

# **Employment, Retention and Advancement (ERA) Programme**

## **Technical Report of Customer Survey**

**Neil Park  
ONS**

# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1 Background and aims**

The quantitative customer survey formed a key component of the Impact study of the ERA evaluation. It was designed to assess the effectiveness of the ERA programme by providing information about the work experiences, outcomes and attitudes of programme members and those of a control group of clients. The survey was managed and undertaken by the Office for National Statistics (ONS).

## **1.2 Outline of survey design**

The survey covered the three groups of clients eligible for the ERA programme: people entering the New Deal for 25+ (ND25+); lone parents seeking to join the New Deal for Lone Parents (NDLP); and lone parents working part time and receiving Working Families Tax Credit (WTC). Interviews were conducted with samples of clients in these three groups and with equal numbers of the control groups. The interviews took place at 12 and 24 months after entry to the ERA study<sup>1</sup>. They were carried out by the ONS telephone unit where possible, with face-to-face interviewers following up those who could not be contacted or who were reluctant to participate. A 'keep in touch' exercise was carried out between the interviews.

---

<sup>1</sup> A third interview at 60 months after entry was considered but DWP decided not to proceed because of the time required to obtain results.

## 2. Sample

### 2.1 Sample design

As noted in section 1, the survey covered the 3 groups eligible for ERA:

- Unemployed people aged 25 years or over entering the New Deal (ND25+)
- Lone parents seeking to join the New Deal for Lone Parents (NDLP)
- Lone parents working part-time and claiming Working Tax Credit (WTC)

It was calculated that the analysis would require a minimum of 1600 cases to be interviewed in each group. The set sample size, approximately 7,400, was determined by assuming a minimum response rate of 65% at wave 2 (based on the original sample).

Over a 12 month period from December 2003 to November 2004, approximately 13,500 Jobcentre customers were recruited to the ERA trial. In total, 7,413 cases were selected for the survey.

MDRC was responsible for drawing the ERA sample. The sample was drawn in two batches, the first covered customers entering the trial between December and May and the second from June-November.

It was intended that the sample would consist of an equal number of cases in each sample group at each site. However, a shortfall in the number of WTC customers entering the trial meant that this was not possible. Instead, all WTC cases were automatically selected and the remainder of the sample was made up of roughly equal numbers of randomly selected ND25+ and NDLP cases. Tables 1 and 2 show the numbers selected in the batch 1 and 2 samples.

*(MDRC: You may wish to add further details of how the sample was drawn).*

**Table 1 The batch one sample: number of cases selected from customers entering ERA from Dec 03-May 04**

	Site						
Target group	RIAB <sup>2</sup>	Gateshead	Manchester	SEWales	Derbyshire	NELondon	Total
ND25Plus Programme	132	132	132	106	132	132	766
ND25Plus Control	132	132	132	110	132	132	770
NDLP Programme	132	132	132	132	120	132	780
NDLP Control	132	132	132	132	126	132	786
WTC Programme	42	87	17	50	47	12	255
WTC Control	44	90	20	54	49	13	270
Total	614	705	565	584	606	553	3627

---

<sup>2</sup> Renfrewshire, Inverclyde, Argyll and Bute

**Table 2 The batch two sample : number of cases selected from customers entering ERA from Dec 03-May 04**

	Site						
Target group	RIAB	Gateshead	Manchester	SEWales	Derbyshire	NELondon	Total
<b>ND25Plus Programme</b>	119	119	119	119	119	119	714
<b>ND25Plus Control</b>	119	119	119	119	119	119	714
<b>NDLP Programme</b>	119	119	119	88	119	119	683
<b>NDLP Control</b>	119	119	119	95	119	119	690
<b>WTC Programme</b>	79	254	51	48	47	14	493
<b>WTC Control</b>	69	270	46	48	47	12	492
<b>Total</b>	624	1000	573	517	570	502	3786

#### ***Extra WTC cases***

As mentioned earlier, the intention had been to select equal numbers of each sample group at each site, but a shortfall in the WTC group meant this was not possible. However, towards the end of the recruitment period, there was a substantial increase in the number of WTC recipients recruited to the trial. The ERA evaluation consortium was keen to interview this group.

Ideally the new WTC cases would have been added to the overall sample. However, extra funding was not available and the addition of these cases had to be accomplished without extra cost. It was decided that existing ND25+ cases would be substituted with new WTC cases. The ND25+ cases were considered less useful than the NDLP customers because their response rate was lower. Approximately 1,370 ND25+ cases were dropped from the wave 2 ERA sample and 1,240 new WTC cases were added to the sample. The dropped cases had a wave 1 interview only.

Unlike the original set sample which had two interviews at yearly intervals, the new WTC cases had just one interview covering a period of 20-24 months.



### **3. Questionnaire design**

The customer survey included two questionnaires :

Wave 1 questionnaire for interviews at 12 months after entry to ERA

Wave 2 questionnaire for interviews at 24 months after entry to ERA

A third questionnaire, which was a combination of the waves 1 and 2 documents, was designed for the additional WTC sample.

#### **3.1 Design of the wave 1 questionnaire**

PSI produced a list of the concepts to be covered in the wave 1 and 2 interviews. Many had been covered already in previous evaluation studies by MDRC or in other social surveys and so tested questions could be taken from these sources. If no suitable question existed, a new question was designed by ONS in consultation with consortium members and DWP.

A pilot test was carried out on a sample of 182 entrants to the study who had been randomly assigned in November 2003. All the WTC cases were selected and the remainder divided equally among the two New Deal sample groups. Interviews were achieved with 84% of the sample. The majority of questions worked well and only minor adjustments were needed for the main stage survey.

#### **3.2 Design of the wave 2 questionnaire**

The wave 2 questionnaire repeated many of the concepts covered at wave 1. The main changes were an increased focus on the advancement related concepts and new questions on non-work outcomes such as children's educational performance and behaviour. The new questions replaced information that only needed to be established once, for example, certain demographic items and views about the random assignment process.

The Wave 2 questionnaire was tested on respondents to the first pilot test. Interviews were achieved with 90%. Again the questions generally worked well and few changes were required for the main stage.

#### **3.3 Content of the questionnaires**

Table 3 shows the topics covered in the wave 1 and wave 2 questionnaires and the questionnaire for the additional WTC cases.

**Table 3 - Summary of questionnaire contents**

Topics	Wave 1	Wave 2	Extra WTC cases	Proxy interviews
<i>Classification</i> Marital status, tenure, number of children and their ages.	✓	✓ (cut-down version)	✓	✓
<i>Random assignment</i> Whether respondent remembers random assignment, which group they were assigned to, how they felt about being assigned to programme or control group.	✓		✓ (cut-down version)	
<i>Current economic status and employment history</i> Periods of employment / self-employment from random assignment to wave 1 or from wave 1 to wave 2: employment status, hours worked, net and gross pay, whether paid fixed hourly rate, receipt of WTC.	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Present job (or last job in reference period)</i> Industry, occupation, employment pattern, autonomy and stress at work, travel to work.	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Contacts with the office</i> Number of contacts, method of contact, when respondent contacted office.	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Help or advice received when not working</i> Type of advice/help received, services used, receipt of better off calculation.	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Help or advice received when working</i> Type and amount of advice/encouragement received regarding getting a better job or improving conditions of work.	✓	✓	✓	

Topics	Wave 1	Wave 2	Extra WTC cases	Proxy interviews
<i>Work-related training and education</i> Title of course(s), duration, number of hours per week, whether arranged by jobcentre, if course taken when working.	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Incentive payments for full time working</i> Awareness, eligibility and receipt, whether bonus worked as an incentive.	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Training bonus</i> Awareness, eligibility and receipt, whether bonus worked as an incentive.	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Advancement behaviour</i> Types of advancement behaviour respondent took (trying to get longer hours, more pay etc).	✓	✓ (some changes from wave 1)	✓ (some changes from wave 1)	✓
<i>Attitudes to advancement</i> Likelihood of looking for new job, increasing hours, better pay, advancement attitudes, barriers to advancement, quality of life.	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Judgements of ERA/procedures/advisers</i> Help received in overcoming barriers to work, relationship with adviser, adviser's emphasis on advancement and long-term goals.	✓	✓	✓	
<i>Childcare arrangements/costs</i> Use, type and cost of childcare (term time and school holidays), convenience of childcare arrangements, advice from jobcentre.	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Benefits</i> Types and amount of each benefit received, partner benefits.	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Child Outcomes</i> Qualifications and educational achievement child (1 chosen at random), homework habits, child's behaviour (whether bullied, in trouble with police, truancy, drug taking, smoking, drinking).		✓	✓	✓



### **3.4 Mid-Year additions to the questionnaire**

During the course of wave 2 both MDRC and DWP asked for additional questions to be added to the questionnaire.

In September additional questions on the nature of contacts with job centres were added to the questionnaire (requested by MDRC). Details of the questions can be found in appendix 7.1. No problems were reported with these questions.

In October additional questions on barriers to employment were added to the questionnaire (requested by DWP). Details of the questions can be found in appendix 7.1. No problems were reported with these questions.

## **4. Fieldwork**

### **4.1 Design**

ERA was designed as a telephone interview with non-contacts and refusals being re-issued to face-to-face interviewers where appropriate. Telephone interviews are cheaper than face-to-face although the response rates tend to be lower. However, previous experience with samples of benefits claimants, such as on the ONE survey, suggested that some benefit claimants were more willing to be interviewed by telephone than have an interviewer call at their home. Respondents were given a £20 voucher in return for their co-operation at each wave.

### **4.2 Contact procedures**

#### ***Pre-contact letter 6 months after entry to ERA***

Six months after entry to the ERA programme a pre-contact letter was sent to each sample member. The letter set out the purpose of the study and informed respondents about the £20 voucher. The letter also included a leaflet setting out the purpose of the survey and giving a confidentiality undertaking, and a post-card so that sample members could inform us of any changes to their contact details.

#### ***Advance letter***

All respondents were sent an advance letter and purpose leaflet 8 days before fieldwork started in the Telephone Unit. The letter and leaflet explained that respondents who completed the interview would receive a £20 gift voucher as a token of our appreciation. A copy of the advance letter is in Appendix A.

Both the pre-contact and advance letters were also produced in Welsh for respondents living in Wales.

### **4.3 Briefings**

Before work started on the survey, all interviewers were given a personal briefing by ONS research and field staff. The briefings covered:

- The background to the survey: objectives of the research, sample design
- Approaching respondents
- Demonstration of the questionnaire
- The importance of a high response rate to the project

In November 2006 an additional briefing was carried out in Doncaster. This was necessitated by the addition of new WTC cases to the sample from September to January. A large proportion of the new cases were in Derbyshire and we needed to increase our interviewer capacity in order to complete the work.

### **4.4 Fieldwork dates**

Wave 1 fieldwork was carried out between December 2004 and March 2006. Wave 2 fieldwork ran from December 2005 to March 2006.

## 4.5 The fieldwork period

Fieldwork was carried out in monthly batches. Each month's fieldwork began with 16 days of telephone interviewing at the end of which all non-contacts and suitable refusals were re-issued to face-to-face interviewers. Nominally, 2 weeks was allowed for the face-to-face interviewers although, in practice, considerably more time was allowed. Periodically, non-contacts and 'soft' refusals from the face-to-face stage were reissued again, first to the telephone unit and then to face-to-face interviewers.

## 4.6 Interviews

### Interview length

The aim was for most of the interviews to be completed within 35-40 minutes and this was achieved at both waves. The median interview length was 28 minutes at wave 1 and 29 minutes at wave 2. At both waves, three-quarters of the interviews were completed in less than 36 minutes. As anticipated new WTC cases in wave 2 received longer interviews than other groups. Whilst most WTC interviews were completed in less than 40 minutes a significant proportion took longer. There is no evidence that this caused any problems for interviewers or respondents. Table 4 shows the interview lengths for each wave.

**Table 4 - Interview length in minutes**

	Median	75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
Wave 1	28	36
Wave 2	28	36
WTC cases	35	43

### Interview reception

In general the survey was very well received. Respondents were pleased to be given the chance to express their views, irrespective of how satisfied they were with ERA. The survey was perceived to be less relevant to those who were currently working and who had not been to the jobcentre for some time. In both waves, the promise of a £20 gift voucher proved a powerful incentive to take part.

### Reactions to questions

#### *Questions on partner's income and parental background*

In wave 1 a small number of respondents were surprised to be asked about their partner's income and some were a little taken aback at the questions on parental background.

#### *Questions on FT bonus and incentive*

Respondents were asked about their knowledge of the bonuses available to those working full time for a sustained period of time and for undertaking certain kinds of training. The questions required the interviewer to state the conditions under which the bonuses would be paid and then to code the respondent's awareness of them, their eligibility and whether they had received them. In a few cases, respondents who had not received a bonus thought that they fulfilled the criteria and complained to jobcentre plus staff that the ONS interviewer had told them that they were eligible. ONS

interviewers were instructed to be particularly careful not to offer any opinion about respondent's eligibility for any bonuses, but to refer them to job-centre staff.

#### **4.8 Post interview procedures**

At the end of each interview the respondent's contact details were checked and amendments made where necessary. Interviewers coded the occupation and industry information after the interview. The National Statistics-Socio Economic Class (NS-SEC) was derived from this information.

#### **4.9 Proxy interviews**

Proxy interviews consisted of a reduced version of the full interview, focusing on the main factual items. They were only carried out by face-face interviewers and they were briefed to accept proxy interviews only if there was no chance of obtaining an interview with the sample member. In wave 1 only 11 interviews were conducted by proxy. In wave 2 only 1 interview was conducted by proxy.

## 5. Response

The target response rates for both wave 1 and wave 2 of the ERA survey was 80% of the set sample. The minimum acceptable rates were 70% at wave 1 and 65% at wave 2. Low response rates would mean that there was a serious risk of bias in the sample and that results would not be representative of all ERA study members.

### 5.1 Measures taken to minimise non-contacts

A number of steps were taken to minimise non-contacts, these included:-

#### *Collection of good quality contact information*

When jobcentre customers joined the ERA programme, staff collected contact information for all sample members. This included the details of up to three other people whom we could approach if we were unable to contact the sample member. There were automatic checks on the consistency of street and postcode details. The ONS sampling unit looked up the addresses of clients with no telephone numbers in the telephone directory.

#### *An extended field period*

Contact with respondents was initially attempted about one year after they entered the ERA study. The telephone unit interviews were always conducted in a fixed two and a half week period. However, the field period for face-to-face interviewers was intentionally kept open for as long as possible. In addition, a reissue exercise was run every 4 months (as discussed in section 4.5).

#### *Regular updating of addresses by DWP*

Every month DWP supplied an update file of address details taken from the Labour Market System (LMS) database. In Wave 1 these new contact details replaced those on the sample file. In Wave 2 these details supplemented address details collected in the keep in touch exercise.

#### *Postcards*

Respondents were sent a pre-contact letter explaining the ERA survey about 6 months before they were due to be interviewed. A postcard was sent out with the letter which sample members were asked to return should their contact details change. About three hundred sample members returned postcards.

#### *Movers outside the area*

Respondents who moved outside the site areas in which they were sampled were followed up if they moved elsewhere within Great Britain, provided an address or telephone number could be obtained for them.

#### *Checking respondent's contact details after each interview*

Each respondent's contact details were checked and updated at the conclusion of their wave 1 interview. This data was then used to update the sample file.

### *Keeping in Touch Exercise (KITE)*

An attempt was made to contact all wave 1 respondents between survey waves. This contact provided an opportunity to check the respondent's contact details, enquire about any plans to move and remind them about the ERA study.

### *Use of email to contact respondents*

At the end of the ERA interview all respondents were asked for an email addresses. About a quarter of respondents provided one. The email address was used as last resort for people not contacted by telephone or face-to-face.

Reissues exercise – effectiveness of reissues, how much did they add?

## **5.2 Steps taken to minimise refusals**

### *Reducing the number of stages where opting out was possible.*

When jobcentre customers joined the ERA study, participation in the survey was presented as integral to taking part. Jobcentre staff asked for agreement for names and contact details to be passed to ONS. Jobcentre staff were also instructed to mention the financial incentives for taking part in the survey.

### *Use of a dual mode interview*

Previous experience of surveys involving benefit claimants suggested that some were unwilling to have an interviewer call at their home but were happy to be interviewed by telephone. If contact by telephone was not possible, cases were reissued to a face-to-face interviewer. Telephone interviewers were briefed to avoid refusals by withdrawing from interviews if respondents were reluctant to take part.

### *Use of financial inducements*

For each interview completed respondents were sent a £20 voucher that they could spend in a variety of shops.

## **5.3 Response rates**

### **Wave 1**

Table 5 shows the set sample in the programme and control group within each sample group at each site. Tables 6-8 show the response rates based on these numbers. The target response rate for the survey was 80% at both waves, based on the original sample. At wave 1 this target was exceeded; interviews were achieved with 84% of sampled customers (Table 6). Most of the non-response consisted of non-contacts: 13% of respondents were not contacted and just 4% refused to participate (Table 7, final column). The measures taken to achieve this high response are discussed in section 5.3.

One third of non-contacts (33%) resulted from respondents moving and being untraceable, a further third (33%) could not be reached by telephone or face-to-face, and the remainder were cases where contact was made with the respondent's household but not with the respondent (Table not shown).

Respondents gave a variety of reasons for refusing to take part in the survey. The most popular were that they could not be bothered (29%) or were too busy (10%) (Table not shown).

Nearly 1% of the sample was unable to take place due to illness or language difficulties. About 1% of the set sample was ineligible; this includes respondents who had died, moved abroad, who were in prison or who had been withdrawn at DWP's request (Table 7).

#### *Response by Site (Table 7)*

The highest response rate was achieved in Derbyshire (90%) which had a relatively low non-contact rate (7%). Conversely, the lowest response rates were in North East London (77%) and Manchester (78%) both of which had high non-contact rates (18% and 17% respectively). There was little variation in refusal rates across the six sites, the lowest being in Derbyshire (2%) and the highest was in NE London (5%).

#### *Response by sample group (Table 7)*

The response rates for the WTC and NDLP samples were both well over the 80% target, 93% and 87%. This was the case for both programme and control groups. However, the response rate for the ND25+ group, 75%, was below the target, although well above the minimum acceptable response rate. The main reason for the low response amongst this group was the difficulty contacting them. The non-contact rate amongst ND25+ respondents (20%) was more than twice as high as among the NDLP group (9%) and 4 times as high as for the WTC group (5%). Interviewers were asked to make a special effort to locate ND25+ respondents, but the non-contact rate was still high. Interviewers reported that they suspected that some people were deliberately avoiding them or were disclaiming their identity. However the main reason for the high level of non-contacts amongst the ND25+ sample is the limited availability of contact information. This is discussed in section 5.4. There was very little difference in refusal rates between the sample groups. (Table 7)

Response for ND25+ respondents was below 80% for both programme and control groups across all six sites (with the exception of the control group in Derbyshire). In London and Manchester the ND25+ control groups had a response rate below the minimum acceptable response rate of 70%. (Table 7)

#### *Response by programme group (Table 7)*

When the survey was designed, there was concern that the response in the control group might be lower than in the programme group because the former clients would have less interest in the project. However, there is no evidence that this was the case. Both the programme and control groups had response rates of over 80% (85% and 82%).

**Table 5 The wave 1 set sample**

	Site						
Target group	RIAB	Gateshead	Manchester	SEWales	Derbyshire	NELondon	Total
ND25Plus Programme	251	251	251	225	251	251	1480
ND25Plus Control	251	251	251	229	251	251	1484
NDLP Programme	239	251	251	220	251	251	1463
NDLP Control	245	251	251	227	251	251	1476
WTC Programme	94	121	26	98	341	68	748
WTC Control	96	113	25	102	360	66	762
Total	1176	1238	1055	1101	1705	1138	7413

**Table6 Wave 1 response rates by target group and site.**

	Site						
Target group	RIAB	Gateshead	Manchester	SEWales	Derbyshire	NELondon	Total
ND25Plus Programme	77%	79%	71%	80%	81%	71%	76%
ND25Plus Control	73%	81%	67%	73%	85%	68%	74%
NDLP Programme	90%	90%	90%	89%	95%	83%	89%
NDLP Control	84%	89%	86%	82%	90%	80%	85%
WTC Programme	95%	93%	88%	95%	95%	90%	94%
WTC Control	86%	90%	92%	95%	93%	92%	92%
Total	82%	86%	79%	84%	90%	77%	84%



**Table 7 – Response by site, customer group and programme group**

	Gateshead and South Tyneside	Derbyshire	North East London	South East Wales	RIAB	Manchester
W2 Responders	86%	90%	77%	84%	82%	79%
Refusals	3%	2%	5%	4%	4%	4%
Non-constants	11%	7%	18%	13%	14%	17%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Base</i>	1227	1695	1136	1090	1164	1045
<i>Ineligibles</i>	11	10	2	11	12	10

	Working Tax Credit	New Deal 25+	New Deal Lone Parent		Programme	Control		Total
W2 Responders	93%	75%	87%		85%	82%		84%
Refusals	2%	5%	3%		3%	4%		4%
Non-constants	5%	20%	9%		12%	13%		13%
Total	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%		100%
<i>Base</i>	1506	2932	2919		3660	3697		7357
<i>Ineligibles</i>	4	32	20		31	25		56

**Table 8 - Response Rate by Target group (Site, customer and programme group)**

	Gateshead and South Tyneside		ND25+		NDLP		Derbyshire		ND25+		NDLP	
	WTC											
	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control
W2 Responders	93%	90%	79%	81%	90%	89%	95%	93%	81%	85%	95%	90%
Refusals	4%	2%	3%	5%	2%	3%	1%	2%	4%	4%	2%	2%
Non-contacts	3%	8%	17%	14%	8%	8%	4%	5%	15%	10%	3%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Base	121	112	247	250	249	248	341	359	246	248	251	250
Ineligibles	0	1	4	1	2	3	0	1	5	3	0	1

	North East London						South East Wales					
	WTC		ND25+		NDLP		WTC		ND25+		NDLP	
	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control
W2 Responders	90%	92%	71%	68%	83%	80%	95%	95%	80%	73%	89%	82%
Refusals	4%	0%	4%	10%	4%	4%	1%	2%	3%	7%	3%	4%
Non-contacts	6%	8%	25%	22%	13%	16%	4%	3%	18%	20%	8%	14%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Base	68	65	251	250	251	251	98	102	220	225	219	226
Ineligibles	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	1

	RIAB		ND25+		NDLP		Manchester		ND25+		NDLP	
	WTC											
	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control
W2 Responders	95%	86%	77%	73%	90%	84%	88%	92%	71%	67%	90%	86%
Refusals	0%	2%	2%	7%	3%	5%	0%	8%	2%	5%	4%	4%
Non-contacts	5%	11%	20%	20%	8%	10%	12%	0%	27%	28%	6%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Base	94	96	249	249	233	243	25	25	249	248	248	250
Ineligibles	0	0	2	2	6	2	1	0	2	3	3	1

## Wave 2

Table 9 shows the eligible sample for wave 2. For wave 2 all ND25+ cases from April to November were replaced by new WTC cases. Tables 10-13 show the responses rates based on these numbers. As in wave 1 the target response rate was 80%.

The response rate for wave 2 was 76%, slightly less than the target response rate but significantly higher than the minimum acceptable response rate of 65%. Of the sample passed forward from wave 1 we managed to re-contact 89% at wave 2.

The refusal rate at wave 2 was just 3% (of the original set sample). The two main reasons given for not taking part were that the respondent was 'Too busy' or that they 'Could not be bothered'. (Table not shown). About a third of the refusals were cases where respondents were unable to complete an interview because of illness or language difficulties.

Of the non-contacts about two-thirds (64%) could not be reached by telephone or face-to-face. Approximately a fifth of non-contacts (23%) resulted from respondents moving and the final 13% were where contacts was made with the respondents household but not with the respondent.

### *Response by Site (Table 7)*

The response rate in all 6 areas was above 70%. The highest response rate was in Derbyshire (79%) closely followed by Gateshead and South East Wales (both 78%). The poorest response rate was in London (70%). Levels of non-contacts and refusals were similar across all 6 regions with the exception of Derbyshire. In Derbyshire the introduction of large numbers of new WTC cases with poor contact details from September to January resulted in relatively high level of non-contacts. The key reason for the poor response in London was the low level of response in wave 1.

### *Response by sample group (Table 7)*

The response rate for the WTC group was 79%. The response rate for the NDLP group was 79% and the response rate for the ND25+ group 66%. This is the same pattern of response as in wave 2. In three target groups the response rate lower than 65%, these were the ND25+ control groups in London, RIAB and Manchester. In each of these areas the response rate in wave 1 was below 70% and the failure to achieve a 65% response rate in wave 2 can be mostly attributed to this.

### *Response by programme group (Table 7)*

The response rate for the programme group was 79% and for the control group it was 74%. This difference is 2 percentage points higher than in wave 1 and is indicative of the poorer quality contact details available for the control group sample. The non-contact rate for the control group was 2 percentage points higher than for the programme group (11% and 9% respectively).

### *Response for new WTC cases (Table 12)*

The response rate for new WTC cases was 70%. This was somewhat lower than hoped for and is probably the result of contact details for certain members of this group becoming increasingly out of date (as many of them may not have been contacted for 2 years). The response rate was poorer for the control group than for the programme group (67% and 73%). Most of this difference, about 4 percentage points

was due to greater levels of non-contacts amongst the control group. The remainder was due to a greater level of refusals.

The non-contact rate for new WTC cases was 25%. About a fifth of this was due to contact being made with someone other than the sampled person. The remaining four-fifths was due to out of date or incorrect contact details. The remaining non-responders (about 5% of the eligible sample) were made up of refusals.

**Table 9 The wave 2 set sample**

	Site						
Target group	RIAB	Gateshead	Manchester	SEWales	Derbyshire	NELondon	Total
ND25Plus Programme	89	93	82	59	93	90	506
ND25Plus Control	91	91	83	62	92	90	509
NDLP Programme	239	251	251	220	251	251	1463
NDLP Control	245	251	251	227	251	251	1476
WTC Programme	133	138	89	115	784	108	1367
WTC Control	134	130	90	121	798	109	1382
Total	931	954	846	804	2269	899	6703

**Table 10 Wave 2 response rates by target group and site.**

	Site						
Target group	RIAB	Gateshead	Manchester	SEWales	Derbyshire	NELondon	Total
ND25Plus Programme	67%	73%	66%	66%	71%	67%	69%
ND25Plus Control	58%	70%	59%	69%	76%	54%	64%
NDLP Programme	76%	82%	81%	81%	88%	75%	81%
NDLP Control	71%	75%	75%	76%	83%	66%	74%
WTC Programme	92%	81%	78%	86%	79%	81%	81%
WTC Control	82%	83%	68%	79%	76%	79%	77%
Total	75%	78%	74%	78%	79%	70%	76%

**Table 11 – Response by site, customer group and programme group**

	Gateshead and South Tyneside	Derbyshire	North East London	South East Wales	RIAB	Manchester
W2 Responders	78%	79%	70%	78%	75%	74%
Refusals	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%	3%
Non-contacts	7%	13%	8%	8%	8%	9%
W1 Non-responders	11%	5%	18%	12%	14%	13%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Base</i>	954	2269	899	804	931	846
<i>Ineligibles</i>	12	9	2	5	12	15

	Working Tax Credit			New Deal 25+	New Deal Lone Parent	Programme	Control		Total
	From Wv1	New Wv2	All WTC						
W2 Responders	86%	70%	79%	66%	77%	79%	74%		76%
Refusals	4%	6%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%		3%
Non-contacts	3%	24%	13%	7%	8%	9%	11%		10%
W1 Non-responders	7%	NA	4%	24%	13%	9%	12%		11%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
<i>Base</i>	1514	1236	2750	1015	2939	3336	3367		6703
<i>Ineligibles</i>	4	3	7	18	30	25	30		55

**Table 12 - Response Rate by Target group (Site, customer and programme group)**

	Gateshead and South Tyneside		ND25+		NDLP		Derbyshire		ND25+		NDLP	
	WTC		ERA	Control	ERA	Control	WTC		ERA	Control	ERA	Control
	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control
W2 Responders	81%	83%	73%	70%	82%	75%	79%	76%	71%	76%	88%	83%
Refusals	4%	2%	0%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	2%	2%	0%
Non-contacts	9%	6%	3%	9%	5%	11%	16%	17%	2%	8%	5%	6%
W1 Non-responders	7%	9%	24%	18%	10%	11%	2%	3%	23%	14%	5%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Base</i>	<i>138</i>	<i>128</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>249</i>	<i>247</i>	<i>783</i>	<i>797</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>251</i>	<i>249</i>
<i>Ineligibles</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>

	North East London		ND25+		NDLP		South East Wales		ND25+		NDLP	
	WTC		ERA	Control	ERA	Control	WTC		ERA	Control	ERA	Control
	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control
W2 Responders	81%	79%	67%	54%	75%	66%	86%	79%	66%	69%	81%	76%
Refusals	3%	8%	3%	2%	2%	5%	1%	4%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Non-contacts	10%	8%	4%	8%	7%	10%	9%	13%	14%	7%	6%	4%
W1 Non-responders	6%	5%	26%	36%	16%	20%	4%	4%	17%	23%	11%	18%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Base</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>251</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>121</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>218</i>	<i>225</i>
<i>Ineligibles</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>

	RIAB		ND25+		NDLP		Manchester		ND25+		NDLP	
	WTC		ERA	Control	ERA	Control	WTC		ERA	Control	ERA	Control
	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control	ERA	Control
W2 Responders	92%	82%	67%	58%	76%	71%	78%	68%	66%	59%	81%	75%
Refusals	3%	5%	4%	3%	3%	2%	5%	8%	3%	1%	4%	2%
Non-contacts	2%	3%	8%	9%	11%	12%	14%	22%	10%	5%	6%	8%
W1 Non-responders	4%	10%	20%	30%	10%	16%	3%	2%	22%	34%	10%	15%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Base</i>	<i>133</i>	<i>133</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>233</i>	<i>241</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>248</i>	<i>247</i>
<i>Ineligibles</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>



**Table 13 – Wave 2 Response, new WTC cases by site and programme group**

Site	Gateshead		Derbyshire		North East London		South East Wales		RIAB		Manchester		Total
Customer group	WTC		WTC		WTC		WTC		WTC		WTC		
ERA group	Prog	Cont	Prog	Cont	Prog	Cont	Prog	Cont	Prog	Cont	Prog	Cont	All
Outcome	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Interview	88%	75%	71%	67%	73%	72%	53%	42%	97%	86%	78%	65%	70%
Non-contact	0%	0%	5%	6%	5%	12%	0%	5%	0%	11%	5%	8%	6%
Refusal	12%	25%	24%	27%	23%	16%	47%	53%	3%	3%	17%	28%	24%
W1 Non responders	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Base</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>442</i>	<i>438</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>1236</i>
<i>Ineligible</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>

Notes - 1240 new WTC cases were initially added to the sample, 1 was dropped before the beginning of fieldwork



## 5.4 Problems affecting response rates

The ND25+ sample had a much lower response rate than the original WTC and NDLP groups. This section discusses some of the reasons.

### *Variations in the availability of contact data.*

**Availability of telephone numbers.** In Wave 1, 16% of ND25+ cases did not have any telephone numbers. This is 3 times the proportion of NDLP cases (5%) and 16 times the rate for WTC cases (1%). At wave 2 the number of cases with no recorded telephone number was considerably lower, but ND25+ cases were still 6 times more likely than the other groups to have no telephone number (6% of ND25+ cases compared with 1% of NDLP cases).

**Number of additional contacts.** ND25+ cases were also much less likely to have supplied named alternative contacts: only 40% of ND25+ cases had additional contact information compared with 62% of NDLP and 68% of WTC respondents.

**Tenure.** ND25+ respondents were more likely than those in other groups to be living in accommodation that was not rented or owned in their name. About a quarter of ND25+ respondents lived in such accommodation compared with only 7% of NDLP and just 3% of WTC respondents. One reason that this makes the ND25+ sample more difficult to trace is that they are often not listed in the telephone directory. More generally, however, this is an indication of their mobility.

### *Collation of contact data*

Although the collection of extensive contact information was helpful, the collation of information from different sources was complicated. In wave 1 it was easy to identify which source of contact data was the most up-to-date; aside from some postcards sent by respondents, all the contact data was provided by DWP.

At wave 2, however, there were many more sources. In addition to contact data supplied by DWP, we also had our own contact data collected from the ERA wave 1 survey, the KITE and postcards returned by clients. Also, we did not know the precise date to which the DWP update information referred. In some cases the best contact details from DWP and our most up-to-date contact details (usually from the KITE) did not match. It was therefore decided to send the advance letter to the best address available from the KITE (as 80% of the wave 2 sample had taken part in the KITE). The interviewer's information sheets gave details of all addresses. Telephone numbers and alternative contacts that we had collected for each sample member throughout the course of the survey together with their source and an indicator of which was likely to be the most productive.

## 6. Data management

### 6.1 Editing

All range and consistency checks were carried out in the interview as part of the CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interview) programme. Additional checking and editing of the data was carried out in the office.

### 6.2 Data Issues

#### 1. QHelpNW ‘Help received when not working’

ERROR - 400 cases not routed to questions (error ran from Dec-Mar).

Respondents who had not worked in the reference period did were not asked xwkmeets (and xwkmeets not calculated), as a result they missed out on QHelpNW.

*Characteristics of cases.*

*RA'd in Dec-Mar*

*XWkrawl = 3 'No work in reference period' and Xifcont=1 (had contact with job-centre)*

*Missing Variables*

*XIntronw*

*XHelpN1-9*

*Xhpnspec*

*XBetOffN*

*XServN1-9*

*XSrvNoth*

*XJobcwho*

*Xlfapp*

#### 2. Xencmore-xsuppwk – ‘Encouragement/support when working’

ERROR - 34 cases not routed to questions - also affects **ALL** wave 1 (fix made in Dec 2005).

Similar error to the first one, in the wave 1 and wave 2 questionnaire wkmeets/xwkmeets ‘whether respondent met with job centre when working/not working or both’, only asked if respondent had periods of working and not working in reference period. When respondents had worked for the entire reference period the questions Xencmore-Xsuppwk were not asked. The error was identified by Jared Smith (MDRC) in December and fixed as soon as possible. Approximately 760 cases were affected in wave 1.

*Characteristics of cases*

*RA'd in Dec (+all Wv1 cases)*

*Xwkraw1 = 1 and Xifcont=1*

*Missing Variables*

*XEncwk*

*XEncmore*

*XPerhlpB*

*XExtref (some missing values)*

*XPerhlpC*

*XSuppWk*

### **3. QChildOut ‘Child Outcomes’**

ERROR - 5 cases not routed to age specific questions (16+) in child outcomes (fix made Dec 2005).

Problem arose due to complexity of random selection of 1 child, where only 1 child present the system selected the child but in a strange way that resulted in no 'meta' data of the child (age, sex, name) being passed forward, as a result questions routed by age were missed out (only affects children age 16+).

*Characteristics of cases*

*RA'd in Dec*

*Xnum818=1 and xselchage>=16*

*Missing Variables*

*XChqual1-4*

*XnoGcse*

*XaGcse*

*Xnoscot*

*Xascot*

### **4. WTC benefit problem**

ERROR - 91 cases not asked WTC benefit questions due to error in imputation of amount from work history.

To prevent asking about WTC twice the program picks up the amount of working tax credit received by a respondent from the Whist section. The questionnaire was programmed incorrectly resulting in blank data being passed forward and the questions on amount of WTC received by a respondent not being asked. As a result 31 respondents who said they received working tax credit were not asked how much working tax credit they received. All missing data set to dk.

*Characteristics of cases*

*XBenb1-5 = 3 (WTC recipients),*

*Respondent in work, respondent used to receive WTC but not anymore (via salary)*

### *Missing variables*

*XWFTCamt*

*XWTper*

*XWTwho*

#### 5. Wave 1 questions not asked of new WTC cases

14 new WTC cases missed out data relating to their sex, tenure and living arrangements, attitudes to random assignment and questions on their parents working habits. These fields have been set to ‘-7’. The cause of this problem was an improperly formatted data file in the questionnaire.

### Characteristics of cases

New WTC cases (error is effectively random)

### *Missing variables*

*Xsex*

*XTen1*

*XSaccom*

*XHHaccom*

*XLlord*

*XMove*

*XLivarr*

*Racheck*

*Ustand*

*Parint*

*FS1416*

*Mothwk*

*Link*

## **6.3 Data files**

SPSS data-files were provided to DWP in two batches for each wave.

## **7. Appendices**

### **7.1 Questionnaires for Wave 1 and 2**

### **7.2 Pre-contact letter**

### **7.3 Advance letters**

### **7.4 Purpose leaflet**

### **7.5 Example information sheet**