HMIP Prisoner Survey: Adults in England and Wales

User Manual
(1st Edition)

Volume A

Introduction, Technical Report and Appendices

Dr Kim Reising, Dr Janet C. Bowstead,
Prof Nicholas Hardwick, Prof Rosie Meek,
Sophie Riley, and Joe Simmonds

ROYAL HOLLOWAY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Contact

Data queries:
help@ukdataservice.ac.uk; ukda_requests@hmiprisons.gov.uk

Questions and feedback about this user guide:
ukda_requests@hmiprisons.gov.uk

Authors

Kim Reising, Janet C. Bowstead, Rosie Meek, Nicholas Hardwick, Sophie Riley, Joe Simmonds, HMI Prisons

Project Team

Rosie Meek (PI), Nicholas Hardwick, Kim Reising, Janet C. Bowstead, and Melissa Henderson, affiliated with the Department of Law and Criminology; Kathy Rastle from the Department of Psychology, Arnaud Chevalier from the Department of Economics. All at Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, Surrey, TW20 0EX.

Data Owner

HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 10 South Colonnade, Canary Wharf, London, E14 4PU.

Citation

Readers wishing to cite this document should use the following form of words:

Reising, K., Bowstead, J.C., Hardwick, N., Meek, R., Riley, S., and Simmonds, J. (2023) *HMIP Prisoner Survey: Adults in England and Wales – User Manual. 1st Edition.* Egham: Royal Holloway University of London.

The data should be cited using the latest information provided on the UK Data Service catalogue record at https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk/datacatalogue/studies/study?id=9068 (see the 'Citation and Copyright' section).

Foreword

When I was Chief Inspector of Prisons between 2010 and 2016, I quickly came to realise the value of our surveys for our inspection process. Surveys did not provide all the answers about what was happening in a prison - but they certainly indicated the questions we should be asking. They were the foundation of the inspection process. I realised then that survey results had a value beyond the inspectorate's use to inform a much wider understanding of what was happening in our prisons and other places of detention – the impact, good and bad, of past policy changes, and the future practice and policy changes that could help make prisons safer and more decent and benefit us all by supporting prisoners' rehabilitation.

Getting to the point where we could make these survey data available to a wider audience of researchers and policy makers has been a long process. There were considerable ethical and practical challenges to overcome, and we were fortunate to have funding from Royal Holloway to conduct a feasibility study that paved the way for our successful application for a full grant from the Economic and Social Research Council that has enabled the full dataset to now be published. We are of course grateful to these funders, to my successors as Chief Inspector and their teams for working with us and the talented and hard-working teams at Royal Holloway who have brought the project to fruition.

But most of all I should acknowledge the tens of thousands of prisoners who sat in their cells over the last twenty or so years, painstakingly filling in the survey, sometimes struggling a little with the reading and writing required. As any prison researcher will know, the response rate is exceptional. It is a tribute I think to the trust they had in the inspectorate and to the fact that they wanted their experience to lead to improvement for themselves and those who came after them. That was clearly the view of those prisoners we spoke to in the feasibility study - and for those who now use this data, it is both an opportunity and a responsibility to use the prisoner voices it contains to deepen our understanding of how prison is experienced, and the changes required.

Professor Nick Hardwick
Royal Holloway University of London

Acknowledgements

The project team would like to thank the HM Inspectorate of Prisons for provision of the data. The support of both the Economic and Social Research Council and the UK Data Service is gratefully acknowledged.

The work reported in this user manual is part of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) funded project 'Secondary Analysis of Data collected over a 20 year Period by HM Inspectorate of Prisons' conducted at the Royal Holloway University of London in partnership with HM Inspectorate of Prisons between the years 2021-2023 (grant reference ES/V012215/1, PI Professor Rosie Meek).

Further details of the project and our associated publications can be found here: https://royalholloway.ac.uk/research-and-teaching/departments-and-schools/law-and-criminology/research/our-projects-and-research-impact/secondary-analysis-of-data-collected-over-a-20-year-period-by-hm-inspectorate-of-prisons/.

Further information about the HMIP Prisoner Survey is available on the HMIP website at https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/research/detainee-survey/.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction to the Documentation

The format of this documentation has been designed to make the analysis of the HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) Prisoner survey data easier and more straightforward. Details of the organisation of the documentation are given below.

This documentation takes the form of an explanatory Volume A and a separate Volume B codebook/data dictionary for each year of the HMIP Prisoner Survey. The organisation of the volumes is described below.

1.1. Important Features of the Documentation

There are certain key aspects of the information that will help users navigate the datasets as well as this User Manual. These key aspects are listed below.

1.1.1. Refreshing the Data

An additional data file of the HMIP Prisoner Survey will be archived with the UK Data Service (UKDS) every year following the release of the annual report of the latest year of data. Data users can obtain individual annual datasets or the entire data collection to date from the UKDS. It is essential that users also obtain the updates to this user manual.

1.1.2. Volume A

This initial introductory volume, essential for all users, will be supplemented in the future through the issue of update sheets. Volume A contains essential information required for the analysis of the data, including details of fieldwork, sampling, and information to assist users in the aggregating of data across years.

1.1.3. Volume B

Each dataset will be released in a separate year-specific volume; Volume B1 containing a codebook/data dictionary for the first year of data and its related questionnaires, Volume B2 containing information for the second year of data, and so on.

With each new release, those acquiring the latest year of data will also receive update sheets for both Volume A and Volume B containing the codebook / data dictionary of the latest year of data.

Codebooks/data dictionaries contain essential information for each variable in each year included in the HMIP Prisoner Survey database.

1.2. Getting more Information

Further information about the HMIP Prisoner Survey is available on the HMIP website at https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/research/detainee-survey/

2. Introduction to the HM Inspectorate of Prisons Prisoner Survey

2.1. About HM Inspectorate of Prisons[1]

HM Inspectorate of Prisons for England and Wales is an independent inspectorate led by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons. HMIP provide independent scrutiny of the conditions for and treatment of prisoners and other detainees and report on findings.

Inspections are guided by the idea of 'healthy establishments', in which staff support prisoners and detainees to reduce reoffending and achieve positive outcomes for themselves and the public. In their reports, they include recommendations on how establishments can improve outcomes for prisoners.

HMIP's work forms part of the UK's obligations under the Optional Protocol to the United Nations Convention against Torture (OPCAT). OPCAT requires member states to regularly and independently inspect places of detention. HMIP also work with other criminal justice inspectorates.

The HMIP prisoner survey is carried out by HMIP as part of the Chief Inspector of Prison's responsibility to "ensure independent inspection of places of detention, report on conditions and treatment and promote positive outcomes for those detained and the public" (HMIP, 2022). HM Chief Inspector of Prisons' responsibilities are set out in sections 5A and 43 of the Prison Act 1952 (as amended). They are to inspect (or arrange for the inspection of) and report to the relevant Secretary of State on:

- prisons, young offender institutions (YOIs), and secure training centres (STCs) in England and Wales
- court custody facilities in Crown Courts, county courts and magistrates' courts in England and Wales and escorts to and from these facilities; and
- immigration removal centres (IRCs), short-term holding facilities, pre-departure accommodation and escort arrangements throughout the UK.

In addition to inspection of individual establishments the Inspectorate also carries out 'thematic inspections' of cross-cutting themes and in its annual reports and other publications reports to Parliament and other bodies on the state of the establishments it inspects.

[1] See also https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-hmi-prisons/.

The HM Chief Inspector of Prisons designates a small number of inspection teams, each led by a team leader and working to the Deputy Chief Inspector. Each team retains a specialism in the inspection of a specific type of custodial establishment – for example, young offender institutions and secure training centres, immigration removal centres, adult women's prisons, and police custody facilities – but all also inspect adult male prisons.

Inspectors are drawn form a range of backgrounds, including seconded or former prison managers with operational experience working in custodial establishments, third sector organisations, and those with health, social care, probation, police, and legal backgrounds. In addition, Inspectorate staff also include social researchers, editorial and administrative staff.

HMIP is an independent body sponsored by the Ministry of Justice. It is one of the bodies that fulfils the UK's obligations under the Optional Protocol to the United Nations Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT).

2.2. The Prison Inspection[2]

HMIP's inspections cover a wide range of issues, including the safety and security of the establishment, the conditions and treatment of prisoners, the quality of health care services, education and training opportunities, and the effectiveness of rehabilitation and reintegration programmes. Inspections are conducted by teams of inspectors and where appropriate are conducted jointly with other statutory inspectorates such as those responsible for healthcare or education.

The current inspection framework is that prisons are inspected at least once every five years, and most prisons are inspected every two to three years, but high-risk establishments may be inspected more frequently. The inspection schedule is predicated on a risk assessment, taking into account the function of the prison and dynamic factors such as time since the last inspection, type and size of the prison, significant changes to the prison or changes in leadership, and intelligence received. The majority of inspections are full and unannounced, assessing progress made since previous inspections and undertaking in-depth analysis. Over the years different types of short 'follow up' inspections have been implemented to review progress since the full inspection and these have usually not involved a prisoner survey.

A full inspection of a prison normally spans a period of two weeks. The first inspection week involves a small inspection team attending the prison for two days to plan the main inspection

[2] See also https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/.

and carry out an initial assessment, and HMIP researchers will also attend the establishment to conduct a prisoner survey.

Inspectors have unrestricted access to all parts of the prison at any time, as well as to all the prison's information and data, and may speak to any prisoner in confidence.

A full inspection process has consistently included:

- A prisoner survey,
- Speaking to prisoners in confidence individually and in groups, using the Inspectorate's own interpreters where required,
- Speaking to staff and managers. In recent years a staff survey has also sometimes been carried out,
- Speaking to and examining correspondence from prison visitors, families, and other sources,
- Examining prison data, and
- Observation.

Members of the research team conduct a survey of a representative proportion of the prison population, gathering prisoner perceptions and experiences. Participants are chosen at random across all wings/units of the prison. The survey is confidential and anonymous. Where possible, researchers talk to each selected prisoner to explain the purpose of the survey, leave the paper form with the prisoner, and go back to each cell to collect the survey later that day or the following morning. Distribution and collection of the survey takes up to two days. The survey is used to make comparisons between prisoner responses from the inspected prison and the collective responses from prisoners held in similar prisons. Comparisons are also made between the current responses and those gathered at the last inspection, alongside a breakdown of responses by protected characteristics and, where appropriate, in-prison locations (e.g. different wings). Survey findings are seen by HMIP as an essential part of the evidence base for inspection to provide a robust and representative user view of the treatment and conditions in custodial establishments.

After each inspection the Inspectorate will publish a report on a date determined by The Chief Inspector, setting out their findings and assessments, identifying good practice and making recommendations for improvement. The inspected establishment is required to publish its response. Where very serious concerns are identified, the Chief Inspector may issue an ‘Urgent

Notification' to the Secretary of State at the end of the inspection requiring immediate remedial action.

2.3. The Expectations[3]

HMIP's inspections are carried out against published inspection criteria known as Expectations. The Inspectorate sets its own inspection criteria to ensure transparency and independence. The starting point of all inspections is the outcome for detainees. The Inspectorate's Expectations are based on and referenced against international human rights standards.

Expectations for adult male and female prisons and young offender institutions (YOIs) are currently grouped under four tests of a healthy prison:

- **Safety**: Detainees, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.
- **Respect** (Care for YOIs): Detainees are treated with respect for their human dignity.
- **Purposeful activity**: Detainees are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them.
- **Rehabilitation and release planning**: Detainees are supported to maintain and develop relationships with their family and friends. Detainees are helped to reduce their likelihood of reoffending and their risk of harm is managed effectively. Detainees are prepared for their release back into the community.

Outcomes for prisoners are assessed under each healthy prison test as 'Good', 'Reasonably good', 'Not sufficiently good' or 'Poor'.

Since July 2021 the Inspectorate has introduced a fifth expectation on leadership:

- **Leaders** provide the direction, encouragement, and resources to enable good outcomes for prisoners.

The assessment of leadership is not given an overall grading.

Each inspection will also assess progress in implementing recommendations made at the previous inspection.

[3] See also https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/our-expectations/.

In other inspection sectors, the principles that underpin the healthy establishment concept are applied, although the specific focus can vary depending on their relevance[4]. The Inspectorate publishes inspection criteria for assessing the treatment of and conditions for: men in prison, women in prison, children in custody, detainees in close supervision centres, immigration detainees, detainees in Border Force custody, detainees in court custody, detainees in tri-service (i.e., army, navy, and air force) custody facilities and the Military Corrective Training Centre, and joint standards with Ofsted for secure training centres.

These are available on the HMIP website at:
https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/our-expectations/.

Each expectation describes the standards of treatment and conditions an establishment is expected to achieve. These are underpinned by a series of 'indicators' which describe evidence that may show the expectation being met. The list of indicators is not exhaustive and does not exclude other ways of achieving the expectation. Expectations and indicators have been revised over time as the inspectorate's experience has grown.

3. The HMIP Prisoner Survey

The HMIP Prisoner Survey is conducted as part of each full inspection and designed to gather information from prisoners about their experiences of custody, including their access to healthcare, education, and other services, as well as their perceptions of safety and security within the prison.

The survey is conducted across all adult prisons in England and Wales, with a different questionnaire used for men's prisons and women's prisons.. The survey results are summarised and published in a report of each inspection.

Surveys are conducted by the inspectorate's research team who are accredited Government Social Research (GSR) researchers. They and all inspectors have the level of security clearance required to provide unrestricted access to all a prison's data.

[4] For immigration removal centres, short-term holding facilities and family detention the four tests are safety, respect, activities and preparation for removal and release (or safety, respect and preparation for reintegration for oversees escorts). Police custody expectations are arranged under the headings of: leadership, accountability and partnerships; pre-custody – first point of contact; in the custody suite – booking in, individual needs and legal rights; in the custody cell, safeguarding and health care; and release and transfer from custody. Court custody expectations fall under the headings of leadership, strategy and planning, individual rights, and treatment and conditions.

The survey was first conducted in June 2000 and is ongoing. In total it has been carried out for 23 years by HMIP to date, with some changes to the survey structure and content. In that time over 100,000 surveys have been completed in every prison in England and Wales.

The survey runs continuously with questionnaire content typically changing at the start of each financial year (post-2010), but also with some use of slightly different versions of the survey in different prison types, specifically open and women's prisons.

The prisoner survey is analysed to provide inspectors with

- comparisons with previous inspections and surveys conducted at similar establishments,
- breakdowns of the data by different protected characteristics,
- thematic analysis of prisoners' written comments.

The survey data is only part of the overall inspection framework, involving gathering and analysing quantitative and qualitative data about prisons and other places of detention and combining this with other forms of evidence (including inspectors' observations and discussion with staff and prisoners) to come to judgements about establishments.

Survey data is presented here in annual datasets containing the quantitative survey data from inspections published during that year. The survey datasets available for research use do not include prisoners' written comments.

Table 1. *Fieldwork periods, 2000 – 2022.*

Dataset	**Publication Period**	**Inspection Period[a]**	**Questionnaire Version[b]**
2000-03	Sep 00 – Aug 03	Jan 00 – Apr 03	V01 (2000 – 2002) V02 (2002 – 2004)
2003-04	Sep 03 – Aug 04	Dec 02 – Apr 04	V03 (2004 – 2006)
2004-05	Sep 04 – Aug 05	Mar 04 – Mar 05	V03 (2004 – 2006)
2005-06	Sep 05 – Aug 06	Apr 05 – Apr 06	V03 (2004 – 2006)
2006-07	Sep 06 – Aug 07	Mar 06 – Apr 07	V04 (2006 – 2009)
2007-08	Sep 07 – Aug 08	Mar 07 – Feb 08	V04 (2006 – 2009)
2008-09	Sep 08 – Aug 09	Mar 08 – Apr 09	V05 (2006 – 2009)
2009-10	Sep 09 – Mar 10	Feb 09 – Nov 09	V06 (2009 – 2011)
2010-11	Apr 10 – Mar 11	Nov 09 – Dec 10	V06 (2009 – 2011)
2011-12	Apr 11 – Mar 12	Aug 10 – Nov 11	V07 (2011 – 2012)
2012-13	Apr 12 – Mar 13	Oct 11 – Nov 12	V08 (2012 – 2017)
2013-14	Apr 13 – Mar 14	Nov 12 – Nov 13	V08 (2012 – 2017)
2014-15	Apr 14 – Mar 15	Nov 13 – Dec 14	V08 (2012 – 2017)
2015-16	Apr 15 – Mar 16	Oct 14 – Nov 15	V08 (2012 – 2017)
2016-17	Apr 16 – Mar 17	Oct 15 – Nov 16	V08 (2012 – 2017)
2017-18	Apr 17 – Mar 18	Dec 16 – Nov 17	V09 (2017 – 2020)
2018-19	Apr 18 – Mar 19	Nov 17 – Nov 18	V09 (2017 – 2020)
2019-20	Apr 19 – Mar 20	Nov 18 – Dec 20	V09 (2017 – 2020)
2021-22	Apr 21 – Mar 22	May 21 – Dec 22	V10 (2021 – today)

Note:

[a]The inspection period refers to the time when the actual inspection of the prison takes place. The publication period refers to the time when the inspectorate releases the report to the public. The annual report and dataset typically include reports that were published in the previous fiscal year, which runs from 1st April to 31st March; inspection periods may vary.

[b]The questionnaire has gone through a series of major and minor revisions from the initial version to today. These revisions typically take place at the start of each financial year (1st April post-2010 and 1st September pre-2010), but there have also been some slightly different versions of the survey in different prison types, specifically open and women's prisons.

3.1. The Questionnaire

The questionnaire package consists of:

- A coversheet, which contains information about the survey structure and purpose, the random selection of prisoners to take part, and how the survey is part of the overall inspection. It explains participation is voluntary. There is information on how the paper form will be processed, and what will be done with the data. The request to complete the survey is in the name of HMIP, and the confidentiality of responses is explained, as well as the response to any safeguarding risks revealed by a prisoner. Prisoners are also given contact details for independent support for any personal issues they may have and a schedule indicating questionnaire collection time.
- A self-completion questionnaire, which takes approximately 60 minutes to complete. HMIP researchers first developed the self-completion questionnaire in 1999/2000 to support HMIP Expectations. The questionnaire consists of structured questions covering the prisoner 'journey' from reception to release together with demographic and background questions which enables comparison of responses from different sub-groups of the prisoner population. There are also three open questions at the end of the questionnaire which allow prisoners to express in their own words what they find most positive and negative about the prison. Qualitative analysis of these written comments is undertaken by HMI Prisons researchers and used by inspectors; these are not included in the datasets available for research.

The questionnaire has gone through a series of major and minor revisions from the initial version to today. A set of questionnaires, together with examples of the cover sheets, is included in Volume B.

Table 2. *Main topics covered in the HMIP Prisoner Survey.*

Section	Topic
A	Derived from the inspection
B	Background information
C	Arrival and reception
D	First night and induction
E	On the wing
F	Food and canteen
G	Relationships with staff
H	Faith
J	Contact with family and friends
K	Time out of cell
L	Applications, complaints, legal rights
M	Healthcare
N	Other support needs
P	Alcohol and drugs
Q	Safety
R	Behaviour management
S	Education, skills, and work
T	Planning and progression
U	Preparation for release
V	More about you
W	Final questions about this prison

3.2. Sample Selection Procedure and Calculation

The HMIP survey uses a random sampling method to select prisoners for participation in the survey. On the day of the survey a random sample is drawn by HMIP researchers from a P-NOMIS (the prison system's prisoner database) prisoner population printout ordered by cell location.

Using a power calculation, HMIP researchers calculate the minimum sample size required to ensure that the survey findings are representative of the entire population of the establishment. The formula used in the calculation assumes a 75% response rate (65% in open establishments) and a 95% confidence interval with a 7% margin of error.

If there are different populations held separately at an establishment (e.g. adults and young adults) then a separate sample size is likely calculated for each population as they may be analysed separately. The HMIP survey team then contacts the selected prisoners to invite them to participate in the survey. The survey is voluntary, and prisoners are free to decline to participate.

Table 3. *Core sample size, 2000 – 2022*[5].

Dataset	Sample size
2000-03	5372
2003-04	2654
2004-05	2446
2005-06	3357
2006-07	3734
2007-08	3605
2008-09	3996
2009-10	2185
2010-11	5719
2011-12	6324

Dataset	Sample size
2012-13	6490
2013-14	7233
2014-15	8477
2015-16	6705
2016-17	7202
2017-18	6940
2018-19	6448
2019-20	7002
2021-22	3726
TOTAL	99615

3.3. Data Collection and Fieldwork

HMIP researchers distribute and collect the questionnaires in person. Assurances are given about confidentiality, anonymity and the storage and retention of the data. Prisoners are provided with a sealable envelope for their completed questionnaire and told when researchers will return to collect it. The questionnaire is available in a number of languages.

3.3.1. Preparatory Work

The questionnaire is prepared by selecting the appropriate questionnaire template for the type of establishment. There are several variations of the questionnaire template including[6]:

- an adult male prison questionnaire (used for high security, locals, trainers, opens, therapeutic communities, foreign national prisons, young adults),
- a women's questionnaire,
- a children and young people (CYP) questionnaire,

[5] In March 2020, HMI Prisons' planned inspection schedule was suspended due to the COVID-19 pandemic. During 2020 and spring 2021, HMIP conducted short scrutiny visits and scrutiny visits. These visits, which operated under the 'do no harm' principle, allowed HMI Prisons to fulfil its statutory duty to report on treatment of and conditions for prisoners and detainees, while making sure that the health of prisoners and detainees, establishment staff and HMI Prisons staff was not compromised.

[6] CYP, STC, IRC and MCTC inspections are not included in the UKDS dataset.

- a Secure Training Centre (STC) questionnaire,
- an Immigration Removal Centre (IRC) questionnaire, and
- adapted questionnaires for other places of detention (e.g. Military Corrective Training Centre (MCTC)).

The questionnaire and a cover sheet are printed based on the power calculation that would return the sample size required. The questionnaire is put into an envelope with a 'Confidential Questionnaire' label on the front.

Inspection announcement and staff survey posters are printed and distributed. Other intelligence about the prison is gathered from a variety of sources and shared with inspectors.

3.3.2. Fieldwork Process

On the first day of the survey visit, the sample will be drawn up from the P-NOMIS list, and researchers allocated to wings/units which they will distribute and collect questionnaires. Each researcher then identifies which sampled prisoners on their allocated wings require a translated questionnaire and arrange this.

Questionnaires are distributed at a time when it is easiest to find the prisoners e.g. during lunchtime, lock-up or during association. Questionnaires are collected on the same or following day (depending on the time and size of the distribution and other logistic issues). It is ensured that all respondents have sufficient time to complete the questionnaire. Questionnaires are distributed to and collected from each respondent individually and an effort is made to speak to all sampled prisoners in person.

During handout, prisoners are informed and reassured about the purpose of the survey, that they have been randomly selected, and that the survey is confidential and anonymous (including the limits of confidentially and anonymity). Respondents can ask questions about the questionnaire, the Inspectorate, and the inspection at all times.

For prisoners who are not in their cells, questionnaires are left in their cells, with a completed cover sheet stating the collection time. A final check is conducted, and if a prisoner has not returned to their cell, HMIP may employ a resampling technique and replace the absent prisoner with the next individual on the population list who is in the same wing or unit as per their location-based sampling method. By incorporating resampling, when necessary, HMIP mitigates potential compromises to sample sizes, randomness, and overall representativeness.

3.3.3. Refusal

If a prisoner declines to complete the questionnaire this is indicated with a 'DEC' or 'D' next to their name. If the questionnaire is not returned or returned blank, this is indicated with 'N/R'.

3.3.4. Translations

The questionnaire has been translated into various other languages. Telephone interpreting can be used where there is no version of the questionnaire in the respondent's language. In some cases, inspectors are able to identify before the handout process who needs a translation from the numeracy and literacy fluency level data that may be recorded in P-NOMIS for the sampled prisoner.

If a translated questionnaire is requested while handing out the surveys, a note is made, and the relevant questionnaire is photocopied from the master copies which the organising HMIP researcher has brought with them.

When de-enveloping translations after collection, if both English and translated version have been completed, by default the translated version will be used and responses transferred on a blank English questionnaire by HMIP researchers.

Survey comments for translations are sent to HMIP's language service provider.

3.3.5. Assistance

While distributing questionnaires, prisoners may be identified who need assistance with completing the questionnaire. There are generally two reasons prisoners may need assistance:

1. Language differences which mean that they are unable to complete the questionnaire and require the use of an interpreter.
2. They are unable to complete the questionnaire because of difficulties with reading and/or writing.

If there is no translated version of the questionnaire in the prisoner's language, it is checked whether they understand what the questionnaire is about. If they agree to complete the questionnaire with the help of an interpreter, they are taken to a room/office with access to a telephone.

If the prisoner's level of English is such that it cannot be communicated to them what the inspection and questionnaire is about, HMI Prisons' researchers do not attempt to facilitate telephone interpreting. It is considered unethical by HMIP to take prisoners out of their cell or regime for something they have not consented to participating in and/or which they may feel obliged to comply with.

If a prisoner has difficulty reading and/or writing, they will be asked whether there is someone they wish to help them complete the questionnaire such as a cell mate, someone else from the wing, or someone from education and if they are comfortable with such an arrangement. If no arrangement can be made or the prisoner does not wish to do so, HMIP researchers agree a time to assist the prisoner.

3.3.6. Confidentiality and Informed Consent

All completed questionnaires are confidential i.e., only HMIP researchers and members of the Inspectorate see them. In order to ensure this confidentiality, respondents are asked to have their questionnaire ready for collection by a member of the research team, sealed in the envelope provided, when they come to collect it at the specified time.

The questionnaire responses are anonymous. Respondents are not asked to report their names on their questionnaire so that they can be confident that responses cannot be traced back to them as individuals. However, where there are imminent and serious safety concerns stated in an unnamed questionnaire, attempts are made to identify the individual in order to take any necessary safeguarding measures.

All questionnaires are checked to see if a name has been added to the front or back of the questionnaire. Questionnaires which contain the names or identifiable information of others are placed into an envelope marked 'Official Sensitive' and sealed inside a self-addressed envelope. All questionnaires are brought back to the office in person.

Completed questionnaires are stored securely when they are not used.

3.4. Data Processing

Completed surveys are taken to the HMIP office and prepared for analysis. The general order for conducting survey analysis is:

- scan in questionnaires,
- extract scanned images,
- data cleaning the questionnaire responses (see below),
- scan in and send comments for translation,
- type up and code comments,
- monitor responses and survey methodology,
- compile full survey results,
- check exported data against full survey results,
- fill in last time comparator,
- fill in functional type comparator,
- conduct any diversity or sub-population analysis,
- read comments (including confidential comments)
- and do some thematic analysis.

3.4.1. Visual edits and data input

The returned questionnaires are ordered by wing. Each wing pile is counted and recorded on the monitoring survey responses form. Any responses that have been provided in translated questionnaires are transferred onto spare English questionnaires if it has not been yet done. All questionnaires are numbered and scanned to be converted into electronic files. For adult prison surveys, all comments provided by prisoners are typed up by HMIP researchers, coded, and subjected to a thematic analysis that is provided to inspectors. This analysis is not for publication but is used by inspectors for the purposes of the inspection. Once all questionnaires have been scanned in, the data is cleaned.

3.4.2. Data cleaning

The data is first checked for accuracy (e.g. completion errors) using an automated cleaning function. This identifies potential issues, such as no response to a question, crossed out ticks, as well as every response being ticked. The initial stages of data cleaning ensure that the data accurately reflects how the prisoner has completed the form.

The data is then checked for consistency. Manual cleaning is required because questionnaires are frequently returned with conflicting responses (respondent errors). The two main types of question that need to be manually checked are:

- multiple response questions, and
- follow-up questions.

The general rule is that if a respondent has said that none of the responses are valid, they cannot also have ticked alternative responses. In such a case, the negative response option is removed. Multiple responses are also checked individually throughout as they are not covered by the automatic cleaning function, so crossed out ticks or mistakes will not be registered unless they are manually removed.

Further, with follow-up questions, it is generally assumed that the first answer is correct and subsequent ones should match. However, where there is no response to the first question, the answer to the following question(s) may be used as a guide to fill in the first question(s).

Once the cleaning is complete the data is checked in terms of whether certain summary counts make sense. In addition, the data is converted to a spreadsheet for further checks. For some multiple-choice questions, for instance, filters are used to ensure cleaning was done correctly. Once the data has been cleaned correctly, the full survey results of the data are transferred to a statistical package for analysis.

There are separate spreadsheets for female establishments, male locals, male Cat B trainers, male Cat C trainers, Therapeutic Communities (TCs), male open prisons, High Security prisons, units, Close Supervision Centre (CSC) units, sex offender prisons, and male young adult establishments.

3.4.3. Response rates

The number of prisoners in the sample, along with the number of refusals and non-returns, is recorded by wing. This enables the number of returned questionnaires to be calculated. This figure is then checked by manually counting the questionnaires before they are scanned, and/or by counting using the first page of the questionnaire where the wing is recorded.

3.4.4. Use

The survey analysis is passed to the inspection team within four days of it being undertaken and passed to the inspection team for use in the full inspection week. The inspection team leader

may ask for additional analysis of particular wings or categories of prisoners and this will be carried out if resources permit.

4. The HMIP Prisoner Survey Data

This Chapter explains about access to the HMIP Prisoner Survey data files and their structure.

4.1. Access to the Data

As of 2023, the HMIP Prisoner Survey data is deposited at the UK Data Archive, which is managed by the UK Data Service (UKDS). The UK Data Archive holds the data for all available annual aggregations of the survey. For each annual aggregation there is one file. Researchers who would like to conduct secondary analysis of the HMIP Prisoner Survey data should contact the UK Data Archive, University of Essex, Colchester, CO4 3SQ.

4.1.1. UKDS Requirements

As part of the database is only available subject to the UKDS Special Licence Agreement, researchers will apply methods and standards specified in the Research Data Handling and Security: Guide for Users for disclosure control for statistical outputs. No cell in any published table should contain frequencies of less than ten to further protect people with minority backgrounds/statuses.

4.1.2. HM Inspectorate of Prisons Requirements

HMIP also has a number of specific requirements, and these are specified below:

No cell in any published table should contain frequencies of less than ten to further protect people with minority backgrounds/statuses. ‘Small numbers’ are numbers one to ten. Low-level analyses are more likely to contain small numbers, which might facilitate identification of individuals, especially at a local level.

When publishing/releasing analyses, cell values from one to ten must be suppressed to prevent possible identification of individuals from small counts within the table. Zero does not need to be suppressed. If only one cell requires cell suppression, at least one other component cell must be suppressed (the next smallest) to avoid calculation of suppressed values from the totals. These values should be replaced with ‘*’ and add a note: “‘*’ in this table means a figure between one and ten”.

Numbers larger than ten might not be disclosive but judgement still needs to be taken as to whether results imply more about individual cases.

An alternative to suppressing values from one to ten is to consider a higher level of aggregation for one or more items e.g. combining small categories into a category of 'other'. A higher level of aggregation is the preferred option if several cells are affected by the suppression rule.

4.2. Data Files

4.2.1. Naming Convention

The variables have been named to reflect the questions asked and the group of questions they belong to. A full list of variables can be viewed in Volume B.

4.2.2. Variable Names

Variable names carry a letter prefix to indicate the questionnaire section in which the question appears, e.g. 'A' for administrative data, 'B' for background information, 'C' for arrival and reception, and so on. It should be noted, though, that the most recent questionnaire structure (i.e. the 2021/22 survey) was used and older questions may have been reallocated.

Suffixes to variable names have been added to specify the version of the question, as the majority of questions have changed over time in either format or wording; thus '01' is attached to the first version of a question, '02' to version two of a question, and so on.

The variable names are in part HMIP's working variable names and in part slightly edited or newly derived names for improved clarity and structure, in an attempt to be self-explanatory.

Given the nature of this repeated cross-sectional design, some variables are repeated in each year, while others are repeated intermittently, and still others appear in only one or two years, or only in a particular functional type of prison. See Volume B for changes.

4.2.3. Variable and Value Labels

Variable labels are the labels given to a variable. The variable labels follow a naming system and structure for clarity and consistency. As a result, the variable labels in the datasets are not identical to the wording within the survey questionnaires. Within the paper questionnaires a

range of numbering systems was used over the years, and within the same year at different prison types, so that otherwise identical questions would have different numbers. The question numbers found in the questionnaires are therefore not used in the variable names or labels in the datasets.

Value labels are the labels given to the response categories of a variable. For example, the variable 'V_gender' can take the numeric codes 1, 2, 3, and 4 and these can be labelled 'Male', 'Female', 'Binary', and 'Other' respectively. Value labels ease the interpretation of analysis output. All annual aggregations of the HMIP Prisoner Survey are fully labelled.

4.2.4. Multiple Response Variables

When a question has been asked in the survey, where only one answer is appropriate (e.g. 'Is your cell bell answered within 5 minutes?' – 'Yes', 'No', 'Don't know', 'Don't have a cell call bell'), results are stored as a single-code response category in one variable.

However, some questions enable the respondent to provide more than one answer. In such cases there is a variable for each answer category. For example, in the questionnaire the question is 'When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems?' with tick box options. In the data this becomes a series of variables; 'Money worries', 'Housing/accommodation', 'None', etc all become a separate variable and are coded as binary variables (i.e. 1 if the respondent has selected the answer, and 0 if the respondent has not selected the answer).

The variable names for multi-code response categories consist, in part, of the same name plus a specific name to represent the answer – i.e. 'C_probcash' for the first possible answer, 'C_probhouse' for the second possible answer, and so on.

4.2.5. Derived Variables

In addition to the questions directly asked of respondents, the data files also include a few derived variables. Derived variables are those which are calculated from other questionnaire variables and/or data from non-survey sources in order to enable easier analysis of the datasets. Some relate to the prison, and others to individuals. These variables have names with the initial letter A_ .

Data users may want to derive further variables depending on their research questions, by means of amalgamating value categories, or creating binary variables from variables which have multiple responses, for example. Caution should be exercised in deriving any variables to ensure that the processing is justifiable, and that the analysis remains valid in terms of the original data.

A particular potential for such a long time series of cross-sectional datasets is analysis over many years, but this carries with it the issue of changes to variables and values over time which make comparisons difficult or impossible. Depending on the research questions, data users may find the same variable available over the time period they require, but they may want to make comparisons over longer periods and want to derive consistent variables over that whole time. This will generally require a reduction and amalgamation of value categories to the most limited range that is available or derivable over the whole period.

For example, a more detailed range of categories of ethnic origin is used in more recent surveys, and there are four different ethnic origin variables in total up to 2022. However, these four variables can be combined into the more limited range of six options that were used in the earlier years as a derived ethnic origin variable. Data users will have to decide if this is justifiable for their analysis, but examples of the necessary syntax for some of these derived variables is available in Appendix A.1. These are primarily basic variables in the B_ and V_ sections. In addition, there are series of questions, for example on safety (section Q) and on access to health professionals (section M) where variables could be derived which represent a reduced range of value options, but over a longer period. A couple of examples of such syntax are also provided for data users, but with the proviso that this is not a recommendation or endorsement of such derived variables as enabling valid analysis: that would require the judgement of the data user.

4.2.6. Missing Data Convention

Most respondents have a value recorded against them for each variable. However, in some cases the value is referred to as a ‘missing value’ code. When carrying out analyses, missing values are typically excluded. More information on the types of missing value codes in the datasets is given below.

77 – Not Applicable

Not all questions are applicable to all respondents. It is possible that a whole section of the questionnaire is not relevant for some respondents (e.g. questions for prisoners who have a custody/sentence plan). In other cases, it may be an individual question that is not appropriate, (e.g. a respondent has stated that they have never made a complaint, so they are therefore not asked about the procedure of making a complaint). In either of these cases their 'answers' are given the value label '77: Not Applicable'.

88 – Not Asked

Other questions may not have been asked for a range of reasons. This tends to apply more to earlier years of the survey process where survey versions were changed more frequently and/or different versions used in different functional types of establishments during the same time period. In these cases, the answer is given the label '88: Not asked'.

99 – Not Answered/Missing

For some questions respondents are not explicitly given the options 'don't know' or 'refuse' and may respond 'don't know' or otherwise not answer a question. Respondents may also by accident miss answering a question or write comments rather than choosing an answer option. These are classified as '99: Not Answered/Missing'.

5. The HMIP Prisoner Survey Analysis

The HMIP Prisoner Survey is a large and complex series of datasets which provide a rich source of data for analysis. It is important that anyone undertaking analysis fully understands the nature of the data and the conventions in conducting analysis. It is also important to remember the administrative and functional context for the survey as a part of HMIP inspections, and that the data were not originally collected for wider research use. As a result, researchers may find the design of the survey, variables, and value options, as well as the prison sampling, are not optimal for some research questions or conclusions.

This chapter discusses the three types of analysis: individual-based analysis, prison-based analysis, and incident-based analysis.

5.1. Individual-based analysis

Individual-based analysis is when the intention is to make statements about the characteristics or experiences of individuals in the sample. Examples of the type of statement arising from this type of analysis include:

"XX% of adults in the sample were female"

"XX% of men felt unsafe"

5.2. Prison-based analysis

Prison-based analysis is when the intention is to make statements about the characteristics of or experiences in a specific prison in the sample. In such analysis it is important to remember the selection of prisons for inspection, and the frequency of inspection of a particular prison, is made for HMIP functional reasons, and not standard research sampling or selection reasons. This is also pertinent to comparisons between prisons, including prisons of the same functional type. Examples include:

"XX% of prisons in the sample accommodated young adults"

"XX% of prisons were high secure estates"

5.3. Incident-based analysis

This comprises analyses where the intention is to make statements about the nature of incidents of, for instance, victimisation using the information recorded in section Q of the datasets. Incident-based analysis usually examines the nature of specific incident types or compares different types of incidents. Examples of the types of statements arising from this type of analysis include:

> "XX% of victimisation incidents occurred in local prisons"

> "In XX% of theft of canteen or property incidents the victim self-identified as minority"

6. Methodological Limitation

It should be noted that the figures derived from the HMIP Prisoner Survey are estimates. As with any sample survey, the survey estimates are subject to sampling error and a range of other methodological limitations.

6.1. Sampling Error

As with each inspection only a sample of the population is questioned, findings are subject to sampling error. That is the results may differ to those which would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed. The error depends on the size and design of the sample, and the size of the estimate.

6.2. Non-response

As in any sample survey, it is difficult to represent the population adequately. Some prisoners may be impossible to interview, and others may refuse to be interviewed. Non-response has implications for the measurement of certain experiences if non-respondents have different experiences to respondents.

6.3. Recall

The HMIP Prisoner Survey asks respondents to recall some of their experiences from the day of arrival in prison – a period that may be years for some. The HMIP Prisoner Survey data is thus dependent on respondents' ability to accurately remember their experiences in the reference period. There are several problems which could prevent accurate recall:

- respondents could forget a relevant incident;
- respondents could remember an incident, but think it happened before the reference period and therefore not report it or conversely, remember an earlier incident as happening within the reference period and thus erroneously report it.

6.4. Unwillingness to Recall

Respondents may not wish to report certain characteristics or experiences to the survey for a variety of reasons.

7. Terms and Definitions

Demographic information

Information about people's characteristics (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity).

Fieldwork

The collection of primary information; for the HMIP Prisoner Survey, this is the process of surveying respondents as part of each full prison inspection.

HMIP

HM's Inspectorate of Prisons for England and Wales (data owner).

Immigration Removal Centre (IRC)

Is a type of detention facility where foreign nationals who are subject to deportation from the UK are held while their immigration status is resolved.

Prison

Category A prison

These are high security prisons. They house male prisoners who, if they were to escape, pose the most threat to the public, the police or national security.

Category B prison

These prisons are either local or training prisons. Local prisons house prisoners that are taken directly from court in the local area (sentenced or on remand), and training prisons hold long-term and high-security prisoners.

Category C prison

These prisons are training and resettlement prisons; most prisoners are located in a category C. They provide prisoners with the opportunity to develop their own skills so they can find work and resettle back into the community on release.

Category D prison

These prisons have minimal security and allow eligible prisoners to spend most of their day away from the prison on licence to carry out work, education or for other resettlement purposes. Open prisons only house prisoners that have been risk-assessed and deemed suitable for open conditions.

Women and young adults prison

Women and young adults are categorised and held in either closed conditions or open conditions, according to their risks and needs.

Females and young adults who're considered high risk are categorised as ‘restricted status’, meaning they can only be held in a closed prison. In exceptional cases, women and young adults may be held in a high security prison (category A).

Youth offender establishments

Young Offender Institution (YOI): These prisons house prisoners aged between 18 to 21.

Youth Custody: These establishments house young people under the age of 18 who have been remanded or sentenced to periods of detention by the courts.

Therapeutic community

A specialised type of prison unit or wing designed to provide a supportive and therapeutic environment for prisoners with mental health, addiction, or behavioural problems.

Respondent

The person who is randomly selected to answer the survey questions.

Response rate

The percentage of people who actually took part in the survey, out of those who were selected to take part (the sample).

Sample

A subset of the population, selected to take part in a survey.

Secure Training Centre (STC)

A type of custodial establishment in England and Wales that provides a secure accommodation and education for young people aged between 12 and 17 who have been sentenced or remanded by the courts.

Young Offender Institution (YOI)

A type of secure facility in England and Wales that holds young people between the ages of 15 and 21 who have been sentenced to custody for committing a criminal offence.

Appendices

A. 1 Example of SPSS Syntax for deriving variables

Age. If you have four different age variables and you want to combine them into a single age variable with the same categories, you can use the "COMPUTE" command in SPSS to create a new variable and then use the "IF" command to assign the correct value based on the original age variable. Here is an example syntax:

```
* Deriving age variable from variables with a wider range of age categories. B_age_D1.

* Compute new variable "B_age_D1".
COMPUTE B_age_D1 = 0.

* Assign age groups based on original age variables.
IF (B_age_01 = 0 | B_age_02 = 0 | B_age_03 = 0 | B_age_04 = 1) B_age_D1 = 1.
IF (B_age_01 = 1 | B_age_01 = 2 | B_age_02 = 1 | B_age_02 = 2 | B_age_03 = 1
   | B_age_03 = 2 | B_age_04 = 2 | B_age_04 = 3 | B_age_04 = 9) B_age_D1 = 2.
IF (B_age_01 = 3 | B_age_01 = 4 | B_age_02 = 3 | B_age_02 = 4 | B_age_03 = 3
   | B_age_03 = 4 | B_age_04 = 4) B_age_D1 = 3.
IF (B_age_01 = 5 | B_age_01 = 6 | B_age_02 = 5 | B_age_03 = 5 | B_age_04 = 5)
   B_age_D1=4.
IF (B_age_01 = 7 | B_age_02 = 6 | B_age_03 = 6 | B_age_03 = 7 | B_age_03 = 8 |
   B_age_04 = 6 | B_age_04 = 7 | B_age_04 = 8) B_age_D1=5.
EXECUTE.
```

In this example, we are creating a new variable called "B_age_D1" using the "COMPUTE" command and initialising it to zero. We then use the "IF" command to assign the correct value to "B_age_D1" based on the original age variables. The values assigned to "B_age_D1" correspond to the age groups defined in the previous examples. Finally, we use the "EXECUTE" command to execute the syntax and create a new variable.

Ethnicity. If you have four different ethnic origin variables and you want to create one ethnic origin variable with, for instance, six categories, you can use the "COMPUTE" command in SPSS to create a new variable and then use the "IF" command to assign the correct value based on the original ethnic origin variables. Here is an example syntax:

```
* Deriving ethnic origin variable with six categories from the four ethnic origin variables with more categories. B_ethnic_D1.

* Compute new variable “B_ethnic_D1”.
COMPUTE B_ethnic_D1 = 0.

* Assign ethnicity groups based on original ethnicity variables.
IF (B_ethnic_01 = 1 | B_ethnic_02 = 1 | B_ethnic_02 = 2 | B_ethnic_02 = 3 |
   B_ethnic_03 = 1 | B_ethnic_03 = 2 | B_ethnic_03 = 3 | B_ethnic_04 = 1 | B_ethnic_04 = 2 |
   B_ethnic_04 = 3 | B_ethnic_04 = 4) B_ethnic_D1 = 1.
IF (B_ethnic_01 = 2 | B_ethnic_02 = 4 | B_ethnic_02 = 5 | B_ethnic_02 = 6 |
   B_ethnic_03 = 4 | B_ethnic_03 = 5 | B_ethnic_03 = 6 | B_ethnic_04 = 14 |
   B_ethnic_04 = 15 | B_ethnic_04 = 16) B_ethnic_D1 = 2.
IF (B_ethnic_01 = 3 | B_ethnic_02 = 7 | B_ethnic_02 = 8 | B_ethnic_02 = 9 |
   B_ethnic_02 = 10 | B_ethnic_03 = 7 | B_ethnic_03 = 8 | B_ethnic_03 = 9 |
   B_ethnic_03 = 11 | B_ethnic_04 = 9 | B_ethnic_04 = 10 | B_ethnic_04 = 11 |
   B_ethnic_04 = 13) B_ethnic_D1 = 3.
IF (B_ethnic_01 = 4 | B_ethnic_02 = 11 | B_ethnic_02 = 12 | B_ethnic_02 = 13 |
   B_ethnic_02 = 14 | B_ethnic_03 = 12 | B_ethnic_03 = 13 | B_ethnic_03 = 14 |
   B_ethnic_03 = 15 | B_ethnic_04 = 5 | B_ethnic_04 = 6 | B_ethnic_04 = 7 |
   B_ethnic_04 = 8) B_ethnic_D1 = 4.
IF (B_ethnic_01 = 5 | B_ethnic_02 = 15 | B_ethnic_03 = 10 | B_ethnic_04 = 12)
   B_ethnic_D1 = 5.
IF (B_ethnic_01 = 6 | B_ethnic_02 = 16 | B_ethnic_03 = 16 | B_ethnic_03 = 17 |
   B_ethnic_04 = 17 | B_ethnic_04 = 18 | B_ethnic_04 = 19) B_ethnic_D1 = 6.
EXECUTE.
```

In this example, we are creating a new variable called “B_ethnic_D1” using the “COMPUTE” command and initialising it to zero. We then use the “IF” command to assign the correct value to “B_ethnic_D1” based on the original ethnic origin variables. The values assigned to “B_ethnic_D1” correspond to the six ethnic origin categories you want to create. Finally, we use the “EXECUTE” command to execute the syntax and create the new variable.

Status. To combine five different status variables (i.e., sentenced/convicted status) into one status variable with four categories, you can use the “COMPUTE” command in SPSS to

create a new variable and then use the “IF” command to assign the correct value based on the original status variables. Here is an example syntax:

```
* Deriving a status variable from variables with more categories of sentenced/convicted status. B_status_D1.

* Compute new variable “B_status_D1”.
COMPUTE B_status_D1 = 0.

IF (B_status_01 = 1 | B_status_02 = 0 | B_status_03 = 1 | B_status_03 = 2 | B_status_04 = 2 |
   B_status_04 = 3 | B_status_05 = 3) B_status_D1 = 1.
IF (B_status_01 = 2 | B_status_02 = 1 | B_status_03 = 3 | B_status_04 = 1 | B_status_05 = 1 |
   B_status_05 = 2) B_status_D1 = 2.
IF (B_status_04 = 4 | B_status_05 = 4) B_status_D1 = 3.
IF (B_status_04 = 5 | B_status_05 = 5) B_status_D1 = 4.
EXECUTE.
```

In this example, we are creating a new variable called “B_status_D1” using the “COMPUTE” command and initialising it to zero. We then use the “IF” command to assign the correct value to “B_status_D1” based on the original status variables. The values assigned to “B_status_D1” correspond to the four status categories you want to create. Finally, we use the “EXECUTE” command to execute the syntax and create a new variable.

Citizenship. To derive a variable for UK/British citizenship from variables that asked the question both ways around, you can use the “COMPUTE” command in SPSS to create a new variable and then use the “IF” command to combine them into a new variable that has consistent coding. Here is an example syntax:

```
* Deriving a UK/British citizenship variable from variables that asked the questions both ways around. V_british_D1.

* Compute new variable “V_british_D1”.
COMPUTE V_british_D1 = 0.

IF (V_british_01 = 0 | V_british_02 = 1) V_british_D1 = 1.
IF (V_british_01 = 1 | V_british_02 = 0) V_british_D1 = 0.
EXECUTE.
```

In this example, we are creating a new variable called “V_british_D1” using the “COMPUTE” command and initialising it to zero. We then use the “IF” command to assign the correct value to “V_ british_D1” based on the original citizenship variables. Finally, we use the “EXECUTE” command to execute the syntax and create a new variable.

Healthcare. To create a binary variable for healthcare quality based on the three healthcare quality variables with different categories in the data, you can use the “COMPUTE” command in SPSS to create a new variable and then use the “IF” command to assign the correct value based on the original status variables. Here is an example syntax:

```
* Deriving a binary healthcare quality variable that illustrates the overall quality of healthcare.
M_overallhealth_D1.

* Compute new variable “M_overallhealth_D1”.
COMPUTE M_overallhealth_D1 = 0.

IF (M_overallhealth_01 = 1 | M_overallhealth_02 = 2 | M_overallhealth_02 = 3 |
   M_overallhealth_03 = 1 | M_overallhealth_03 = 2) M_overallhealth_D1 = 1.
IF (M_overallhealth_01 = 3 | M_overallhealth_02 = 5 | M_overallhealth_02 = 6 |
   M_overallhealth_03 = 3 | M_overallhealth_03 = 4) M_overallhealth_D1 = 2.
IF (M_overallhealth_01 = 4 | M_overallhealth_02 = 1 | M_overallhealth_03 = 5)
   M_overallhealth_D1 = 3.
IF (M_overallhealth_01 = 2 | M_overallhealth_02 = 4) M_overallhealth_D1 = 77.
EXECUTE.
```

In this example, the “COMPUTE” command initialises the new variable to zero. The subsequent “IF” statements evaluate the conditions and assign the appropriate values to “M_overallhealth_D1” based on the categories of the original variables. After the “IF” statement, the “EXECUTE” command tells SPSS to execute the commands and create a new variable.