing with information leaflet. All other elements of the advance mailing remained the same (i.e.: incentive).

The group who received the information leaflet as part of their mailing had a slightly higher response rate, so the advance mailing composition was changed to include the information leaflet.

### **5.3.4 On the doorstep**

Interviewers were briefed to familiarise themselves with the questionnaire content and survey materials to enable them to tailor their approach to the respondent they were speaking to. Interviewers were provided with a range of materials for use on the doorstep when selling the survey and arranging appointments. It was compulsory for interviewers to show their NatCen identification card to respondents on the doorstep.

Interviewers were advised to use the information leaflet, 'All you need to know about Understanding Society', to provide extra information about the survey regarding what respondents had to do, what would be done with their information and who was running the survey. The leaflet was designed to not overwhelm the respondent but provide enough information to encourage them to participate. In combination with the survey leaflet, interviewers were to keep a spare copy of the advance card to hand to act as a memory aid when making contact.

A survey branded appointment card was designed for use when interviewers wanted to leave their contact details or details of an arranged appointment with the respondent. The appointment card was business card sized, to enable respondents to keep hold of it easily such as in a wallet or on a pin board. Interviewers were able to complete the appointment card with the time and date of the appointment and their name so respondents would know who their appointment was with, especially useful if they had to reschedule.

A Participants' Handbook, which is covered in more detail in section 5.3.5, was also available for use on the doorstep if interviewers felt that this was appropriate for the respondent they were conversing with.

### 5.3.5 During the interview

In the interview, respondents were also given further information and survey materials to keep. The first was a Participant's Pack that contained:

- Participants Handbook
- Fridge magnet
- Understanding Society pens (x2)
- Participants Folder

The Participants' Handbook was an information tool that highlighted the importance of UKHLS in more detail than the information leaflet, and provided full contact details of which organisations were involved with managing the survey.

The fridge magnet detailed the household's survey month, and could be used to remind respondents when they would be invited to participate again in future waves. It also helped to re-iterate that the survey was an annual interview and the importance of this for measuring short term change.

Understanding Society pens were also given to each household for filling out the paper self-completions. The pens were made from recycled electrical goods, which aimed to demonstrate that the survey was modern and concerned with topics pertinent to recent years.

The Participants Folder was an A5 folder, where respondents could keep their survey materials (such as their carbon copy of consent forms and consent leaflets) and could refer to the documentation at a later date.

Interviewers were also required to administer Change of Address cards to respondents that they interviewed. As UKHLS is a longitudinal survey, the importance of being able to find and contact respondents at future waves is paramount. To enable this, a card was designed to encourage and facilitate the update of address information with ISER. Respondents were asked to complete the card with any address update information, especially if they were planning to move before their next interview the following year. Respondents who completed this card and returned it to ISER would receive an extra £5 gift voucher for doing so. In addition, interviewers gave out corresponding freepost change of address envelopes to encourage return of address updates.

### 5.3.6 Keeping in touch with respondents

Post-interview, respondents were encouraged to keep in touch with the survey and with ISER by accessing the Participants Website. On the website respondents could update their address details, and receive their £5 incentive for doing so, engage with the most recent findings of the survey and find out about the latest news.

Respondents were also sent a findings report which aimed to demonstrate what was being learnt from the information they gave, and how the data was being used. The report was designed to further engage the respondents in the survey, to highlight the importance of their participation and build a sense of commitment.

## **5.4 Monitoring Fieldwork**

Fieldwork began in January 2009 and ended on schedule in March 2011. For most months, fieldwork ran to timetable, however extensions to particular months were required due to religious festivals (Ramadan) and adverse weather conditions.

### **5.4.1 Progress reporting**

Fieldwork progress reports were sent to ISER weekly, comprising a breakdown of coverage and survey response. A number of figures were reported with a focus on 1<sup>st</sup> issue coverage by date against target, subsequently broken down by field area and sample type; and overall headline figures for response: household level, broken down by field area and sample type, plus individual response (CAPI, paper self-completions, and data linkage consent) and reasons for refusal.

As fieldwork progressed, this report was replaced by providing outputs from NatCen's internal monitoring system and delivering them daily to ISER. These outputs allowed closer inspection of progress than the weekly reports, facilitating better control over the monitoring of fieldwork.

### **5.4.2 Translations**

The monitoring of translations in field was two-fold: admin data and interviewer feedback. During fieldwork, transmitted outcome codes were investigated on a regular basis. If a household had been transmitted with an outcome indicating language difficulties, the admin data was read to confirm that a translation was definitely required, i.e.: the language was one that we translated the CAPI into. These cases would be allocated to an appropriate language speaking interviewer. If the translation request was at the individual level, interviewers would contact the operations team at Brentwood or their Project Manager to organise a translator to accompany them for the interview. All translation cases that were allocated to an interviewer were logged in a central system to manage deadlines and resources.

For year 2 of wave 1, a revised centralised system in Blaise for monitoring translations in field was designed and implemented. The system generated reports based on CAPI data, and thus requests could be quickly and routinely identified and resources and deadlines monitored more closely.

The launch of the translated CAPI questionnaire was delayed by six months due to knock on effects from questionnaire development issues. The backlog was identified and dealt with on an ongoing basis, along with newly identified cases. The delay may have had an effect on converting the requests into productive interviews for addresses requiring translations during the first 6 months of fieldwork due to the large time gap between first making contact and attempting to obtain an interview in translation.

### **5.4.3 Maximising response**

Interviewers were briefed on the importance of maximising response and minimising no-contacts within their assignments. Interviewers were required to familiarise themselves with the survey materials, the questionnaire content and the importance of tailoring their approach dependent on who they were talking to.

Interviewers had strict coverage targets which required them to start visiting addresses early in the fieldwork period. Furthermore, as interviewers were to interview all eligible household members resulting in making appointments and multiple trips to the address, it was important for them to make contact when the advance mailing was fresh in respondent's minds.

Interviewers were reminded of the importance of flexible call patterns, and making sure that they varied the days and times that they visited the addresses. Interviewers were also encouraged to spread their visits out, to increase their chance of making contact, and to knock when passing on the off chance of catching the household in. It was also encouraged that interviewers speak with neighbours to help inform them of the best time to make contact. Interviewers were advised to hold onto non contacts for as long as possible during the fieldwork period, in accordance with the coverage targets, in case the household was away on holiday.

Initially, only experienced interviewers were allowed to work on UKHLS assignments as it was felt that this would facilitate good response rates with skilled doorstep techniques. Towards the end of year 1, less experienced interviewers were permitted to work on the survey, however they were accompanied by a supervisor to provide encouragement and help achieve a confident doorstep approach.

### **5.4.4 Fieldwork quality control**

All interviewers were required to attend a one-day briefing. During the briefing, interviewers conducted dummy interviews, and were instructed to practice further at home before starting work.

Interviewers' work was checked when it was returned to the office to ensure that outcome codes were assigned correctly, and that all necessary paperwork, such as consent forms and paper self-completion questionnaires, was returned. Interviewers were also monitored closely during the

fieldwork by their project manager who dealt with any project related queries or concerns the interviewer may have had.

It is standard practice at NatCen for interviewers to be supervised in the field twice a year, and for their work to be reviewed on an on-going basis. The introduction of Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) in year 2 of wave 1 allowed NatCen's Performance Unit to monitor interviewers to a greater degree. In addition, standard NatCen checking procedures applied: 10% of respondents interviewed were re-contacted by telephone to determine whether interviewers had followed the survey procedures applicable to UKHLS. Interviewers whose performance was below expectation were contacted and offered further briefing and support. Furthermore, in the only incidence where an interviewer was identified as falsifying data, disciplinary action was taken and the interviewer removed from the survey.

The interviewer's route through the CAPI questionnaire was programmed so that all relevant questions came on route according to the household sample type. Consistency checks of values and measurements were built into the CAPI. The 'hard' checks did not allow entries outside a given range, and the 'soft' checks asked the interviewer to confirm what he or she had entered. Soft checks were usually triggered where values were implausible but not impossible. All checks were reviewed as part of the data editing process.

#### **5.4.5 Safety, consent and confidentiality issues**

Before starting work, interviewers had to follow standard NatCen procedures and notify the local police. The interviewers explained what the survey was about, and gave them a copy of the NatCen police letter and UKHLS advance card. The interviewers also presented their identity card and left their name and a contact telephone number.

As mentioned in the advance card, the respondents' answers were treated in the strictest confidence in accordance with the Data Protection Act. Interviewers were also not permitted to interview anyone known to them personally, such as a friend, a neighbour or a colleague. Such instances were re-assigned to other interviewers.

Interviewers also made it clear to respondents that participation was optional and they could refuse to answer any question they were uncomfortable with.

### 5.4.6 Fieldwork complaints

NatCen has a standard procedure for dealing with complaints from respondents about interviewers, but this procedure was altered slightly for UKHLS because respondents could contact ISER directly.

If complaints were made directly to ISER, and it was warranted, the matter would be referred to NatCen for further investigation. Once fully investigated, ISER would respond, depending on the nature of the complaint. If the complaint concerned an interviewer's conduct, NatCen would forward the complaint to Field Services.

If complaints were made directly to the NatCen research team, the matter would be investigated fully, and then forwarded to ISER and to Field Services.

If the complaint concerned an interviewer's conduct, Field Services would contact the interviewer's Area Manager explaining that a complaint had been made, and requesting the interviewer's account of events in writing. At this stage, the nature of the complaint was not explained in detail to the interviewer as this could influence the interviewer's account. Once the interviewer's version of events was received, Field services responded to the Area Manager with fuller details of the complaint, which the Area Manager relayed to the interviewer, asking if the interviewer wished to add anything to their original account. If the complaint was justified, then action was taken against the interviewer. The action taken would depend on the type of incident, and the severity of the matter.

## 6 Response rates

### 6.1 Household response

A total of 93,712 addresses were issued to interviewers - 49,915 General Population (GP) addresses and 43,797 Ethnic Minority Boost (EMB) addresses. Of those, 4,999 and 33,826 respectively were found to be ineligible. Additional 624 GP and 972 EMB addresses were added in the field<sup>17</sup>. Of those, only 515 and 282 respectively turned out to be eligible, making the total of eligible addresses 45,431 for the GP sample and 10,253 for the EMB sample. Interviews were achieved with 57% of the GP and 40% of the EMB households.

Of the unproductive households across both sample types, the highest proportion were refusals (see table 6.1 below). A higher proportion of the GP households refused to take part in the survey compared to EMB - 36% compared to 30%. The EMB households, on the other hand, had a higher proportion of non-contacts (10% versus 4%) and households with unknown eligibility (contacted and no contact) (13% versus 1%).

A more detailed breakdown of household response for each sample type can be found in Tables 6.4-6.5 at the end of this chapter.

**Table 6.1 Household response**

<i>Base: All issued addresses</i>					W1
Household type	GP		EMB		
Outcome	N	%	N	%	
<b>Issued</b>	<b>49,915</b>		<b>43,797</b>		
Not eligible	4,999	10	33,826	77	
<b>Eligible</b>	44,916		9,971		
Additional (eligible) households	515		282		
<b>Total eligible</b>	<b>45,431</b>		<b>10,253</b>		
Productive	26,057	57	4,060	40	
Refusal	16,479	36	3,104	30	
Non-contact	1,777	4	989	10	
Unknown eligibility (contacted)	82	0	439	4	
Unknown eligibility (no contact)	315	1	927	9	
Other unproductive	721	2	734	7	

<sup>17</sup> Additional households were identified when one address on the PAF sample contained more than one dwelling unit (for example where a property has been split into flats) and/or a dwelling unit contained more than one household (for example where the interviewer identified a lodger who does not share a living room or meal with others living in the same dwelling unit).

In order to maximise response rates, many households that were initially returned as unproductive (because they could not be contacted or because they refused to participate) were re-issued to interviewers. In total, 13,202 GP households (26% of the total 50,539) and 11,081 EMB households (25% of the total 44,769) were re-issued, including multiple dwelling units and multiple households. Of those, interviews were achieved with 2,864 (22%) of GP and 3,171 (29%) of EMB households.

The two most common reasons for refusing to take part in the survey across both sample types were related to respondents' attitudes towards the survey and their busy lifestyles, as illustrated in table 6.2 below<sup>18</sup>. Of the GP households that refused to take part and were asked about their reasons for refusal, 31% said they did so because of their attitude to this survey or surveys in more general; this was the reason for 28% of the EMB households refusing to take part. Twenty five per cent of the GP households and 28% of the EMB households said they were 'too busy' to take part.

**Table 6.2 Household reasons for refusal**

*Base: All households that refused to take part (excluding office refusals and broken appointments)*

	GP	W1 EMB
<b>Sample</b>	<b>GP</b>	<b>EMB</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Too busy</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>28</b>
Looking after ill/elderly	3	2
Looking after child(ren)	1	1
Respondent almost never home	2	3
Respondent is temporarily absent	1	1
Stressful family situation	4	3
Too busy (not elsewhere specified)	14	19
<b>Personal Reasons</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>
Unhappy about confidentiality	4	4
Questions too personal	3	3
<b>Attitudes to the survey</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>28</b>
Respondent does not want to be bothered	24	24
Nothing ever changes	1	0
Survey is too long	1	2
Survey is waste of time	3	2
Previous bad experience with surveys	1	0
<b>Family pressure</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Other family member opposes respondent participating	2	2
Someone has convinced respondent to refuse	1	1
Other household member refuses on behalf of respondent	1	2
<b>No reason given</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Other reason</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>
<i>Bases:</i>	<i>2,544</i>	<i>16,882</i>

<sup>18</sup> 74 GP and 56 EMB households coded as "Don't know" or "Not applicable" were excluded from this analysis.



As might be expected, response varied by region (see figure 6.1 below). Across the GP sample, response was lowest in London, with Inner London having response rate of 45% and Outer London of 48%. These two areas also had higher non-contact and refusal rates compared to other regions – non-contact rate for Inner London was 9%, Outer London 6%; refusal rates were 42% and 43% respectively. In other areas response varied between 54% and 63%. Table 6.6 at the end of this chapter shows a more detailed breakdown of response by GOR.

**Figure 6.1 Household response by GOR (GP sample)**

*Base: All eligible GP households*



For the EMB sample, the lowest response was in Scotland<sup>19</sup> (21%), while in other areas it ranged between 33% and 48%, as illustrated by figure 6.2 below. Additional detail for the EMB sample, breaking down the nature of response in each area, can be seen in table 6.7 at the end of this chapter.

<sup>19</sup> The sample size was only 97 households

**Figure 6.2 Household response by GOR (EMB sample)**

Base: All eligible EMB households



## 6.2 Individual response

### 6.2.1 Response to interview


Within productive households, the overall co-operation rate for adults aged 16 and over was quite high, especially across the GP sample. Eighty two percent of adults in the GP sample completed (fully or partially) an individual CAPI interview. Across the EMB sample, 73% did so. A slightly higher proportion of EMB respondents gave a proxy interview – 7% compared to 5% in the GP sample, as illustrated in table 6.3 below.

**Table 6.3 Individual Outcome**

<i>Base: All aged 16 and over in productive households</i>		W1	
<b>Sample</b>	<b>GP</b>	<b>EMB</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	
Fully productive interview	82	72	
Full proxy interview	5	7	
Partially productive interview	0	1	
No contact	3	5	
Refusal before interview	7	8	
Refusal during interview (unproductive partial)	0	0	
Broken appointment - No re-contact	0	1	
Ill at home during survey period	0	0	
Away or in hospital all survey period	1	1	
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	0	
Language difficulties	0	1	
Too elderly	0	0	
Other reason for no interview	1	3	
<i>Bases:</i>	<i>50,138</i>	<i>9,195</i>	


Looking at response by age and sex, firstly for productive households in the GP sample (see figure 6.3 below), response was noticeably higher among women than men – 88% compared to 75%. For this sample, response also increased with age - only 67% of 16-24 year olds completed an individual interview compared to 89% of those aged 65 and over.

**Figure 6.3 Individual response by age and sex (GP sample)**



Across the productive households in the EMB sample, similarly, response was slightly higher among women compared to men – 75% versus 70% (see figure 6.4 below). In terms of response by age for this sample type, response was lowest among the 16-24 year-olds and also among those aged 55 to 64 and 65 and over. Further details on response by age and sex across both samples can be found in tables 6.8 and 6.9 at the end of this chapter.

**Figure 6.4 Individual response by age and sex – EMB sample**




## 6.2.2 Adult Self-completions

In addition to individual CAPI interview, adult respondents were asked to complete a paper self-completion questionnaire. Of the GP respondents who completed an individual interview, 87% (35,857) also completed a self-completion questionnaire. This proportion was lower among the EMB respondents, with 70% (4,656) of those who completed an individual interview also completing a paper self-completion questionnaire.


Across both samples, a similar proportion of women and men who completed an individual interview also completed a self-completion questionnaire. Across the GP sample, 87% of men and 88% of women did a self-completion; across the EMB sample this was 69% and 70% respectively (see figures 6.5 and 6.6 below). In terms of self-completion response by age, for the EMB respondents, self-completion rates declined with age, with 77% of 16 to 24 year-olds completing a self-completion compared to 58% of those 65 years and older. There was no marked difference across different age groups among the GP respondents.

A full breakdown of self-completion rates by sex and age can be found in tables 6.10-6.11 at the end of this chapter.

**Figure 6.5 Self-completion response by age and sex (GP sample)**



**Figure 6.6 Self-completion response by age and sex (EMB sample)**



### 6.2.3 Youth Self-Completion

Young people aged 10-15 were also asked to complete a paper self-completion questionnaire. Seventy seven per cent (3,993) of young people in productive GP households completed a self-completion compared to 63% (902) of young people in the EMB households. For more detailed results see table 6.12 at the end of this chapter.

## Tables

**Table 6.4 GP household response**

<i>Base: All issued GP addresses</i>		Wave 1	
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Issued</b>	<b>49,915</b>		
<b>Not eligible</b>	<b>4,999</b>	<b>10</b>	
Not yet built/under construction	64	0	
Demolished/derelict	293	1	
Vacant/empty housing unit	3,000	6	
Non-residential address	501	1	
Address occupied, no resident household	694	1	
Communal establishment/institution	96	0	
Resident household, not eligible for survey	4	0	
Other ineligible	347	1	
<b>Eligible</b>	<b>44,916</b>		
Additional (eligible) households	515		
<b>Total eligible</b>	<b>45,431</b>		
<b>Productive</b>	<b>26,057</b>	<b>57</b>	
Full interview	18,961	42	
Partial interview	6,941	15	
Completed household questionnaire only	138	0	
Completed at least 1 individual interview but no household	17	0	
<b>Refusal</b>	<b>16,479</b>	<b>36</b>	
Office refusal	856	2	
Contact made, but all information refused about number of DUs at address	401	1	
Contact made, but all information refused about household	1,056	2	
Contact made at DU, but information refused about households	57	0	
Refusal before interview	12,562	28	
Proxy refusal	285	1	
Refusal during interview	51	0	
Broken appointment	1,211	3	
<b>Non-contact</b>	<b>1,777</b>	<b>4</b>	
No contact after 6+ calls	1,404	3	
Contact made at address, but not with household member	236	1	
Contact made at address, but not with anyone at selected DU	38	0	
Contact made at selected household, but not with responsible adult	89	0	
Contact made at (selected) DU, but not with selected household	10	0	
<b>Unknown eligibility (contacted)</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>0</b>	
Information refused if address residential	7	0	
Contact made but unable to determine eligibility	8	0	
Information refused about whether residents are eligible	10	0	
Unable to confirm eligibility due to lack of knowledge	14	0	
Unable to confirm eligibility due to language barrier	10	0	
Other unknown eligibility	33	0	
<b>Unknown eligibility (no contact)</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>1</b>	
Office use only: Not issued to interviewer	19	0	
Office approval only: Inaccessible	37	0.1	
Unable to locate address	106	0.2	
Unknown whether address is residential: no contact after 6+ calls	35	0.1	
Residential: unknown if eligible person(s) due to non-contact after 6+ calls	79	0.2	
Boost sample only: Screener non-completed due to non-contact	0	0	
Other unknown eligibility	39	0.1	
<b>Other unproductive</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>2</b>	
Language difficulties with the whole household	273	1	
Office use only: Lost on laptop	11	0	
Interview achieved but respondent requested data delete	4	0	
Office use only: Other unproductive	433	1	

**Table 6.5 EMB household response**

<i>Base: All issued EMB addresses</i>		Wave 1	
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Issued</b>	<b>43,797</b>		
<b>Not eligible</b>	<b>33,826</b>	<b>77</b>	
Not yet built/under construction	68	0	
Demolished/derelict	312	1	
Vacant/empty housing unit	2,264	5	
Non-residential address	697	2	
Address occupied, no resident household	178	0	
Communal establishment/institution	100	0	
Resident household, not eligible for survey	29,993	69	
Other ineligible	214	1	
<b>Eligible</b>	<b>9,971</b>		
Additional (eligible) households	282		
<b>Total eligible</b>	<b>10,253</b>		
<b>Productive</b>	<b>4,060</b>	<b>40</b>	
Full interview	2,509	25	
Partial interview	1,448	14	
Completed household questionnaire only	97	1	
Completed at least 1 individual interview but no household	6	0	
<b>Refusal</b>	<b>3,104</b>	<b>30</b>	
Office refusal	120	1	
Contact made, but all information refused about number of DUs at address	128	1	
Contact made, but all information refused about household	349	3	
Contact made at DU, but information refused about households	39	0	
Refusal before interview	1,997	20	
Proxy refusal	55	1	
Refusal during interview	32	0	
Broken appointment	384	4	
<b>Non-contact</b>	<b>989</b>	<b>10</b>	
No contact after 6+ calls	836	8	
Contact made at address, but not with household member	84	1	
Contact made at address, but not with anyone at selected DU	11	0	
Contact made at selected household, but not with responsible adult	53	1	
Contact made at (selected) DU, but not with selected household	5	0	
<b>Unknown eligibility (contacted)</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>4</b>	
Information refused if address residential	17	0	
Contact made but unable to determine eligibility	12	0	
Information refused about whether residents are eligible	115	1	
Unable to confirm eligibility due to lack of knowledge	10	0	
Unable to confirm eligibility due to language barrier	18	0	
Boost sample only: refusal to complete screener	216	2	
Boost sample only: screener not completed due to lack of knowledge	24	0	
Other unknown eligibility	27	0	
<b>Unknown eligibility (no contact)</b>	<b>927</b>	<b>9</b>	
Office use only: Not issued to interviewer	12	0	
Office approval only: Inaccessible	50	1	
Unable to locate address	95	1	
Unknown whether address is residential: no contact after 6+ calls	121	1	
Residential: unknown if eligible person(s) due to non-contact after 6+ calls	169	2	
Boost sample only: Screener non-completed due to non-contact	440	4	
Other unknown eligibility	40	0	
<b>Other unproductive</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>7</b>	
Language difficulties with the whole household	230	2	
Office use only: Lost on laptop	10	0	
Interview achieved but respondent requested data delete	3	0	
Office use only: Other unproductive	491	5	



**Table 6.6 Household response by GOR (GP sample)**

Base: All eligible GP households

Wave1

GOR Outcome	North East	North West	Yorkshire and The Humber	East Midlands	West Midlands	East of England	Inner London	Outer London	South East	South West	Wales	Scotland	Northern Ireland	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Productive	63	61	60	63	57	58	45	48	56	59	63	54	61	57
Refusal	33	34	34	33	37	38	42	43	39	35	32	37	33	36
Non-contact	3	3	4	2	4	3	9	6	3	3	3	5	5	4
Unknown eligibility (contacted)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown eligibility (no contact)	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Other unproductive	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	2	0	2
Bases:	1,903	4,984	3,740	3,173	3,941	4,152	2,099	3,178	6,052	3,805	2,148	4,149	2,107	45,431

**Table 6.7 Household response by GOR (EMB sample)**

Base: All eligible EMB households

Wave 1

GOR Outcome	North East	North West	Yorkshire and The Humber	East Midlands	West Midlands	East of England	Inner London	Outer London	South East	South West	Wales	Scotland	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Productive	33	40	48	41	36	47	38	40	42	44	45	21	40
Refusal	26	26	28	29	30	34	30	33	32	19	23	13	30
Non-contact	21	8	7	5	12	5	11	9	8	9	10	9	10
Unknown eligibility (contacted)	1	3	2	7	3	2	5	5	4	2	4	5	4
Unknown eligibility (no contact)	17	12	10	11	7	9	8	7	11	16	13	51	9
Other unproductive	2	11	6	8	12	3	7	6	3	9	5	1	7
Bases:	111	619	523	473	1,291	445	3,316	2,631	535	108	104	97	10,253

**Table 6.8 Individual response by age and sex (GP sample)**

<i>Base: All aged 16 and over in productive GP households</i>							W1
Age	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Total
Outcome	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Men</b>							
Productive	60	73	74	74	80	88	75
Proxy	10	8	8	9	6	4	8
Refusal	14	10	10	10	8	5	10
No contact	9	6	4	4	3	1	4
Other unproductive	5	3	3	2	2	2	3
<b>Women</b>							
Productive	73	89	91	90	91	91	88
Proxy	6	3	2	2	2	3	3
Refusal	9	4	3	4	5	3	5
No contact	7	3	2	1	1	0	2
Other unproductive	4	2	2	1	2	3	2
<b>Total</b>							
Productive	67	81	83	83	86	89	82
Proxy	8	5	5	5	4	3	5
Refusal	12	7	7	7	6	4	7
No contact	8	4	3	3	2	1	3
Other unproductive	5	3	2	2	2	2	3
<i>Bases:</i>							
Men	3,781	3,639	4,448	4,127	3,638	4,235	23,868
Women	3,820	4,234	4,832	4,559	3,937	4,888	26,270
Total	7,601	7,873	9,280	8,686	7,575	9,123	50,138

**Table 6.9 Individual response by age and sex (EMB sample)**

<i>Base: All aged 16 and over in productive EMB households</i>							W1
Age	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Total
Outcome	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Men</b>							
Productive	63	70	75	72	71	73	70
Proxy	7	7	9	8	9	6	8
Refusal	13	10	8	10	9	10	10
No contact	10	7	4	7	5	4	7
Other unproductive	6	6	4	3	6	8	5
<b>Women</b>							
Productive	69	78	84	77	68	60	75
Proxy	7	6	4	5	6	14	6
Refusal	11	7	6	9	10	9	8
No contact	7	4	2	3	3	4	4
Other unproductive	6	6	5	5	12	13	7
<b>Total</b>							
Productive	66	75	79	75	69	66	73
Proxy	7	6	6	7	7	10	7
Refusal	12	8	7	9	10	9	9
No contact	8	6	3	5	4	4	5
Other unproductive	6	6	4	4	9	10	6
<i>Bases:</i>							
Men	1,058	1,086	947	647	333	342	4,413
Women	1,046	1,286	1,049	700	364	337	4,782
Total	2,104	2,372	1,996	1,347	697	679	9,195

**Table 6.10 Self-completion response by age and sex (GP sample)**

Base: All aged 16 and over in productive GP households who completed individual interview (fully or partially)

							W1
Age	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Total
Outcome	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Men</b>							
Yes	88	85	87	88	88	86	87
No	12	15	13	12	12	14	13
<b>Women</b>							
Yes	89	86	88	88	89	85	88
No	11	14	12	12	11	15	12
<b>Total</b>							
Yes	89	86	88	88	89	85	87
No	11	14	12	12	11	15	13
<i>Bases</i>							
Men	2,283	2,650	3,305	3,074	2,917	3,713	17,942
Women	2,806	3,753	4,398	4,125	3,578	4,444	23,104
Total	5,089	6,403	7,703	7,199	6,495	8,157	41,046

**Table 6.11 Self-completion response by age and sex (EMB sample)**

Base: All aged 16 and over in productive GP households who completed individual interview (fully or partially)

							W1
Age	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Total
Outcome	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Men</b>							
Yes	77	67	68	68	65	61	69
No	23	33	32	32	35	39	31
<b>Women</b>							
Yes	78	69	69	72	65	54	70
No	22	31	31	28	35	46	30
<b>Total</b>							
Yes	77	69	69	70	65	58	70
No	23	31	31	30	35	42	30
<i>Bases</i>							
Men	669	763	709	465	235	248	3,089
Women	720	1,007	876	539	249	203	3,594
Total	1,389	1,770	1,585	1,004	484	451	6,683

**Table 6.12 Youth self-completion response by sex**

*Base: Young people (10-15) in productive households*

		W1
<b>Sample</b>	<b>GP</b>	<b>EMB</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Male</b>		
Yes	76	61
No	24	39
<b>Female</b>		
Yes	78	66
No	22	34
<b>Total</b>		
Yes	77	63
No	23	37
<i>Bases</i>		
<i>Male</i>	<i>2,628</i>	<i>719</i>
<i>Female</i>	<i>2,554</i>	<i>706</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>5,182</i>	<i>1,425</i>

# 7 Data Preparation

## 7.1 Data keying and scanning

Paper self-completions were scanned in by an external agency.

## 7.2 Data coding and editing

Most of the data validation of CAPI surveys is carried out in the field. Extensive range and consistency checks were included in the CAPI program in order to prompt interviewers to clarify and query any data discrepancies directly with the respondent in real time. However, all cases were also passed through an in-house edit to identify any further interviewer issues.

All self-completion data was passed through an edit to check for any respondent routing and coding errors. Consent forms were also reconciled with the CAPI data during the edit stage.

### 7.2.1 SIC and SOC coding

Four-digit SIC and SOC coding was carried out in the employment and proxy sections of the questionnaire. Each coder's initial batch of work was 'blind coded', i.e. a second coder independently coded respondent's answers to SIC and SOC without seeing how they had initially been coded. Any discrepancies between the initial coder's work and the blind coding by the second coder were resolved by a coding supervisor and feedback was given to correct errors or resolve any misunderstandings.

### 7.2.2 Cleaning of address information

Each respondent was asked to provide information about a stable contact that could be approached in the event of the individual or household having moved. These addresses, along with any amended or new household addresses, were checked with a software program called Matchcode, which checks and where necessary corrects the postcode for each address.

# Appendix A      Fieldwork Documents