

Social Survey Division on
NP3APP001

Created By: [REDACTED] on 20/02/2014 at 12:01

Title: Response Team Proposal

Categorisation
Non Response / Response Rates\SVS
Papers

Aim

To conduct micro-analysis of non-response and other non-response analysis on ONS SS surveys to establish methods to improve response or confirm that more fundamental changes are required.

The proposal is to suggest that a team of an SRO (or 1/2 and SRO) and RO is based in Helen's area for 12 months plus and:

A) For their core work each month:

- 1) Run some statistical filters that have been derived comparing response rates in an Interview Area(IA) on the LFS at wave 1 in 2011 Census year with the current rolling annual and quarterly response rates. These filters establish if falls in response are very unlikely to be down to chance i.e. a 'bad' quarter.
- 2) If an IA fails the filters it will then be prioritised by response rate (lowest first) for further analysis-up to 2 areas selected per month (also select a few IA's where response has risen or stayed level for comparison)
- 3) That analysis involves drilling down into whether it is increasing refusal or non-contact rates that have caused the fall in overall response rate in that IA.
- 4) Which reasons for refusal have increased? Have interviewers used changed and their attributes?
- 4) Then has there been a change in calling patterns from 2011?
- 5) Have dwelling types changed, has there been a change in the demographics of the area looking at admin/open(internet) data.
- 6) Other paradata studies.

The approach is a micro-analysis which will supplement the macro approach looking at non-response as a whole. It also does not set an overall response target or compare IA's but focuses on comparing an IA with itself back in 2011, when response rates overall were 63% and the CNRLS showed the LFS was unbiased.

The proposal is then that the team visits these areas, goes out with interviewers and possibly runs some specific refusal follow ups, Sunday pilots and repeated contact attempts.

All the above will then be presented to a Response Board including the RM and FM of the IA's concerned and Titchfield HQ staff to decide how to proceed eg:

- 1) Alter the calling patterns for that IA or at least revert to 2011 calling patterns for a trial period if feasible.
- 2) Tailored training for new interviewers in that area for different dwelling types.
- 3) Different persuasion strategies and calling patterns tailored to that area to overcome the changes that have occurred since 2011.
- 4) Trial and propose Sunday calling in those areas pending funding.
- 5) Other responsive or adaptive design ideas.

In some ways the above is an adaptive survey design approach.

The work [REDACTED] is doing see below on the CNRLS could feed into this work as, for a selected IA, you could compare all the sample in 2011 with the current position eg dwelling types, migrants, students etc. You can also tailor any refusal follow ups. Plus other ideas.

Where the above assists all surveys is that 1) if you increase wave 1 LFS you should increase wave 2-5, as attrition is a constant amount between waves proportional to the size of the wave. You should also increase the LFS boost surveys 2) As the LFS is UK wide and most interviewers work on the LFS to some degree, now that the FF is integrated, it should also give you insight into issues with collection in certain areas for all the social surveys, although as response could be related to survey topic, length and design the insight could be limited to certain factors eg calling patterns for contacts.

B) For supplementary work (but A will probably be sufficient):

- 1) The team could also look at attrition issues across longitudinal surveys. So issues need to be collated by the Survey Managers.
- 2) They could also undertake logistic regression analysis or monitor the work being done by Southampton Uni.
- 3) They could do a literature review and attend conferences on non-response, paradata studies and attrition etc.
- 4) They could investigate additional metrics such as number of calls to obtain contact or the value of reissues.
- 5) Finally, they could follow up some of the CPI investigation into the interviewing process and management information.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Quick summary of what I just said:

I intend to put all of the surveys together to create a large CNRLS dataset (excluding the Crime survey), this will allow greater precision when doing significance tests of predictors as well as allowing general conclusions to be drawn. We can also then test the impact of individual surveys in the model (which is why knowing the incentives on each survey would be interesting), given the other explanatory variables.

I also want to look at some of the paradata variables as I think that could be useful for Field. I plan to look at eligibility, contact and refusals separately and then together in one model as the predictors for these things may be slightly different.

Is there anything else which would be of particular interest to SSD to explore further?

Thanks,
[REDACTED]