

Social Survey Division on
NP3APP001

Created By: [REDACTED] NEWPORT/ONS on
16/12/2009 at 11:02

Title: LFS Non-response bias paper

Categorisation
02 - Living Costs and Food Survey
(LCF)\Reports

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
CC :
Date Sent : 13/01/2009 11:40:14
Subject : [Re: Number of Visits Analysis](#)



[Non-responseBiasPaperDec08c.doc](#)

[REDACTED]
13/01/2009 11:39

To:
cc:
Subject:

[REDACTED]
Re: Number of Visits Analysis [Notes Link](#)

Thanks for the information Geoff - any links you can send me would be great.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
13/01/2009 09:54

To:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

It is an interesting area. [REDACTED] did a short project recently looking at differential response, and it did appear that non-contact would be more likely to lead to bias than refusal note, however, that refusal is a much bigger non-response category than non-contact in LFS - see our recent ELMR paper). Non-contact group were concentrated in certain Output Area Classification groups.

[REDACTED] have recently submitted a paper on non-response bias in the LFS.

[REDACTED] has done some very good work on calling patterns and has looked at number of call attempts in some detail. He has become quite an ONS authority in this area.

Getting a handle on the characteristics of non-responders has been a problem (the Census-link studies have helped, but are, of course, becoming dated). If one can determine some of the characteristics of non-responders one can use their counterpart responders (e.g. Pakistan born) as a proxy, but this is making a major assumption. Similarly, one might use attriters as a proxy for non-responders. However, with non-contact, we could use the 'hard to contact, but eventually did make contact' group as a proxy for the 'didn't manage to make contact at all' group. In fact, if we did limit the contact attempts, some of those with whom we have made contact and so became responders, would become non-contacts. Thus, I had been thinking of discussing the issue with [REDACTED] and perhaps doing some work on the characteristics of the groups which required 1, 2, 3, 4... attempts before contact was made.

Note that it is one thing for contact/non-contact groups to differ, but they will only cause significant bias if

1. they differ markedly in terms of the indicators in which we are interested (e.g. unemployment) and
2. they are sufficiently large to make an impact.

The most appropriate RO to work on this would be [REDACTED] as he has already helped us with some of the response work. [REDACTED].

I can let you have links to some of the work we have done, [REDACTED] has been building up a database on response/non-response work across ONS.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
12/01/2009 17:11

To:
cc:
Subject:

[REDACTED]
Re: Number of Visits Analysis

[REDACTED]

I'm about to start work on an analysis looking at the impact of reducing the number of attempts interviewers make to secure an LCF interview to 5. [REDACTED] has already done some work on this and has found that households that require more than 5 visits differ from those who are easier to contact, which suggests that bias may be an issue if we cut the number of interviewer visits. [REDACTED] and I think it would be interesting to look at whether similar results are obtained using LFS data. Do any of the ROs in your teams have any time available to collaborate on this project?

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

12/01/2009 16:52

To:

cc:

Subject:

[REDACTED]

Re: Number of Visits Analysis [Notes Link](#)

Yes and Yes. Otherwise perhaps open it up as a project for an RO to assist you with in SVS. But yes ask [REDACTED] if one of the RO's in their teams could assist you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

12/01/2009 16:50

To:

cc:

Subject:

[REDACTED]

Number of Visits Analysis

[REDACTED]

I'm about to start work on a mini-project looking at the impact of limiting the number of attempts interviewers make to contact households to 5. [REDACTED] has already done quite a lot of work on this and has found that households who are more difficult to contact have different characteristics to those who require fewer interviewer visits - for example age and household income differs. [REDACTED] and I thought it would be interesting to see if we get the same results using LFS data (although the field period is shorter on LFS so interviewers may only make a small number of visits). Would you be happy for someone in the LFS team to work on this as a joint project? Alternatively would it be ok if I used LFS data - we'd make sure you see the paper before its published (probably in SMB).

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]