



Understanding Society

Working Paper Series

No. 2008 – 04

December, 2008

**Cognitive testing of *Understanding Society*.
The UK Household Longitudinal Study
Questionnaire**

**Michelle Gray, Rebecca Constantine, Joanna d'Ardenne,
Margaret Blake (National Centre for Social Research), S.C.
Noah Uhrig (Institute for Social and Economic Research,
University of Essex)**

***Also published as a Working Paper of the National Centre for Social
Research (NatCen), London.***

Contents

1	BACKGROUND	1
	Aims of the cognitive question testing	1
	Research Design.....	2
	Sample composition.....	2
	Report structure	3
	A note on mode.....	4
2	ETHNICITY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY	5
	Household membership	5
	Findings.....	5
	<i>Inclusion of people in the household</i>	5
	Recommendations	6
	Ethnic origin question at the household level	7
	Findings.....	7
	<i>Ease or difficulty around providing the information</i>	7
	<i>'Other minority group'</i>	8
	<i>'Ethnic group' and 'origin'</i>	8
	<i>Identifying Black Caribbeans</i>	9
	Recommendations:	9
	National identity	10
	Findings.....	10
	<i>Being 'British'</i>	11
	<i>Ease of answering using the scale</i>	11
	<i>Possible confusion with the rating task</i>	12
	Recommendations:	12
	Ethnic identity	12
	Findings.....	14
	<i>A preference for version A (Census)</i>	14
	<i>A preference for Version B (ethnic boost alternative)</i>	15
	Recommendations:	16
	Parental ethnicity	16
	Findings.....	17
	<i>A preference for version A (census)</i>	18
	<i>A preference for version B (ethnic boost alternative)</i>	18
	<i>Issues with code 2: 'Other white background' on Version A (Census)</i>	18
	<i>Code all that apply v code one only</i>	18
	Recommendations:	19
	Parental ethnic importance	19
	Findings.....	20
	Recommendations:	21
	Parental migration	21
	Findings.....	22
	Recommendations:	23
3	DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT	24
	Experience of refusal of job	24
	Findings.....	25
	<i>Refused or turned down</i>	25
	<i>Other reasons why you might be refused or turned down for a job</i> ..	25
	Recommendations:	26
	Experience of feeling unsafe	27
	Findings.....	27
	<i>Understandings of the answer categories at Q2 (places felt unsafe)</i> ..	28
	<i>Understandings of the answer categories at Q2a (reasons)</i>	28

Recommendations:	28
Experience of refusal for promotion	29
Findings.....	29
Recommendations:	30
Experience of refusal of training at work	30
Findings.....	31
Recommendations:	31
Experience of being insulted or threatened	32
Findings.....	33
<i>Insulted, called names, threatened or shouted at</i>	33
<i>Reporting the reason</i>	33
Recommendations:	33
Experience of physical attack	34
Findings.....	35
Recommendations:	35
Experience of avoiding public places	36
Findings.....	36
Recommendations:	37
General feedback on the discrimination section	37
<i>Recommended question order</i>	38
4 LIFE SATISFACTION, NEIGHBOURHOOD ATTACHMENT AND ENVIRONMENT	39
Life satisfaction	39
Findings.....	39
<i>Appropriateness of scales</i>	39
<i>Question wording</i>	40
<i>Concepts of health</i>	40
<i>Concept of life overall</i>	40
Recommendations:	41
Neighbourhood attachment	42
Findings.....	42
<i>Concepts of 'different backgrounds'</i>	42
<i>Concepts of getting 'on well together'</i>	43
<i>Concepts feelings of belonging</i>	43
<i>Concepts of 'local area' and 'immediate neighbourhood'</i>	44
Recommendations:	44
Environment	46
Findings.....	46
<i>Is the tariff used a household decision or does one person make the decision?</i>	46
<i>Meaning of 'seriously considering'</i>	46
Findings.....	47
<i>'Recycling scheme'</i>	47
<i>Recycling schemes used by their council</i>	47
<i>Answer strategies used in RECYCLE2</i>	47
Findings.....	49
<i>Findings</i>	49
<i>Difficulties with particular parts of the question</i>	50
<i>Concept of 'local producers'</i>	50
<i>Appropriateness of scale</i>	50
Recommendations	51
5 CONSUMPTION AND BENEFITS	52
Consumption	52
Version A	52
Findings.....	52
<i>Inclusions in 'all other expenses'</i>	53
Version B	53

Findings.....	53
Version C	54
Findings.....	54
<i>Methods of calculation</i>	54
<i>Concepts of ‘supermarket’ and ‘grocery store’</i>	54
<i>Non-food items included</i>	55
<i>Money spent on food for the home</i>	56
<i>Money spent on food outside of the home</i>	56
<i>Money spent on items</i>	57
<i>Clothing and footwear</i>	57
<i>Car and public transport costs</i>	57
<i>Entertainment, leisure activities and hobbies</i>	57
<i>Additional categories</i>	58
<i>General findings</i>	58
Comparison of versions A, B and C.....	58
<i>‘Usual month’ versus ‘last month’</i>	58
<i>Inclusion of other members of the household</i>	59
Recommendations:.....	59
Benefits	60
Benefit screeners	60
<i>Interviewers and brackets</i>	61
Findings.....	61
<i>BENEFIT_G3</i>	61
<i>Understandings of examples</i>	62
<i>Other issues</i>	62
<i>PAYMENT_G3</i>	62
<i>Understandings of examples</i>	62
Recommendations:.....	62
Benefits types	64
Findings.....	65
<i>a) Unemployment-related benefits, or National Insurance Credits</i>	65
<i>b) Income Support</i>	65
<i>c) Sickness or disability benefits</i>	65
<i>d) State pension</i>	65
<i>e) Child benefit</i>	65
<i>f) Any other family related benefits</i>	66
<i>g) Housing or Council Tax Benefit</i>	66
<i>h) Tax Credits</i>	66
<i>j) some other state benefit</i>	66
Recommendations:.....	66
<i>Additional detailed questions about benefits</i>	66
Findings.....	67
<i>Current Vs regular payments</i>	67
Recommendations:.....	68
6 MIGRATION HISTORY AND REMITTANCES	69
Migration history	69
Country of birth questions	69
Findings.....	69
Countries lived in questions	70
Findings.....	70
Number of times moved	71
Findings.....	71
<i>Recall</i>	71
Distances of residences	71
Findings.....	72
<i>Concept of ‘live’</i>	72
Respondents definition of ‘live’ was a permanent residency for a certain time period (at least six months). Respondents felt ‘living’ was “staying at the same place...being with a family/belonging/owning a place of	

	<i>resident.</i> ”. Commonly respondents referred to setting up a family home when defining living they saw it as “ <i>were you settle down</i> ”....	72
	Recommendations:	72
	Remittances	73
	Findings.....	74
	<i>Concepts of ‘payments’</i>	75
	<i>Broad concept of ‘payments’</i>	75
	<i>Concepts of ‘anyone’</i>	75
	<i>Further ambiguities regarding question wording</i>	76
	<i>Undesirable connotations of question</i>	76
	<i>Issues of timeframe and recall</i>	76
	Recommendations:	77
7	COHABITATION AND DATA LINKAGE	79
	Cohabitation	79
	Findings.....	79
	<i>Concepts of living together ‘as a couple’</i>	79
	<i>Sensitivity</i>	80
	<i>Timeframe</i>	80
	Recommendations:	80
	Data linkage consents	81
	Findings.....	82
	<i>Agreement to give consents</i>	82
	<i>Refusals to give consents</i>	82
	<i>Other issues</i>	83
	<i>Understandings of what was meant by giving consent:</i>	83
	Recommendations:	84
APPENDIX A	TECHNICAL DETAILS OF COGNITIVE PHASE	85
APPENDIX B	TEST CONSENTS FORM	89

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the interviewers who worked on this project: Julie Foster, Ann Roberts, Geoff Morris, Colin Tuck, Sue Archer and Oxana Metiuk. At ISER we would like to thank Noah Uhrig and Heather Laurie for their guidance and support. We would also like to thank all the people who took part in this study, as without their help, this research would not have been possible.

AUTHORS' CREDITS

Michelle Gray is a Senior Researcher in the Questionnaire Design and Testing (QDT) Hub in SMU, specialising in questionnaire development and testing. Michelle has experience of cognitive interviewing and behaviour coding methods. Michelle also has experience of qualitative in-depth interviewing (with children and young people) and experience of facilitating focus groups with NatCen field interviewers, exploring issues relating to the organisation's procedures. Michelle has worked on a number of projects using cognitive interviewing methods including: the testing of questions concerning children's health for the Welsh Health Survey, the development and testing of a new survey measures of the choices and constraints around Lone parents and work, which were used in wave 8 of the Families And Children Survey (FACS) 2006 and the development, design and testing of a new travel record to be used on the National Travel Survey (NTS) in 2007. Michelle has a degree in Applied Social Sciences (Criminology) from the University of Southampton.

Joanna d'Ardenne is a Researcher in the Questionnaire Design and Testing (QDT) Hub in SMU. Joanna has worked on a number of different projects since joining NatCen such the testing of some physical activity questions, asked of school aged children, for the Sports Council for Wales (SCW). Joanna has a background in health psychology and has conducted focus groups and in depth interviews as part of her MSc in Health Psychology at the London Metropolitan University. Joanna also has an undergraduate degree in Psychology and Philosophy from the University of Sheffield.

Rebecca Constantine was a Researcher in the Longitudinal Studies Group at NatCen. Rebecca joined NatCen in January 2006 and worked for nine months in the Health Group before moving to her present group to work on the Millennium Cohort Study, from which she has experience of cognitive interviewing. She has been a researcher on *Understanding Society* since October 2007. Rebecca has a first class BSc in Psychology (University of Reading).

Margaret Blake jointly heads the Question Development and Testing Hub (QDT Hub) in the NatCen's Survey Methods Unit. Prior to joining the QDT Hub she worked on the Health Survey for England, the Family Resources Survey and a variety of ad hoc surveys in the field of education and socio-legal studies. Since joining the hub Margaret has worked on a wide range of projects including testing questions on material deprivation for the FRS, attitudes to child poverty on British Social Attitudes, legal services for the Ministry of Justice and violent extremism for Communities and Local Government. Margaret has a PhD in Social Statistics from the University of Southampton.

Noah Uhrig is a Chief Research Officer at the Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex. He is centrally involved in the design and

development of *Understanding Society* and carrying out methodological research required for the project.

1 BACKGROUND

Understanding Society is a new survey of 40,000 UK households, comprising approximately 100,000 individuals. It will be the largest household panel survey in the world, thus an important instrument for social and economic research, and it is expected to follow up and interview the members of the original households (and their newly formed households, if applicable) annually for at least 20 years. The study is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and will be led by the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) at the University of Essex, together with colleagues from the University of Warwick and the Institute of Education. The National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) will conduct the fieldwork for the first two waves of fieldwork.

Understanding Society has been designed to provide valuable new evidence about the UK population including their lives, experiences, behaviours and beliefs, and will enable an unprecedented understanding of diversity within the population. The survey will assist with understanding the long term effects of social and economic change, as well as policy interventions designed to impact upon the general well-being of the UK population.

Wave one of the survey will take place between January 2009 and December 2010 (24 months) and will be a face-to-face survey, conducted with all members, aged 10 and above, of each sampled household. Some of the subsequent waves of the survey will be carried out over the telephone. *Understanding Society* will include an ethnic minority boost sample of over 3,000 households and will address issues specifically relevant to ethnic minority groups such as migration history, parental and grandparental country of birth and national identity.

The Questionnaire Development and Testing (QDT) Hub was asked to take the lead on the testing of parts of the questionnaire, including questions which will be asked of people from a variety of ethnic backgrounds and other questions on a range of topics including household consumption, benefits and life satisfaction

Aims of the cognitive question testing

Before such a large scale longitudinal study commences it is important that the questions are thoroughly tested. Firstly, this is to ensure that certain screening questions are successful at identifying the types of individual and household that are to be included in the main survey (for instance the ethnic screen must be successful at identifying and categorising the ethnic minority households who are to comprise the ethnic minority boost sample). Secondly, it is important the questions are tested to ensure that they accurately and consistently capture the respondent characteristics and experience they are designed to measure. Thirdly the cognitive interviews are to test to what extent the consent preamble works to inform and encourage respondents to give their consent to link their responses to government data.

Research Design

To ensure that questions or blocks of questions were adequately tested with respondents with different characteristics, and particularly from different ethnic groups, the testing was organised to take place in three phases, each testing a different set of questions on a different sample.

- Phase 1 took place between 02/04/08 and 17/04/08; and,
- Phase 2 took place between 17/04/08 and 13/05/08.
- Phase 3 took place between 17/04/08 and 13/05/08 (concurrently with phase 3).

See Appendix B for the split of the questions tested across the three phases. Although there were three different questionnaires, one for each phase, some questions were included in more than one phase in order to cover sufficient respondents or respondents of different types. For example, some questions were asked of the general population on one phase and of ethnic minorities in another. The sample composition for each phase was different and this is covered in the following section.

Unless there were any noticeable differences between the three phases of cognitive testing, we report on the testing of the questions from the above stages jointly. There were, however, various changes that were made to some of the questions between phase 1 and phases 2/3, as a result of interviewer feedback and/or discussions between ISER and NatCen. These changes are indicated in this report and any findings which came about as a result of these changes are separated from the rest.

Sample composition

Seventy interviews were conducted in total. The table below provides details on the characteristics of respondents interviewed as part of this study in total, over the three phases of fieldwork.

Table 1 Characteristics of the sample

Sample characteristics		Men	Women	Total
SEX		32	38	70
AGE GROUP	18-30	5	7	12
	31-59	11	23	34
	60+	16	8	24
General Population/ Ethnic Minority	Ethnic Minority	22	23	45
	General Population	10	15	25
Breakdown of Ethnic Minorities	Asian	6	6	12
	Black	5	5	10
	Chinese	4	4	8
	Mixed	2	3	5
	Other	5	5	10

Sample characteristics		Men	Women	Total
Number interviewed at each Phase	Phase 1	13	15	28
	Phase 2	12	18	30
	Phase 3	7	5	12

Further breakdown of characteristics		No. with characteristic
Migrant Generation	1 st Generation (Not born in UK)	29
	2 nd Generation or later (Born in UK)	16
Asian Ethnic Subgroup	Indian	2
	Pakistani	5
	Bangladeshi	3
	Other Asian	2
Black Ethnic Subgroup	African	1
	Caribbean	9
Other Ethnic Subgroup	Other (Non-Irish)	4
	Other (Irish)	6
Benefits	On benefits at HSE 2004	44
	Not on benefits at HSE 2004	26

Cognitive interviews took place in respondents' homes and were conducted face-to-face, on a one-to-one basis, to ensure respondent confidentiality. The interviews lasted between an hour and an hour and a half. Interviews were recorded with respondents' consent. Respondents were given a £20 High Street voucher as a thank you for taking part in the interview. Further details of the methodology can be found in Appendix A.

Report structure

Chapters 2-7 present findings from the three phases of cognitive interviewing with respondents conducted in April and May, 2008. These phases aimed to assess whether the questions are being understood in the way in which they were intended to by checking respondents' understanding, ability and willingness to answer them. Each section shows:

1. The aims of the question/s and rationale for testing;
2. The question or questions that were cognitively tested¹ and who they were tested on (General Population vs. Ethnic Minority respondents);
3. An outline of the findings at the question(s); and,
4. Final recommendations for improvement.

¹ The questions are numbered according to how they are referred to in the question specification document which was supplied to NatCen by ISER. Where questions were unnamed we inserted numbering from the test questionnaires.

The findings from the cognitive testing will provide evidence about where problems exist and the possible reasons for them. However, cognitive testing does not enable us to quantify the size or extent of these errors. To do this would require a larger scale experimental pilot. Additionally, although cognitive testing provides evidence which can be used to recommend changes to the question, testing of the new recommended questions would be needed to confirm that they are an improvement on the 'old'.

A note on mode

All of the questions were tested in a face-to-face mode and the recommendations we make are those for inclusion in a face-to-face mode only. We are unable to guarantee whether the questions would work in a different mode (for example over the telephone, as planned for future waves) and it is worth noting that extra work would need to take place to design uni-modal versions of these questions. For example the use of showcards would be practically impossible in a telephone survey so items which appear on a card would instead need to be read out to respondents, which would add a significant amount of time to the interview length.

2 ETHNICITY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

Household membership

The aims of these questions are to understand who people consider to be members of their household with a recognition that that in some cases the people who respondents consider to be part of their household may not live at the same address, e.g., students away at university, partners who do not share the same living accommodation, people in prison, those working away for extended periods, in the armed forces and others. Furthermore there may be people living at an address and even forming part of the household under the ONS harmonised definition who respondents would not themselves consider to be part of their household. The questions aim to identify the types of people we may want to collect data from or ask household members about in the future even if they are not currently a sample member. These questions were tested on both General Population (GP) and Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents to explore the concept of 'household' as the designers anticipate that this may vary across ethnic groups.

<p>1. Please list the people living at this address.</p> <p>2a. Is there anyone who you consider to be part of your household who does not live at this address?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>2b. (if YES at 2a): What are the (first) names of these people?</p> <p>2c. (if YES at 2a): What is [NAME]s relationship to you?</p> <p>3a. Is there anyone living here who you do not consider part of your household?</p> <p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p> <p>3b. (If YES at 3a) Who is that?</p>

Findings

On the whole respondents were able to answer these questions and did not report any real problems when doing so. People tended to include the people living at the address as part of their household, and these tended to be family members. On occasion, however, inclusion of people in the household extended to beyond residing family members, details of which are explained below.

Inclusion of people in the household

Respondents definitions of their household can be grouped into one of the following. The 'household' was made up of:

1. Either exclusively family members or family members and other people who permanently lived at the address; children who no longer lived there, lived abroad or only came back to stay on a temporary basis were excluded;
2. Family members or other people who mainly lived elsewhere but (sometimes) stayed at the address on a temporary basis: children who were at university and came back for weekends and/or holidays or partners who were not living at the address but often stayed there were included; and,
3. Family members or other people who did not live at the address and never stayed there: those who spent a lot of time at the address and possibly shared meals with those who live there were included (this definition tended to be more common among respondents from 'non-white' ethnic groups).

Although of those who were asked questions 3a and 3b we did not have anyone answer positively (YES), the types of people respondents thought of as people who could be living at an address but would not be considered to be part of the household included:

- Somebody who was “*unwelcome*” such as an ex-husband or a cousin who they did not get on with; or,
- Anyone who is living there but is not family such as a maid or a lodger. Occasionally respondents queried whether they would in fact include these kinds of people. One respondent decided that to be part of the household these people would have to eat with you and “*pull their weight*”.

There was evidence to suggest that some non-white ethnic groups, and in particular Chinese or Pakistani respondents, could confuse the term 'household' with house-owner.

Recommendations

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The survey will adopt the ONS standard definition of household for sampling purposes: <u><i>a single person or group of people living at the same address as their only or main residence, who either share one meal a day together or share the living accommodation.</i></u> We would recommend that the term 'household' is not used but instead interviewers are instructed to enumerate those living at the address who form part of the household based on this definition (as already implemented in the ARF). ➤ Evidence from the cognitive testing revealed that some respondents, and in particular those from minority ethnic groups, tend to think of other people who they have significant relationships with and affect their daily lives (but fall outside of the standard definition) as forming part of their 'household'. If there is a case for collecting information about these significant others in future waves of the survey, a question needs to be included at Wave 1. We would recommend the following question is asked: <i>Is there anyone who you consider to be part of your household who does not live at this address?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The ONS standard definition of a household was adopted but included anyone who would not have an independent chance of selection given sampling using the Postcode Address File: young people at boarding school, university students in halls of residence, or anyone living in an institution. These are termed “absent” household members. ➤ Full recommendations were not implemented for wave 1, however the findings have been retained for consideration at later waves. ➤ Questions that enumerate and include 'absent' members of the household are included.

Ethnic origin question at the household level

The aim of this question is to identify ethnic minority households eligible to be included in the ethnic minority boost sample. The boost sample has been designed to interview 1000 individuals from each of five main ethnic minority groups: Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Indian, Black Caribbean and Black African. In addition anyone from a Chinese, other eastern or Middle Eastern background will be included as will anyone from a mixed race background. There is no intention to try and include households from white and Irish extraction or from Eastern European countries, Australia or America in the boost sample. These will be represented in the main sample only.

This question was included as part of the cognitive question testing to explore how respondents interpret the terms 'ethnic groups' and 'origins', as well as their comprehension of the answer categories on the showcard. Additionally we wanted to explore whether respondents are able to answer this question: do they know where the other residents are from or about their parents or grandparents, for example? This question was tested on both General Population (GP) and Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents.

HHETH1 thru 12

Does anyone living at this address come from, or have parents or grandparents from any of the following ethnic groups or origins?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- 1 Indian
- 2 Pakistani
- 3 Bangladeshi
- 4 Sri Lankan
- 5 Chinese
- 6 Far Eastern
- 7 Turkish
- 8 Middle Eastern and Iranian
- 9 Caribbean
- 10 African (including North African)
- 11 Other minority group
- 12 No – none of these

Findings

Universally respondents reported few problems when answering this question and were, on the whole, able to do so without difficulty. Irrespective of people's own ethnicity, respondents tended to use very similar strategies when answering this question and thought about one, or a combination of, the following:

- Where they came from;
- where their parents and/or grandparents, and on occasion extended family, came from;
- where the parents and grandparents of their spouses' came from;
- where the parents and grandparents of their housemate came from; and,
- The children in the household, particularly if they were born outside of the UK.

Ease or difficulty around providing the information

While white British respondents tended to answer this question quickly, giving very definite answers and describing it as "*straightforward*" or easy to answer, it did on

occasion require more thought among non-white respondents when answering. The extra level of processing required was often a result of having to consider both parents and/or grandparents from different backgrounds and heritages. It must be noted that when this occurred respondents were still able to answer the question without difficulty. Additionally, and encouragingly, no-one in the sample reported difficulties providing information about the backgrounds of other residents living at their address.

There was one occasion where a respondent chose Pakistani but would have liked an option for 'Kashmiri'.

'Other minority group'

On occasion when this code was selected a respondent could become confused and question whether their answer would qualify as 'another ethnic group'. Additionally there was evidence to suggest that respondents could home in on the word 'minority' and think about belonging to a minority group which was not necessarily related to ethnicity but to religion and/or culture. One respondent for example chose this code on the basis that he was Jewish and followed Jewish practices which to him, made him belong to a minority group.

Some of the responses which were reported as 'Other minority group' included: Jewish; Eastern European; Polish; Russian; Irish and Scottish. We would recommend that respondents are asked to specify the 'other minority group', therefore any which do not fall under the remit of inclusion for the ethnic boost sample can then be ignored. Additionally if that category is reworded to 'other ethnic group' it will be clearer that it refers ethnic rather than other minority groups such as religious or language.

'Ethnic group' and 'origin'

The table below illustrates respondents' interpretations of the terms ethnic group and origin. It is worth noting that it was common for a) respondents to confuse the two, in attempts to explain the differences and b) respondents to see the two as more or less the same thing. Neither seemed to relate to a respondent's own ethnicity.

Table 2: Differences between 'ethnic group' and 'origin'.

Ethnic group	Origin
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People who are not born in this country (UK), not British or English ▪ People with a foreign connection: <i>"Foreigners"</i> ▪ A 'non-white' person ▪ <i>"Different castes"</i> ▪ A type of race ▪ Someone's nationality and possibly their religion as well ▪ Someone's culture, language and skin colour ▪ What background you belong to ▪ From different countries ▪ Minority group such as Black Asian 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The country where people are originally from ▪ Where someone's original roots are ▪ Where your parents/grandparents come from ▪ Country one is born in ▪ Where you and your family originate from ▪ Where your fore-fathers come from ▪ <i>"Further back, it's like the roots of a tree. It's kinda what makes you who you are, but it gets watered down"</i>. ▪ Implies more about ancestry and history ▪ Someone's blood line.

To summarise from the table 2 above, 'ethnic group' tended to relate to the individual: being something other than British, or White, and having a different culture, religion or skin colour. Origin on the other hand 'origin' was associated with someone's heritage, roots and the country where they or their family originated from.

Identifying Black Caribbeans

One of the sample groups for the main survey is Black Caribbean. The screening question tested does not allow this group to be identified. For those who chose African as their ethnic identity there is a follow-up question asking whether they are North African, African Asian, Black African or White African. There is no such question for those who report they are Caribbean which means it won't be possible to identify the target population (distinguishing Black Caribbean from Asian or White Caribbean).

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The aim of this screening question is to identify only those from, or with parents/grandparents from, the five main ethnic minority groups, as well as Chinese and mixed background. We would therefore recommend that the word 'origin' is dropped from the question wording as cognitive testing revealed that it can make people think quite literally about the where their family originates from ➤ To avoid the risk of respondents choosing 'other minority group' for those outside of the definition for the screener, we recommend respondents are asked to specify at the 'other' code. We would also suggest that this answer category is changed to 'other ethnic group'. ➤ We recommend including a follow up question for those who choose 'Caribbean' ➤ We propose the following question wording: Does anyone living at this address come from, or have parents or grandparents from any of the following ethnic groups? CODE ALL THAT APPLY 1 Indian 2 Pakistani 3 Bangladeshi 4 Sri Lankan 5 Chinese 6 Far Eastern * 7 Turkish 8 Middle Eastern and Iranian ** 9 Caribbean 10 African (including North African) 11 Other ethnic group (PLEASE SPECIFY) 12 No – none of these <p>For those of Caribbean origin (9) include a follow-up question which asks: And which of the following most closely describes those Caribbean origins:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The word "origin" was removed from the screener and "Other" was not included. Since certain ethnic groups will be screened into the study using different probabilities, a complex routing was introduced on the Address Record Form. ➤ Routing explicitly selects only respondents from the groups that will be included in the EM boost. ➤ A decision was made to include anyone who describes their ethnicity as "Caribbean/West Indian" and so a follow-up question to specifically identify Black Caribbean was not adopted.

1. Black Caribbean 2. Asian Caribbean 3. White Caribbean 4. Other?	
---	--

National identity

The aim of this question is to measure the degree or strength of self-identification with the nation (UK). The question was tested to explore the use of the word 'British' and investigate whether it is a problematic term for reasons of citizenship/having a passport: will respondents answer yes to this question if they were not born and raised in the UK for example. An additional aim of testing this question was to explore whether the term 'British' could be problematic for people who see themselves as 'Welsh', 'Scottish', 'English' or some national identity that is not considered the same as 'British' per se.

Finally the question was included to explore other problems respondents might have, such as any associated with the word 'important', as well to assess whether the scale is an appropriate way to measure strength of national identity. This question was tested on both General Population (GP) and Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents.

BRIT

Most people who live in the UK may think of themselves as being British in some way. Do you consider yourself to be British in any way?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

{ASK IF BRIT = 1}

BRITID

On a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 means 'not at all important' and 10 means 'extremely important', how important is being British to you?

ENTER NUMBER FROM 0 to 10:

Findings

Cognitive testing of this question revealed that generally, regardless of where people were born, where they or their families come from and their ethnic group, if they lived in the UK they would answer YES to BRIT. In the rare cases where a respondent answered 'don't know' or wasn't sure how to answer, the uncertainty tended to relate to questioning being British because they were not born here or having not thought about 'being British' before now.

The word 'important' in the context of the second question was not found to be problematic. Respondents tended to associate importance in terms of pride. On occasion respondents answered this question thinking about their own identity and considered their identification with the country they were born in when answering. The following quotes display some of the perceptions of the importance of being British:

"It would be important to me no matter what nationality I was, not particularly that I am British that is important to me, it is that I am who I am. It is important in the sense that it is important to have your own nationality but it is not important that it necessarily has to be British."

(Female, 31, white British, phase 1, Scored 5)

"I don't see where you come from as important, really".

(Male, 42, Mixed: White and Black Caribbean, phase 1, Scored 1)

*"I am proud to be British. I would not like to be any other nationality, but I don't know.
My country is important to me. "Being 'British'"*

(Female, early 30s, White British, phase 1, Scored 10.)

*"I think I would go somewhere in the middle 5 or 6 .. I am British, I am proud of being
British....I enjoy my way of life in Britain and so I would say that is neither very
important nor unimportant."*

(Male, early 60s, white British, phase 1, Scored 5/6)

Being 'British'

Some of the things respondents associated with 'being British' included:

- having stronger connections with the country than any other country (Black African respondent);
- reading, speaking and thinking in English ('Chinese British' respondent);
- being British born (White British respondent);
- being born and raised here so "*having the right to say that I am British*" (Pakistani respondent);
- living here and therefore being British (Pakistani respondent);
- having British citizenship (Chinese respondent);
- being educated in Britain (Bangladeshi respondent);
- pertaining to the United Kingdom (Indian respondent); and,
- living here and getting on with people, which therefore makes you British (Black respondent).

Ease of answering using the scale

On the whole respondents reported no difficulties using the 0-10 scale and managed to do so without problems. Respondents who gave high scores did so because they:

- felt proud to be 'British' (10);
- thought of themselves as a royalist (10);
- felt like they were a part of British society now (10);
- liked the British culture (7); and,
- thought it was important to be British.

Interestingly we found evidence of reluctance in choosing the number 10 for fear of appearing "*too extreme*" or sounding "*dogmatic*" and instead opting for lower numbers on the scale. One respondent, for example, said to choose number 10, you would need to be:

"Singing 'God save the Queen' every day and flying the Union Jack outside the house".

(Female, 50, Mixed: White and Asian, phase 1, scored 6).

Conversely there was also evidence of respondents not wanting to score too low (i.e. close to 0) as they did not want it to look like they did not want to be British or considered it unimportant to be British.

Possible confusion with the rating task

Where it was clear that respondents had possibly misinterpreted the task (and the use of the 0-10 scale), they told interviewers they thought they were being asked to do one of three things: 1) rate how British they were, 2) rate how well they perceived Britain was doing compared to other countries and 3) rate how good they thought the country was.

Feedback from interviewers at the de-brief, which was based on some difficulty experienced by particular respondents, suggested that this question would benefit from a visual display of the scale on a showcard.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ We recommend that the existing wording for both questions are is retained. ➤ We recommend that a showcard is used at this question: <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Not at all Important</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Extremely Important</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A single question was implemented without a filter. ➤ The existing BritID question (see below) was retained and was asked of all respondents with a special interviewer instruction on how to accommodate for respondents who spontaneously indicate that they do not see themselves as 'British' in any way. The recommendation to use a showcard was implemented. <p>The final question wording was:</p> <p>SHOWCARD Most people who live in the UK may think of themselves as being British in some way. On a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 means 'not at all important' and 10 means 'extremely important', how important is being British to you?</p> <p>INTERVIEWER: ENTER NUMBER FROM 0 TO 10</p> <p>0 – 10</p>
	<p>INTERVIEWER: ENTER 11 IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT CONSIDER THEMSELVES TO BE BRITISH (VOLUNTEERED)</p>

Ethnic identity

The overarching aim of the ethnic identity question in the survey is to obtain an ethnic identity from the respondent based on how they perceive themselves. Two versions were included as part of the cognitive testing with the aim that an evidence based comparison could be made and we could identify the most meaningful coding frame for respondents.

Version A uses the answer code frame taken from the Census question (2001), with a different question wording (Census question asks: What is your ethnic group?). Version B is an adapted ethnic minority boost alternative and allows for mixed ancestry to be identified without pre-defined mixed categories. Version B also allows for a distinction between the 'other white group' and 'other ethnic other' categories and for identification with 'traveller, Gypsy or Roma' heritage.

Respondents were asked both version A and version B and interviewers were instructed to rotate, per interview conducted, which version was asked first to give each an equal chance of 'true' or realistic exposure. These questions were tested on both General Population (GP) and Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents.

Version A (Census classification)

Unfortunately a mistake with the wording of version A in the question specification was only picked up on after it had already been tested in Phase 1 of the interviewing. The showcard that Phase 1 and Phase 2/3 respondents were exposed to, however, was the same as was the interviewer instruction to CODE ONE ONLY.

Phase 1: The question wording phase 1 respondents were exposed to was:
Look at the showcard and choose the category or those categories that you would use to describe your ethnic origins or identity?

Phase 2/3: The (correct) question wording phase 2/3 respondents were exposed to was:

Please look at this card and tell me which of these best describes your ethnic group? (Note that this was not the standard census question but an adapted version)

CODE ONE ONLY:

White

- 1 British
- 2 Any other white background

Mixed

- 3 White and Black Caribbean
- 4 White and Black African
- 5 White and Asian
- 6 Any other mixed background

Asian or Asian British

- 7 Indian
- 8 Pakistani
- 9 Bangladeshi
- 10 Any other Asian background

Black or Black British

- 11 Caribbean
- 12 African
- 13 Any other Black background

Other

- 14 Chinese
- 15 Any other ethnic group

Version B (ethnic boost alternative)

Respondents from both phase 1 and phase 2/3 were exposed to the same question wording for Version B. The interviewer instruction to CODE ONE ONLY was incorrect in phase one but was correctly altered, in line with the question wording, for phase 2. Incidentally interviewers at Phase 1 tended to ignore this incorrect instruction to anyway and tended to code all that apply.

Look at the showcard and choose the category or those categories that you would use to describe your ethnic origins or identity? Choose any that apply

CODE ONE ONLY: (Phase 1) / CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY: (Phase 2/3):

- 1 White UK
- 2 Indian
- 3 Pakistani
- 4 Bangladeshi
- 5 Sri Lankan
- 6 Chinese
- 7 Turkish
- 8 Middle Eastern and Iranian
- 9 Caribbean
- 10 North African
- 11 Black African
- 12 African Asian
- 13 Irish
- 14 European
- 15 Traveller or Gypsy or Roma
- 16 Other white group
- 17 Other ethnic group

Findings

Although respondents, when probed, tended to voice a preference for one version over the other, for reasons outlined below, there was no strong evidence to suggest that either version caused respondents any major problems and on the whole respondents were able to pick a category from both showcards. Those who did not have a preference tended to be White British and Chinese respondents and said that they thought both versions of the question were easy to answer and straightforward.

It is impossible to conclude which version works best as there were very mixed views within the sample about the two code frames. For example, one respondent said they thought version A seemed to be more to do with the “*colour of your skin*” whereas version B was more to do with “*what your background is and where you come from and where your family comes from*”. Another respondent thought version A was about your background and version B was about “*what you are*”.

People’s preferences for either of the versions did not seem to be connected to their own ethnicity.

A preference for version A (Census)

Respondents who voiced a preference for version A gave a variety of reasons for doing so, including because the following:

- they thought the “*ethnic differences*” were clearer;
- they liked the use of subheadings and categories: you can find where you are on the list; “*you could just look for the section which applied to you and then choose*”,
- they thought the list was “*well laid out*” and the categories were set out better;
- they liked the inclusion of ‘British’ in the subcategories (i.e. ‘Asian or Asian British’): Respondents saw themselves as British, being British born or coming from a country that was run by a British government;
- they preferred the use of ‘White British’ as opposed to ‘White UK’ (on version B): it was pointed out that white UK might offend people as “*we are all UK*” and White UK was described as unfamiliar and confusing; and,
- it was easier to properly identify themselves and their ethnic origin as it included the “*mixed races*” .

The following quote further demonstrates a preference for version A:

“because show card E [Version B] is just a list but show card D [version A] is separated into sections. If you go by each section you know if you are that type, ethnic origin or not.”

(Male, 24, Chinese, phase 2)

A preference for Version B (ethnic boost alternative)

Whilst version A was favoured for its subheadings, categories and well laid out format, conversely it was criticised for having too many categories and sections which you needed to read and consider. Respondents who liked version B thought the list was straightforward and easier to answer and gave reasons for their preference included the following:

- the use of ‘White UK’ as opposed to ‘White British’ as the term British was disliked. Respondents saw themselves as ‘English’ and ideally would have liked a ‘White English’ option;
- the list is more straightforward and doesn’t have any subcategories or headings which you need to go through and consider;
- you are not “*locked in*” to any one category, you can chose more than one;
- you can just read down the list and pick what applies to you;
- it includes Irish which is good;
- this one is about “*what you are*” whereas version A is about your background and you could have a different background to how you see your identity;
- version B allows for identification with ‘Turkish’; and,
- version A puts Chinese under ‘Other’ which makes it seem “*exclusive*”.

We did find evidence of people picking code14: ‘European’ in addition to code 1: ‘White UK’, not because they were from somewhere in Europe but because they are British and saw Britain as being part of Europe and the EU.

Code16: ‘Other white group’ was described as ambiguous. Respondents thought this code could refer to Americans, French, Russian, Austrian, New Zealand people.

Code 17: ‘Other ethnic group’ could be people from South American, Peru, Polynesia, Vietnam, Japan and other Asian countries, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, Ukraine, Iran and Iraq.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Based on inconclusive findings from the cognitive question testing it remains difficult to recommend one version. It is worth noting however that the survey could have problems if it does not include the standard census definition of ethnicity. Given its large sample size and high profile nature, it is likely to be used for comparisons and this will be problematic for those making comparisons with UKHLS data using standard ethnic groups. ➤ We therefore would recommend version A is used, adapting the Census question and classification. If there is a strong desire for version B we would recommend that this question should be asked as an additional question with quite different wording which makes it clear it is about origins and identity. This question could be placed with the national identity or parental ethnicity questions, instead of being next to version A. ➤ If Version B is used, we recommend replacing 'White UK' with 'White British' (White British is more familiar) and is also equivalent to the other categories e.g. Indian and Caribbean which describe people, whereas United Kingdom is the name of a country (noun) not a description of people (adjective). Although Britain and the UK are not the same (Britain Excludes Northern Ireland) British is understood to include people from the UK. If the intention is for European to cover people from countries other than the UK it should be defined as such so that respondents know it means <u>European from countries other than Britain</u> (or the UK). ➤ As with the ethnic boost screening question Caribbean does not allow the definition of Black Caribbean. Would recommend that this category becomes 'Black Caribbean' allowing the White and Asian minority to code themselves in other categories. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The recommendation to use the Census version (version A), as developed by the Office of National Statistics (ONS), was implemented. ➤ An additional question proceeded this one to obtain nationality: <p>Looking at this card which do you consider you national identity to be? You may choose as many or as few as apply.</p> <p>English Welsh Scottish Northern Irish British Irish Other (Please specify)</p>

Parental ethnicity

These questions were included to identify the most meaningful coding frame for respondents to report on their parents' ethnicity. This question was tested on Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents only.

Unfortunately a mistake in the question specification was overlooked in phase 1 so interviewers were not instructed to code one only. It should also be noted that although the categories for Version B are the same as for the question about respondent ethnicity (reported in the previous section), the question wording was very different and asked about 'ethnic group' rather than 'ethnic origins or identity'. Although the equivalent question about respondent ethnicity in Phase 2 allowed for multiple answers to be recorded this version B for the parents' ethnicity only allowed one answer to be coded in Phase 2.

Version A (Census):

Which of these ethnic groups does your [father/mother] come from?
(In **phase 2** only) CODE ONE ONLY:

White

- 1 British
- 2 Any other white background

Mixed

- 3 White and Black Caribbean
- 4 White and Black African
- 5 White and Asian
- 6 Any other mixed background

Asian or Asian British

- 7 Indian
- 8 Pakistani
- 9 Bangladeshi
- 10 Any other Asian background

Black or Black British

- 11 Caribbean
- 12 African
- 13 Any other Black background

Other

- 14 Chinese
- 15 Any other ethnic group

Version B (ethnic boost alternative):

Which of these ethnic groups does your [father/mother] come from?

(In **phase 2** only) CODE ONE ONLY:

- 1 White UK
- 2 Indian
- 3 Pakistani
- 4 Bangladeshi
- 5 Sri Lankan
- 6 Chinese
- 7 Turkish
- 8 Middle Eastern and Iranian
- 9 Caribbean
- 10 North African
- 11 Black African
- 12 African Asian
- 13 Irish
- 14 European
- 15 Traveller or Gypsy or Roma
- 16 Other white group
- 17 Other ethnic group

Findings

Cognitive testing of the two versions revealed that similarly to the respondent ethnicity question (section 3.4 above), neither version caused respondents any major difficulties and on the whole they were able to choose a category from both showcards which best matched their parents' ethnic group.

There were very mixed feelings about which version respondents found easier to answer or preferred which again makes it very difficult to indicate which version would work well for the majority of people. Respondents tended to favour the same

version they preferred at the previous question (Ethnic identity). The kinds of things respondents talked about when justifying their preference mirrored those reported on at the Ethnic identity question.

A preference for version A (census)

Respondents who preferred **Version A** or found this version easier to answer mentioned some of the following aspects as those they particularly liked:

- the layout;
- the grouped categories and the way it is separated into sections;
- the fact it allows for someone to be Asian or Asian British, or Black or Black British, whereas version B is just the country someone is from; and,
- the fact it allows for you to be British, even if you were born and bred elsewhere (Pakistan for example).

A preference for version B (ethnic boost alternative)

Respondents who preferred **Version B** reported the following lines of reasoning when justifying their preference:

- you can choose 'Irish', which fits exactly if your father/mother is from Ireland;
- you can pick 'Turkish', version A does not give you this choice;
- there are more options, particularly for 'other white' (which version A lacks);
- it was easier to answer about father's ethnicity as version A comes across as being more applicable to people living in the UK.

Issues with code 2: 'Other white background' on Version A (Census)

There were cases in the sample where a respondent stumbled across a problem with code 2 (other white background). In one case a respondent with an Irish father was reluctant to choose this code and it made him think of "*foreigners*", or people who were white but born outside of the UK. In another case a respondent with a Finnish mother chose this code, explaining "*she is not British and there are not any other white categories*": this respondent chose the European code from version B's showcard.

An issue came out of the cognitive testing which should be noted (only it is only relevant for respondents who have parents who were born in Pakistan or Bangladesh): the term 'Pakistani' did not exist prior to the 1940s and the and 'Bangladeshi' did not exist until the 1970s so different ethnicity's may be recorded for parents born in the same location depending on when they were born.

Code all that apply v code one only

There were occasions where phase 1 respondents chose two codes, incidentally only at version A, or questioned what to do. One phase 1 respondent chose option 'White and Black Caribbean' from version A but questioned the single/mulit code issue: "*It can only be one, can't it?*". The interviewer re-read the question and the respondent re-iterated her single response.

Although interviewers in Phase 1 could code more than one at both of these questions (as there was no interviewer instruction) in phase 2, where there was a single code, respondents on the whole tended to give just one answer at both versions of the question. On the rare occasion however a respondent wanted to give more than one answer (incidentally at version B only).

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Since, we assume that, the census definition is less important for this question, we recommend Version B is used but is worded in line with our recommendations at the respondent ethnicity question so that it is consistent with the equivalent question. ➤ If the importance is to collect information about parental ethnic group, rather than origins and identity, we would recommend version A is used. ➤ If version B is used, we recommend the following wording is used: <p>Look at the showcard and choose the category or those categories that you would use to describe your [father/ mother's] ethnic origins or identity? Choose any that apply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For both mother's and father's ethnicity, the recommendation to not use the Census categorisation was taken on board. The wording which was recommended however was <i>not</i> adopted but instead a more direct question was used. The language 'ethnic group' rather than the word 'origins' was retained: <p>Which of these ethnic groups does your father come from?</p>

Parental ethnic importance

The purpose of this questions is to measure the strength of self-identification with one's parents ethnicity. The same question was asked about the respondent's father's and mother's ethnic group.

The aims of testing these questions were to explore respondents' comprehension of the word 'importance' in the context of this question and whether there was a more suitable word to tap into *strength* of self-identification. Additionally the testing aimed to explore the way in which 'importance' was understood, i.e. importance for what and in what way? Do respondent think about importance in terms of maintaining cultural heritage, is it about religious beliefs, a sense of belonging or something else?

A final aim of the testing was to assess whether the word 'ethnic group' is problematic in this context and if so whether an alternative word, such as 'heritage' or something else, might be more meaningful. This question was tested with Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents only.

Changes between the phases

Phase 1: Some rules were agreed, prior to phase 1 testing, that meant that in cases where a respondent had chosen a ethnic group for their mother or father in either of the two versions of the parent ethnicity question, and it was a response which could comfortably be inserted into this question, interviewers used the actual answer category. If the ethnic group they had picked from either of the two versions was an answer category which was not appropriate to insert into this question, the words 'your father's/mother's ethnic group' were used.

So, for example, if a respondent had chosen 'Pakistani' for his mother's ethnic group, this question would read '...how important is being **Pakistani** to you?'. If, however, they had chosen 'Other ethnic group' or 'Middle Eastern and Iranian' the question would instead read '...how important is being your father's ethnic group to you?'

Phase 2/3: Interviewer feedback from Phase 1 suggested that these rules were too difficult to replicate in a paper questionnaire. Although this would not be a problem in CAPI, for phase 2/3 it was agreed that on all occasions ‘your father’s/mother’s ethnic group’ would be used. In addition interviewers pointed out a flaw in inserting the father/mother’s ethnic group into the question (as shown in grey text below). With no reference to the father or mother you may run the risk that respondents could potentially interpret the question as being about themselves, or about being ‘Pakistani’ per se.

SPAID (father)

On a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 means ‘not at all important’ and 10 means ‘extremely important’, how important is being [INSERT FATHER’S ETHNIC GROUP*/your father’s ethnic group] to you?

* Used in phase 1 only.

SMAID (mother)

On a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 means ‘not at all important’ and 10 means ‘extremely important’, how important is being [INSERT MOTHER’S ETHNIC GROUP*/your mother’s ethnic group] to you?

* Used in phase 1 only.

Findings

This question generally worked well and respondents were able to make the connection between the question and the 0-10 scale. There were no reports of difficulties when scoring. On occasion respondents questioned the word ‘important’: in relation to what? There were a few suggestions as to ways in which the question could be worded clearer. One respondent for example wondered whether it might be easier to answer if the question had asked ‘how important is it to you culturally?’ or ‘how important is it to you in terms of your identity?’

The ways in which respondents reported thinking about importance, and as a result went about answering this question, included in terms of:

- **Their own identity:** Respondents spoke about their parents role in making them who they are: “well I suppose it’s very important, 10, it decides who I am”;
- **Pride:** Respondents spoke about being proud of where they were from and not wanting to “dismiss” their background or their past;
- **Association and attachment with heritage:** Evidence of respondents scoring on the basis of how they felt about their country of origin/parent’s country of origin: whether they had connections with the country which tended to relate to whether or not they ever lived and/or were educated there as well as their attitudes towards the culture, custom and religion;
- **Recognition for where your parents come from:** Respondents reported it being important to remember and recognise where your parents come from, to learn and have an appreciation for and about the country , the language etc; and,
- **The importance for their parents:** Respondents reporting that it is important for them (parents) so it is important for me or, on the other hand, reporting it is important to them but it isn’t important to me.

3. Don't know

If PAYBUK=2)

PAYRUK

Has your father ever lived in UK?

- 1 Father lived in UK
- 2 Father never lived in UK

{F PAYRUK = 1}

PAYRUK1

In which year did he first move to the UK?

IF UNSURE OF YEAR GIVE APPROXIMATE

ENTER YEAR:

MAYBUK (Not included in Spec but included to allow routing)

Was your mother born in the UK?

CODE ONE

1. Yes, born in the UK
2. No, born outside of the UK
3. Don't know

If MAYBUK=2)

MAYRUK

Has your mother ever lived in UK?

- 1 Mother lived in UK
- 2 Mother never lived in UK

{F MAYRUK = 1}

MAYRUK1

In which year did she first move to the UK?

IF UNSURE OF YEAR GIVE APPROXIMATE

ENTER YEAR:

Findings

On the whole respondents were able to answer these questions and providing the information as the year their father and/or mother first moved to the UK did not appear to cause problems. We found no evidence to suggest that asking for the age of parents (when they first moved to the UK) would yield more accurate responses.

Respondents could either give very definite answers, say that they were fairly sure or comment that the years that they were reporting were guesses. With this in mind, however, those who guessed were still able to give approximate years. Respondents used a number of different recall strategies when answering this question, including working out the date of their parents arrival in relation to:

- how old they were and/or remembering what they were doing at the time their parents arrived;
- dates of their own arrival to the UK;
- significant world events, such as the Vietnam, Gulf and Second World War; and,
- how many years their parents had been in the UK before themselves were born or the birth/age of siblings.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ We recommend that the existing question wording is retained.➤ The additional questions about whether or not the parents were born in the UK (which were not in the spec) will be required unless this information is obtained from other questions in the questionnaire, which were not covered in the cognitive testing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ The recommendations were implemented as a result of the cognitive pilot. Filter questions were used to identify parents not born in the UK and to obtain the exact country of birth for mother and father. Migration questions were routed on non-UK response options.

3 DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT

The aims of the discrimination questions are two fold:

1. To measure experience of harassment/discrimination in employment; and
2. To ascertain whether people have experienced negative behaviour as a consequence of their personal characteristics and the extent to which this makes them feel unsafe in the various areas they inhabit from time to time.

There were several general issues that the cognitive testing was intended to address including what respondents understand by the term 'unsafe' in the context of these questions, as well as exploring whether it is in any way sensitive, or even offensive, to ask if someone feels unsafe at home, due to connotations of domestic violence or sexual abuse. An additional aim of the cognitive testing was to establish whether the entire battery of questions is overly burdensome for respondents.

The experience of refusal for job questions (questions 1 and 1a and 2 and 2a) were tested on both General Population (GP) and Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents.

The other questions in this chapter (questions 3 and 3a, 4 and 4a, 5 and 5a, 6 and 6a and 7 and 7a) were tested on Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents only.

Experience of refusal of job

Q1

In the last 12 months, have you been refused or turned down for a job in the UK?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)

{ASK IF Q1 CODED YES (1)}

Q1a

Do you think you were refused the job for any of the following reasons?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- 1 your sex
- 2 your age
- 3 your ethnicity
- 4 your sexual orientation
- 5 your health or disability
- 6 your nationality
- 7 your religion
- 8 your language or accent
- 9 your dress or appearance
- 10 other reason
- 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)
- 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

Findings

This question, on the whole, did not prove to be problematic for respondents when answering it. Respondents seemed to consider the reference frame of 'the last 12 months' when answering this question and correctly included and excluded instances inside and outside this period of time.

Respondents could generally be grouped into one of four broad types:

- Those who were currently working and had been in the same job for a while, or for the last 12 months at the least, and had not applied for any other jobs;
- Those who had applied for a job but were not short listed for an interview;
- Those who had not been working in the last 12 months, or for longer periods of time (including those who were retired), and had not applied for any jobs; and,
- Those who had applied for jobs in the past and been refused them, but not in the last 12 months.

Refused or turned down

Respondents tended to see these terms as similar and understandings were consistent across the sample. The term 'refused' was universally viewed as being too harsh and it was suggested that this could be replaced with 'not successful' instead. Understandings of what being 'refused or turned down for a job' included:

- Going for a job and not getting it;
- When you really want a job but the employer turns around and says no;
- If you apply for a job, go for the interview and then don't get the job;
- Being turned down for the job without giving you a good reason;
- Not being given the opportunity to do the job after the interview; and,
- Being discriminated against for reasons of age, sex, race.

The types of things respondents talked about in terms of their understanding of being refused or turned down for a job, in the context of this question, tended to focus around the post interview stage of the job application process. There was however evidence to suggest that respondents could also think about and/or include occasions where they had applied for a job but not been shortlisted, or called in for an interview. One respondent for example answered YES to Q1 on the basis that she had applied for a job last year but was not shortlisted for it.

Additionally respondents mentioned 'having a criminal record' as a reason for being turned down for a job but it was clear that they were thinking about this as having a bearing on decisions at the application stage rather than getting as far as, and then being refused after, the interview.

Other reasons why you might be refused or turned down for a job

Other than the presence of a criminal record, respondents listed a number of other reasons for which someone might be refused or turned down for a job. These included:

- if another applicant was better qualified;
- not being the right person for the job;
- the prospective employer not liking the look of you (this could be coded under code 9); and,
- not meeting the criteria for the post (again this could potentially be at the application process, as well as post interview).

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<p>➤ If the intention of this question is to pick up people who have been through some kind of interview process, or assessment (as it might not necessarily be an interview) then we would suggest that this is reflected in the question wording. This will avoid the risk of people answering positively if they sent in a job application but either didn't ever hear back from the employer or were told that they were unsuccessful in their application. Additionally this revised question wording should exclude occasions where people have popped into their local supermarket, for example, to see if there are any current vacancies but were told that they weren't any.</p> <p>➤ We have proposed a recommended question wording for Q1</p> <p>➤ We recognise that the selection process might not necessarily be a formal or informal interview, but could instead be an assessment however we feel that including this alternative in the question may confuse people and/or make the question too wordy. Instead we recommend asking a follow up question, if the respondent answers NO at Q1, to catch situations of this type. The pilot data could be examined to look at the numbers of people who answer positively at Q1a.</p> <p>➤ We would recommend that an interviewer instruction is inserted to code answers such as "because of the way I look" under code 9 or that these are backcoded from the list of other answers post data collection.</p> <p>Q1 In the <u>last 12 months</u>, have you been turned down for an interview for a job in the UK? 1 Yes 2 No</p> <p><i>{IF Q1 CODED 2(NO)}</i></p> <p>Q1a Can I just check, in the <u>last 12 months</u> have you been turned down following any kind of assessment for a job in the UK? 1 Yes 2 No</p> <p><i>{IF Q1 OR Q1a CODED 1 (YES)}</i></p> <p>Q1b Do you think that you were turned down for any of the following reasons? CODE ALL THAT APPLY 1 your sex 2 your age 3 your ethnicity 4 your sexual orientation 5 your health or disability 6 your nationality 7 your religion 8 your language or accent</p>	<p>➤ Entry into the discrimination questions first ascertained whether anyone was looking for work in the last 12 months. Routing also came from the employment history section and the non-employed sections of the questionnaire. The wording of the exact question incorporated the recommended language about "interview or assessment".</p> <p>➤ Only respondents who indicated that they were turned down for a job following any kind of interview or assessment were asked for their presumed reason for being turned down.</p> <p>➤ The recommendation to code "Because of the way I look" as "Appearance" under reasons for being turned down was adopted.</p>

9 your dress or appearance	
10 other reason	
11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)	
12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)	

Experience of feeling unsafe

Q2

In the last 12 months, have you felt unsafe in any of the following places?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY:

- 1 at home
- 2 at school, college or work
- 3 on public transport
- 4 in shops, banks, restaurants or other public buildings
- 5 outside: on the street, in parks or other public spaces
- 6 other places
- 7 none of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q2}

Q2a

Did you feel unsafe in [PLACE] for any of the following reasons?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- 1 your sex
- 2 your age
- 3 your ethnicity
- 4 your sexual orientation
- 5 your health or disability
- 6 your nationality
- 7 your religion
- 8 your language or accent
- 9 your dress or appearance
- 10 other reason
- 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)
- 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

Findings

Cognitive testing suggests that this question was not problematic and there were no reports to suggest that it was misunderstood. Although respondents' perceptions of feeling 'unsafe' differed in terms of seriousness, the kinds of things that were mentioned were those this question would presumably aim to pick up on. Respondents associated 'unsafe', in the context of this question, with feeling:

- in danger on the streets when going out at night;
- nervous, anxious or vulnerable;
- threatened by youths or gangs of young people (hanging around) on the street, in parks or outside shops on estates;
- intimidated or at risk from incidents or fear of unprovoked attack;

- frightened, threatened, uncomfortable, unwelcome or vulnerable; and,
- unsafe whilst at work (incidentally this was the exclusive view of one respondent who worked as a security doorman at a pub and feared people pulling guns out at him or trouble from the punters-interestingly this respondent chose 'Other').

Understandings of the answer categories at Q2 (places felt unsafe)

On occasion a respondent commented that they thought it would be quite odd to feel unsafe in a bank or restaurant (code 4) and also that the home (code 1) was the place you are likely to feel the most safe in. In addition one respondent commented that you might feel unsafe in a shopping centre and another that you could feel safe in a taxi (which isn't necessarily covered in code 3: 'public transport').

Understandings of the answer categories at Q2a (reasons)

On the whole respondents reported no problems understanding the categories on the showcard (reasons for feeling unsafe) and were able to pick the one, or the ones, that applied to them.

It was not always clear in respondents minds what code 4: 'Sexual orientation' meant. One respondent for example said she thought it meant 'lady'. Additionally one respondent chose 'Other', and not code 1: 'your sex', because she is female.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<p>➤ Cognitive testing suggests that this question works well as it is and therefore we recommend retaining it with the existing question wording.</p> <p>➤ The question structure in CAPI needs to allow for respondents to answer Q2a for each of the places they reported in Q2.</p> <p>➤ We recommend that as a result of the testing, the answer categories at Q2 are altered, as shown below: taxi is added, in public buildings is added, in banks or restaurants are removed and pubs in added (in line with recommendations at Q5) and home is moved down the list.</p> <p>Q2 In the <u>last 12 months</u>, have you felt unsafe in any of the following places? CODE ALL THAT APPLY:</p> <p>1 at school, college or work 2 on public transport or in a taxi 3 public buildings such shopping centres, shops or pubs 4 outside: on the street, in parks or other public spaces 5 at home 6 other places 7 none of the above (SPONTANEOUS)</p> <p>{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q2}</p> <p>Q2a Did you feel unsafe in [PLACE] for any of the following reasons? CODE ALL THAT APPLY</p> <p>1 your sex</p>	<p>➤ As per recommendation, the question about feeling unsafe was adopted as is.</p> <p>➤ The recommendations about response options for where felt unsafe to include taxis, etc. were adopted.</p>

2 your age 3 your ethnicity 4 your sexual orientation 5 your health or disability 6 your nationality 7 your religion 8 your language or accent 9 your dress or appearance 10 other reason 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS) 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)	
--	--

Experience of refusal for promotion

Q3

In the last 12 months, have you been refused or turned down for a promotion?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)

Q3a

Do you think you were refused the promotion for any of the following reasons?

- 1 your sex
- 2 your age
- 3 your ethnicity
- 4 your sexual orientation
- 5 your health or disability
- 6 your nationality
- 7 your religion
- 8 your language or accent
- 9 your dress or appearance
- 10 other reason
- 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)
- 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

Findings

There were no reported problems with this question. Respondents displayed good understanding of what a promotion was, for example one respondent said when doing a job, you would “*go up*”. There was also evidence to suggest that respondents were correctly considering the time frame of the ‘last 12 months’ when answering this question.

Respondents who were in work or had been in work, with the exception of one who does freelance work where promotions don’t apply, tended to review the last 12 months and recall whether or not they had gone for a promotion. One respondent thought about whether she had been offered a promotion as well as going for one.

There were instances where respondents commented that the words 'refused' came across as negative for example, one respondent said "very negative connotation.....refused is almost a personal word".

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<p>➤ As these questions follow the same format, we recommend highlighting in bold 'a promotion' so that the interviewer emphasises this part of the question when they read it out.</p> <p>➤ In line with recommendations at a previous question (Q1 and Q1a), we recommend removing the words 'refused' and just using 'turned down'</p> <p>➤ We recommend, if possible, that this question is routed on a question which is asked earlier in the questionnaire which establishes whether the respondent has been working in the last 12 months (if there already is one in place) to avoid asking it to people for whom it is not relevant.</p> <p>Q3 In the <u>last 12 months</u>, have you been turned down for a promotion?</p> <p>1 Yes 2 No 3 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)</p> <p>Q3a Do you think that you were turned down for any of the following reasons?</p> <p>1 your sex 2 your age 3 your ethnicity 4 your sexual orientation 5 your health or disability 6 your nationality 7 your religion 8 your language or accent 9 your dress or appearance 10 other reason 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS) 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)</p>	<p>➤ Recommendations about emphasising "promotion" were incorporated.</p> <p>➤ We included the language "turned down".</p> <p>➤ The routing into the promotion question included anyone who had been employed during the prior 12 months from the employment status history section.</p>

Experience of refusal of training at work

<p>Q4 In the <u>last 12 months</u>, have you been refused or turned down for training at work?</p> <p>1 Yes 2 No 3 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)</p> <p>Q4a Do you think you were refused the promotion for any of the following reasons?</p>
--

- 1 your sex
- 2 your age
- 3 your ethnicity
- 4 your sexual orientation
- 5 your health or disability
- 6 your nationality
- 7 your religion
- 8 your language or accent
- 9 your dress or appearance
- 10 other reason
- 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)
- 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

Findings

This question did not cause respondents any problems and as a result they were able to answer it thinking consistently about being refused or turned down in similar ways. One respondent for example described this as not being allowed to do it [the training] even if she had wanted to. Respondents tended to think about whether or not they had had any training in the last year. In addition respondents reported the following circumstances:

- Being in a job where training is encouraged and therefore it wouldn't be turned down;
- not been working so this did not apply;
- having recently started a job and knowing that training would happen at some point; and,
- having not asked for any training so therefore could not have been turned down.

Again respondents picked up on the negative connotation of the word 'refused'. However, the words 'turned down' did bring about the same feelings.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<p>➤ As these questions follow the same format, we recommend highlighting in bold 'for training' so that the interviewer emphasises this part of the question when they read it out.</p> <p>➤ In line with recommendations at a previous questions we recommend removing the word 'refused' and instead just using 'turned down'.</p> <p>➤ We recommend, if possible, that this question is routed on a question which is asked earlier in the questionnaire which establishes whether the respondent has been working in the last 12 months (if there already is one in place) to avoid asking it to people for whom it is not relevant .</p> <p>Q4 In the <u>last 12 months</u>, have you been turned down for training at work?</p> <p>1 Yes 2 No 3 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)</p>	<p>➤ Recommendations about emphasis of "training" incorporated</p> <p>➤ Included language of "turned down"</p> <p>➤ Routing reflects including anyone who has been employed during the prior 12 months.</p>

Q4a

Do you think you were turned down for any of the following reasons?

- 1 your sex
- 2 your age
- 3 your ethnicity
- 4 your sexual orientation
- 5 your health or disability
- 6 your nationality
- 7 your religion
- 8 your language or accent
- 9 your dress or appearance
- 10 other reason
- 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)
- 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

Experience of being insulted or threatened**Q5**

In the last 12 months, have you been insulted, called names, threatened or shouted at, in any of the following places?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY:

- 1 at home
- 2 at school, college or work
- 3 on public transport
- 4 in shops, banks, restaurants or other public buildings
- 5 outside: on the street, in parks or other public spaces
- 6 other places
- 7 none of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q5}

Q5a

Were you insulted, called names, threatened or shouted (in) [PLACE] for any of the following reasons?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY:

- 1 your sex
- 2 your age
- 3 your ethnicity
- 4 your sexual orientation
- 5 your health or disability
- 6 your nationality
- 7 your religion
- 8 your language or accent
- 9 your dress or appearance
- 10 other reason
- 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)
- 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

Findings

Cognitive testing of this question revealed that on the whole it works well and respondents are able to comprehend the question and select an answer which best applies to them. Additionally cognitive testing highlighted that the reference frame of the 'last 12 months' is unproblematic as respondents tended to adhere to it.

Insulted, called names, threatened or shouted at

The kinds of things respondents thought about and mentioned, which tended to overlap when respondents spoke about them, were:

- *Insulted*: someone has said something to you that you have found offensive; verbal abuse;
- *Called names*: verbal abuse for a less offensive;
- *Threatened*: having felt threatened and feared that you are in some kind of danger; and,
- *Shouted at*: Raised voices in your direction, specifically related to you.

Missing answer categories

'Pubs' and 'nightclubs' are missing from the list. Additionally you could be 'in your car' when type of thing might happen to you. On occasion respondents queried whether this question was about instances in the UK or whether a separate code for 'on holiday' should be formulated.

One respondent was insulted in a taxi and chose to code this under code 2: 'public transport'. It should be borne in mind however that other respondents might have coded this as other.

Reporting the reason

Cognitive testing of this question seems to suggest that respondents are comfortable reporting the reason why, in their opinion, they were insulted, called names, threatened or shouted at. Respondents frequently chose code 3: 'your ethnicity'. On occasion a respondent could be unsure of the actual reason and choose a combination of those from the list on the showcard. There were no other reasons respondents mentioned which the list does not already cover.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<p>➤ In line with recommendations at Q2, we recommend that the answer categories at Q5 are altered.</p> <p>➤ We recommend retaining the question wording and answer categories of the follow up question (Q5a).</p> <p>Q5 In the <u>last 12 months</u>, have you been insulted, called names, threatened or shouted at, in any of the following places?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1 at school, college or work2 on public transport or in a taxi3 in public buildings such shopping centres, shops or pubs4 outside: on the street, in parks or other public spaces	<p>➤ All recommendations were incorporated.</p>

<p>5 at home 6 other places</p> <p>7 none of the above (SPONTANEOUS)</p> <p><i>{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q5}</i></p> <p>Q5a Were you insulted, called names, threatened or shouted (in) [PLACE] for any of the following reasons? CODE ALL THAT APPLY:</p> <p>1 your sex 2 your age 3 your ethnicity 4 your sexual orientation 5 your health or disability 6 your nationality 7 your religion 8 your language or accent 9 your dress or appearance 10 other reason 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS) 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)</p>	
---	--

Experience of physical attack

Q6
In the last 12 months, have you been physically attacked in any of the following places?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY:

1 at home
2 at school, college or work
3 on public transport
4 in shops, banks, restaurants or other public buildings
5 outside: on the street, in parks or other public spaces
6 other places

7 none of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

{FOR EACH CODED AT Q6}

Q6a
Were you physically attacked (in) [PLACE] for any of the following reasons?
CODE ALL THAT APPLY

1 your sex
2 your age
3 your ethnicity
4 your sexual orientation
5 your health or disability
6 your nationality

- 7 your religion
- 8 your language or accent
- 9 your dress or appearance
- 10 other reason

- 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)
- 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

Findings

There were no reported problems respondents had with this question. There was one exception where a respondent said they did not understand what was meant by 'physically attacked' but on the whole cognitive testing revealed that respondents had consistent understandings of being 'physically attack', which all related to violent bodily contact. Some of the descriptions given included:

- Someone has injured, or attempted to, injure you
- Someone coming at full force at you, wanting to do you damage
- Someone coming at you with fists and weapons
- Someone pushing, grabbing or hitting you.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<p>➤ In line with recommendations at other questions, we recommend that the answer categories at Q6 are altered.</p> <p>➤ We recommend retaining the question wording and answer categories of the follow up question (Q6a).</p> <p>Q6 In the <u>last 12 months</u>, have you been physically attacked in any of the following places?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 at school, college or work 2 on public transport or in a taxi 3 in public buildings such shopping centres, shops or pubs 4 outside: on the street, in parks or other public spaces 5 at home 6 other places <p>7 none of the above (SPONTANEOUS)</p> <p>{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q6}</p> <p>Q6a Were you physically attacked (in) [PLACE] for any of the following reasons? CODE ALL THAT APPLY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 your sex 2 your age 3 your ethnicity 4 your sexual orientation 5 your health or disability 6 your nationality 	<p>➤ All recommendations were incorporated</p>

7 your religion 8 your language or accent 9 your dress or appearance 10 other reason 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS) 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)	
--	--

Experience of avoiding public places

Q7

In the last 12 months, have you avoided going to or being in any of the following places?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY:

- 1 at home
- 2 at school, college or work
- 3 on public transport
- 4 in shops, banks, restaurants or other public buildings
- 5 outside: on the street, in parks or other public spaces
- 6 other places
- 7 none of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

{FOR EACH CODED AT Q7}

Q7a

Did you avoid [PLACE] for reasons to do with any of the following?

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

- 1 your sex
- 2 your age
- 3 your ethnicity
- 4 your sexual orientation
- 5 your health or disability
- 6 your nationality
- 7 your religion
- 8 your language or accent
- 9 your dress or appearance
- 10 other reason
- 11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)
- 12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)

Findings

This question seemed to work well and respondents were able to answer it reporting no problems when doing so. Respondents mainly thought about avoiding buses and other forms of public transport, streets or certain areas and particularly at night. Respondents talked about avoiding places because they were aware, sometimes through the media, about the fact that there was often trouble which therefore made them feel anxious.

Respondents thought about the word 'avoid', in the context of this question, in very similar ways mentioning steering clear of and not going to or near to a place. One respondent for example said: "made the effort to not go somewhere you wanted to go".

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<p>➤ In line with recommendations at other questions, we recommend that the answer categories at Q7 are altered.</p> <p>➤ We recommend retaining the question wording and answer categories of the follow up question (Q7a).</p> <p>Q7 In the <u>last 12 months</u>, have you avoided going to or being in any of the following places?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 at school, college or work 2 on public transport or in a taxi 3 in public buildings such shopping centres, shops or pubs 4 outside: on the street, in parks or other public spaces 5 at home 6 other places <p>7 none of the above (SPONTANEOUS)</p> <p>{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q7}</p> <p>Q7a Did you avoid [PLACE] for reasons to do with any of the following? CODE ALL THAT APPLY:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 your sex 2 your age 3 your ethnicity 4 your sexual orientation 5 your health or disability 6 your nationality 7 your religion 8 your language or accent 9 your dress or appearance 10 other reason <p>11 Don't know (SPONTANEOUS)</p> <p>12 None of the above (SPONTANEOUS)</p>	<p>➤ All recommendations were incorporated</p>

General feedback on the discrimination section

Feedback from respondents suggest that the questions are not too intrusive and we can infer from the fact that people were happy to answer, and no-one refused, that they are not perceived as overly sensitive either. One respondent even said that he was happy to discuss these issues as he felt it was important to "publicise a general fear if it exists".

We found evidence to suggest there are pros and cons of asking a section of similar questions: it could be a good thing as a respondent became familiar with the content

of the showcards so they “*knew what was coming*”, however the section could be repetitive and respondents could feel as though they were being asked about quite similar things.

Recommended question order

Based on interviewer and respondent feedback, suggesting that it was often odd to ask or be asked the questions in the order that we tested them, we would recommend the following question order is adapted for the survey: Q1, Q3, Q4, Q2, Q7, Q5 and then Q6. Note; for general population respondents Q1 and Q2 will need to come together.

Recommended question order was incorporated and questions were asked in the following order:

- Feeling Unsafe;
- Avoided;
- Insulted; then
- Attacked.

4 LIFE SATISFACTION, NEIGHBOURHOOD ATTACHMENT AND ENVIRONMENT

Life satisfaction

The measurement objective of these questions is to capture respondent satisfaction with different aspects of their lives, namely satisfaction with their health, their income and their life overall. Cognitive testing issues included whether the scales used were meaningful, what respondents understood by 'satisfied' and whether there were cultural constraints on their answering. These questions were asked of both General Population (GP) and Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents.

It is worth noting that although these questions were tested in a face to face interview, it is currently intended that they will be administered as a self completion questionnaire. Therefore some of the problems discussed may be alleviated when the section is presented in another mode. This is particularly true of issues arising from respondents not being sure of whether to answer in numbers or words, as the format expected will be visually presented in front of them.

Next a few questions about how you feel about your life. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all satisfied" and 10 means "completely satisfied", how dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the following aspects of your current situation?

INTERVIEWER READ OUT....

LFSAT1

a).....Your health?

ENTER NUMBER FROM 0 TO 10:

LFSAT2

b).....The income of your household?

ENTER NUMBER FROM 0 TO 10:

LFSATO

Using the same scale of 0 to 10, how dissatisfied or satisfied are you with your life overall?

ENTER NUMBER FROM 0 TO 10:

Findings

In general respondents were able to respond appropriately to this question, although some had to ask for the question to be repeated or reminding about what the answers categories to use. The main issues arising from the cognitive testing were to do with the numerical answer categorisation.

Appropriateness of scales

The key issue arising from this question was whether or not the answer categories used are appropriate (i.e. asking for a score of 0-10). The following problems arose regarding the answer categories;

- Respondents would answer with a word (e.g. saying “satisfied” or “very satisfied”) rather than giving a number.
- Respondents stated they would rather use descriptive words such as happy/unhappy or good/poor.
- Respondents stated it would be easier to answer with a word, and it would be easier to refer to happiness rather than satisfaction.
- Respondents asked for clarification about what numbers referred to, for example, “Does 10 mean completely satisfied?”; and,
- Respondents asked for the questions to be repeated so they could hear the answer categories again.

One respondent (a first generation ethnic minority) had genuine difficulties assigning a number to a concept of satisfaction and was repeatedly unable to do so despite not having any difficulties answering previous questions and having good English language skills. This respondent was able to answer only after being given a visual prompt by the cognitive interviewer, who drew the scale on a piece of paper, with all the numbers and 0 and 10 labelled with completely dissatisfied/satisfied. It is possible the nature of the task was entirely novel to this respondent hence the difficulty.

A further issue regarding the scale was that respondents may be reluctant to use the lowest scores when rating their satisfaction with their health. For example, one respondent claimed they were “*Not very happy*,” and listed numerous health problems they had but still rated themselves as a 5 on the scale (the mid-point). The justification they used for giving this figure was that many others were worse off than they were. Another respondent with numerous health problems claimed that the 0 option would mean they were at, “*Death’s door*.” This is a possible indication that, at least for the health questions, respondents may feel there are social constraints on them answering in a negative fashion, which militate in favour of a more satisfied response than people might actually experience.

Question wording

Interviewers commented that the question was an awkward sentence to read, for instance it more natural for them to say, “...how satisfied or dissatisfied are you...”, rather than how the question is actually worded, “how dissatisfied or satisfied are you...” However, this may not be a problem if the question is intended to be filled in as a self-completion.

Concepts of health

Health was conceptualised in two ways by respondents:

- 1) Medical health, e.g. whether they had had any recent illnesses or any chronic conditions; and,
- 2) Fitness levels and health related behaviours, e.g. whether they got out of breath easily, whether they smoked and so forth.

Concepts of health satisfaction were related to whether or not respondents were considering their fitness levels and health behaviours when answering the question, or considering their medical history only.

Concept of life overall

Respondents could read **LFSATO** in two different ways:

- 1) As asking about their overall satisfaction with their *current* life, e.g. how satisfied they are with their life at the moment, (here overall was seen as

- referring to all the satisfaction domains that made up their current circumstances) or;
- 2) As asking about how satisfied they are about how their life has been since they were born (here 'overall' was seen to indicate the life span was to be considered, rather than across satisfaction domains of the present circumstance).

It is therefore recommended that the question explicitly states the respondents should rate their satisfaction with their current life situation e.g., "with your life right now."

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation												
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Alter the Question wording from, "...how dissatisfied or satisfied are you.." to the more natural sounding, "...how satisfied or dissatisfied are you.." ➤ Provide a visual aid so respondents can see how they are meant to answer as a number, and how high numbers refer to high satisfaction and low numbers refer to low satisfaction. Alternatively, alter format of answer categories to semantically variable words, for instance, very unhappy/unhappy/ neither unhappy or happy/ happy/very happy. ➤ In LFSATO specify a reference period e.g. "...your life right now.." to prevent respondents reflecting about their whole lifespan. <p>The next a few questions are about how you feel about your life. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all satisfied" and 10 means "completely satisfied", how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following aspects of your current situation?</p> <p>LFSAT1 a).....Your health? PLEASE CIRCLE NUMBER THAT APPLIES:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Not at all Satisfied</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: right;">Completely Satisfied</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> </table> <p>LFSAT2 b).....The income of your household? PLEASE CIRCLE NUMBER THAT APPLIES:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Not at all Satisfied</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: right;">Completely Satisfied</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> </table> <p>LFSATO Using the same scale of 0 to 10, overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your life right now? PLEASE CIRCLE NUMBER THAT APPLIES:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Not at all Satisfied</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: right;">Completely Satisfied</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> </table>	Not at all Satisfied	Completely Satisfied	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10	Not at all Satisfied	Completely Satisfied	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10	Not at all Satisfied	Completely Satisfied	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The life satisfaction items were used in a pencil and paper self-completion instrument. We did not incorporate any of the recommendations but instead carried the questions as their original BHPS form.
Not at all Satisfied	Completely Satisfied												
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10												
Not at all Satisfied	Completely Satisfied												
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10												
Not at all Satisfied	Completely Satisfied												
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10												

Neighbourhood attachment

The measurement objectives for these questions are to capture the extent of community cohesion in the respondents' immediate area and to capture the respondents' feelings of belonging to their immediate area.

Key issues addressed during the cognitive testing included the following:

- 1) How do people interpret 'from different backgrounds? Is this race, religion, social class, education levels, income or a combination of the above?
- 2) How do people assess whether 'people get on well together?'
- 3) What does 'belonging' mean to people and what are they thinking of when they say they either belong or don't belong?

These questions were asked of both General Population (GP) and Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents

QA

To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area (within 15-20 minutes walking distance) is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?

READ OUT: Do you....

- 1 Definitely agree
- 2 Tend to agree
- 3 Tend to disagree or
- 4 Definitely disagree?

QB

How strongly do you feel you belong to your immediate neighbourhood?

READ OUT...

- 1 Very strongly
- 2 Fairly strongly
- 3 Not very strongly, or
- 4 Not at all strongly?

Findings

Some issues were raised regarding the neighbourhood questions. On occasion respondents asked for the question to be repeated, perhaps indicating the need for a show card. However, as later waves are to be contacted over the telephone, show card use should be minimised. Other issues raised regarding the question are discussed below.

Concepts of 'different backgrounds'

Respondents interpreted the phrase 'people from different backgrounds' in a variety of ways and in some cases clarification of what the phrase 'different backgrounds' meant was asked for.

"Different backgrounds in what sense?... Different country, religion, nationality, accent?... [The question] needs to be more specific, [it's] very grey."

(Female, Ethnic Minority, Age 31-59).

Cognitive testing revealed that 'different backgrounds' could refer to people of different ethnic groups, different nationalities, different religions, different cultures, different social classes and people with varying financial security (rich or poor). Respondents can be classified as having one of following two concepts of 'different backgrounds' when answering this question;

- 1) **Broad concept:** The respondent kept several of the above factors in mind when answering, such as ethnicity, religion and social class.
- 2) **Narrow concept:** The factor the respondent thought of when answering tended to be ethnicity.

It is possible that the previous questions on race and ethnicity might have influenced respondents to hold the narrow concept of different backgrounds when answering this question

One key problem regarding QA is it that it presumes that respondents live in an area alongside people from different backgrounds. However, general population respondents living in a predominately white area (who held the 'narrow' concept) thought the question did not apply to them. Such respondents could either agree that people of different races got on (because there were no racial tensions in their all-white area) or disagree that they got on (as there was no-one of a different race to get on with). Therefore, the answers given by this group are in a sense arbitrary and are not a measure of community cohesion. Similarly white respondents who held a 'broad' concept and lived in non-diverse area were limited when reflecting on the question to how well people from different white classes get on. Therefore it is recommended that some measure of diversity within an area is needed to complement findings from this question.

Concepts of getting 'on well together'

The phrase 'get on well together' was interpreted in two main ways, passively and actively;

- 1) **Passively** getting on well was seen as when people from different backgrounds had no major conflicts or problems in the area e.g. a respondent with a passive view of getting on with others would agree if there were no major tensions in their locality, "*they're not beating each other with sticks.*"
- 2) **Actively** getting on well was seen as when people from different backgrounds interacted with each other in a positive manner, for instance talking to each other, helping each other and socialising with each other.

How a respondent answered QA would depend on whether they held a passive or an active concept of getting on well together. If the question's objective is to explicitly measure the amount of positive interaction between groups it should explicitly state so to prevent people from holding the more passive view of what it means to get on.

Concepts feelings of belonging

Feelings of belonging to a neighbourhood were conceptualised by respondents in numerous ways. Belonging could mean any or a mixture of the following;

- Being actively involved with local groups such the resident's association, parish council or other community groups.

- Getting on well with neighbours and having a sense of community even if not actively involved.
- Having an emotional attachment to a place because of being born there or having lived there for a long time; or,
- Being familiar with an area and its people.

However, the concept of belonging was also demonstratively problematic. On occasion respondents found it hard to understand what the question was asking. A further problem arose that 'not belonging' had negative connotations of rejection or being ostracised. Critically, testing revealed that 'belong' could be conceptualised literally; i.e. as a reference to ownership. One respondent, for example, had trouble understanding the question with 'belong' in this context, thinking of the word as meaning "...when something, like a book, belongs to me." (Female, Ethnic Minority).

Difficulties in comprehension possibly arose from a language gap (in this case English was not the respondent's first language). As *Understanding Society* intends to use a large Ethnic Minority boost it is important that the wording is as unambiguous as possible

Concepts of 'local area' and 'immediate neighbourhood'

In general, respondents had no difficulties in understanding what was meant by the 'local area' and conceptualised it in a reasonably consistent manner. Respondents thought about their local area in the following ways;

- 15-30 minutes walk from their house.
- The neighbouring 3-5 streets; and,
- The area from their home up until a notable geographical residential cut off point e.g. a different estate, a shopping centre or dual-carriage way.

The emphasis of the respondents when answering the question was on the parts of the local area they frequented most and had most experience of.

The concept of 'immediate neighbourhood' was sometimes considered to be equivalent to 'local area' namely consisting of;

- Round the block
- Circle of streets; and,
- Just over a mile

Conversely the concept of 'immediate neighbourhood' was considered to be a slightly smaller space compared to 'local area' by some respondents who viewed it as, for instance;

- 5 minutes walk
- 1-2 streets; or,
- 1 block of flats

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
➤ If we want respondents to hold a broad view of what is meant by 'people from different backgrounds' examples will need to be given to stop respondents focusing exclusively on race/ethnicity	➤ The question set were not asked at Wave 1 but the recommendations were noted for when the questions are asked on

future waves.

- Currently, QA presumes that people live in diverse areas. It is recommended some measure of perceived diversity in an area is required in addition to perceived community cohesion.
- If QA is to capture active integration, rather than just the absence of conflict in an area, the phrase 'get on well together' needs to be elaborated on further. The question could be split into two, one part measuring 'passive getting on' and one part measuring 'active getting on.'
- In QB the word 'belong' is potentially problematic.

QA

The following questions ask about people from 'different backgrounds.' By this we mean people from different social backgrounds, cultures, nationalities, religions and so forth.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that people from a range of different backgrounds live or work in the local area (within 15-20 minutes walking distance)?

READ OUT: Do you....

- 1 Definitely agree
- 2 Tend to agree
- 3 Tend to disagree or
- 4 Definitely disagree?

QA1

To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area (within 15-20 minutes walking distance) is a place where people from different backgrounds get on peacefully together?

READ OUT: Do you....

- 1 Definitely agree
- 2 Tend to agree
- 3 Tend to disagree or
- 4 Definitely disagree?

QA2

To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area (within 15-20 minutes walking distance) is a place where people from different backgrounds mix with each other?

READ OUT: Do you....

- 1 Definitely agree
- 2 Tend to agree
- 3 Tend to disagree or
- 4 Definitely disagree?

QB

How strongly do you feel you are part of your immediate neighbourhood?

READ OUT...

- 1 Very strongly
- 2 Fairly strongly
- 3 Not very strongly, or
- 4 Not at all strongly?

Environment

The measurement objectives for these questions are to measure how environmentally conscious respondents are, and to measure knowledge of different types of behaviour that have an impact on the environment.

GREENTARRIF

Does your household buy, or is your household seriously considering buying its electricity on a Green Tariff?

- 1 Yes – already buy
- 2 Yes – seriously considering
- 3 No – neither

Findings

Cognitive testing of this question revealed that respondents on the whole had not heard of green tariffs, although on occasion respondents managed to guess what they might be. Of those respondents who had heard of green tariffs, the majority did not know if their supplier provided it. A lack of understanding about green tariff did not prevent people answering the question, those who did not understand the question either asked for the question to be repeated or asked ‘what is a green tariff?’. Those who did not understand the question tended to answer ‘no – neither’ as it appeared to be the only answer option best suited to them. Occasionally respondents opted to say ‘don’t know’ or did not answer at all.

Is the tariff used a household decision or does one person make the decision?

For both general population and ethnic minority respondents decisions as to tariffs used in their households are made by either:

- Respondent themselves;
- Respondent and spouse / partner (joint decision);
- Spouse / partner only; or,
- Parents.

Respondents tended to either have whole or part-responsibility for decision-making in the household about the tariff used.

Meaning of ‘seriously considering’

Respondents were asked what the phrase ‘seriously considering’ meant to them in the context of this question, and the following definitions were mentioned:

- Thinking about it
- Looking into it
- Getting in touch with someone to find out what is involved
- Being interested in it
- Weighing up the pros and cons.

RECYCLE

Does your council run a recycling scheme as part of your normal rubbish collection?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

RECYCLE2

And do you separate your rubbish into items that can be recycled through your normal rubbish collection always, usually, sometimes or never?

READ OUT...

- 1 Always
- 2 Usually
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Never

Findings

Respondents in general were able to answer these questions and no major difficulties were reported. They understood the answer categories and thought the answer scale was comprehensive. Universally respondents mentioned the recycling bins provided by the council.

We did however find evidence of inconsistent use of the answer options. Respondents could, for example, choose 'never' and subsequently, during probing, explain that they separate paper and plastic. Equally they could choose 'sometimes' whilst telling the interviewer that the council does not provide them with food waste bins so this is something they do themselves. Respondents could also opt for 'always' but admit that they '*may slip occasionally*' and don't recycle everything, however choosing 'always' because they felt they tried their best to do so.

'Recycling scheme'

Respondents tended to have some understanding of the term 'recycling scheme' and stated that the term meant the following things to them:

- Reusing something that has already been used, making it into other products
- Separating glass, paper, plastic etc. From other waste
- 'the green bin'; and,
- Cutting down on landfill and caring for the environment

On occasion respondents from the ethnic minority sample were confused by the term and did not understand its meaning.

Recycling schemes used by their council

On the whole, respondents seemed knowledgeable about the recycling schemes used by their council. They mentioned the different colour bins, each for a different type of recycling, that the council provided for them, and the fact that these bins were collected at different times.

Answer strategies used in RECYCLE2

Respondents were asked the strategies they used when answering question RECYCLE2, and what the different answer categories meant to them. These are some of the answers provided for each category:

Always

- *'We recycle every day'*
- *'Everything that can does get recycled'*
- *'Because the bins are provided it is easy to do'*
- *'It's something I strongly believe in'.*
- *'We get into the habit of recycling...I might slip occasionally, I don't always recycle every single bit'*

Usually

- *'Although I try to do it all the time, there are occasions when it doesn't happen'*
- *'I do it 85% of the time'*

Sometimes

- *'I do some of it, I separate out the paper from the other rubbish'*
- *'I try, but the different schemes have different collecting times and I sometimes can't wait for the set collection time'*
- *'takes the green bits to the tip and not into the normal bin'*

Never

- *'If the bins weren't there I wouldn't do it'*

The quotes demonstrate that the answers generally seem to be consistent and fit into the answer categories. On occasion a respondents reason for choosing the option they did differed from the others in the sample however there is always the risk with frequency questions that one person's 'always' is another person's 'sometimes',

Respondents seemed to be happy with the answer categories provided in the scale, although there proved to be some difficulty when answering the question, so rephrasing or changing the answer categories could be considered.

Q23 (Cars in household)

How many cars or vans are there in your household?

{ASK IF Q23 = 1 OR MORE}

Q23a

SHOWCARD A

Which of these describes the engine size of this (your first/second etc) car/van?

INTERVIEWER: FOR EACH CAR/ VAN TICK ONE ROW.

	Car/ van 1	Car/ van 2	Car/ van 3	Car/ van 4
1. Small engine – up to 1400cc				
2. Medium engine – 1401 – 2000cc				
3. Large engine – 2001+cc				

Findings

On the whole respondents were able to answer this question. There were very few problems reported with providing the engine size of their own vehicle/s; however respondents occasionally did not know the engine size of vehicles belonging to other members of their household, e.g. husband / child. There were no vehicles that respondents were unsure whether to include or not. All respondents who were unsure about the engine size took an educated guess. One respondent had “no interest in cars” but guessed medium because of the size of the car. The reason for this is because the question did not require a specific number but a choice of categories, therefore making it easy to answer.

On occasion respondents reported that they were not familiar with the format ‘1400cc’ and would prefer ‘1.4’ (litre engine).

Q24

Please tell me how often you personally do each of the following things:

	Always	Very often	Quite often	Some times	Occasio nally	Never	N/A, cannot do this
1. Leave your TV on standby for the night	<input type="checkbox"/>						
2. Leave lights on in rooms that aren't being used	<input type="checkbox"/>						
3. Leave a mobile phone charger switched on at the socket when not in use	<input type="checkbox"/>						
4. Keep the tap running while you brush your teeth	<input type="checkbox"/>						
5. Put more clothes on when you feel cold instead of putting the heating on or turning it up	<input type="checkbox"/>						
6. Decide not to buy something because you feel it has too much packaging	<input type="checkbox"/>						
7. Buy food from local producers	<input type="checkbox"/>						
8. Check food labels to find out where food was produced	<input type="checkbox"/>						
9. Buy recycled paper products such as toilet paper or tissues	<input type="checkbox"/>						
10. Take your own shopping bag when shopping	<input type="checkbox"/>						

Findings

Cognitive testing revealed that there were no problems with answering this question overall. However, respondents often queried whether the questions referred to other members of the household as well as themselves. This caused problems, when

respondents were unsure about the behaviours of other members of the household, which meant that they were unsure how to answer certain parts, even though they could answer them when thinking about just themselves. This indicates that the word 'personally' in the question was not always heard.

Difficulties with particular parts of the question

1. 'Standby':

Respondents in the ethnic minority sample were not always sure about the meaning of the term 'standby'. It appears, from looking at the data, that they tended to guess the answer and opt for the 'never' option.

2. Leaving one light on:

Respondents occasionally disregarded one particular light which was left on most or a lot of the time. For example one respondent reported leaving the landing light on all the time. However, the answer category chosen was 'occasionally' and when asked the reason for choosing this, the respondent responded '*because it is only one light*'. Another respondent chose 'never' although he left the toilet light on every night. The reason given for answering in this way was because he 'didn't count the toilet as a room'.

6. Problems with comprehension:

Respondents reported difficulty in answering this question and were not sure what the question was asking. Respondents asked '*what sort of packaging?*' This was a consistent problem amongst both general population and ethnic minority respondents.

8. Checking packaging for other information:

The key issue that arose when testing this question was that respondents often looked for information other than the origin of the food when examining food labels, for example the nutritional information and therefore they were unsure how to answer it.

9. Deliberate Vs coincidental purchasing:

Although respondents understood the concept of buying recycled paper products, they queried whether the question was asking if they bought them *deliberately* or not. One comment which was raised was along the lines of 'I always buy the same product but I don't know if it's recycled or not'.

Concept of 'local producers'

There was some difficulty with the meaning of the term 'local producers' (part 7). Respondents often thought that 'local' referred to where the produce was sold, missing the point about where it was produced. Examples of answers to the meaning of the term were '*local supermarket and shops*' and '*takeaways, bakeries, things like that*'. Due to this the majority of people based their answers on the assumption that local produce was local shops so they were thinking of this, when answering, and therefore giving invalid answers.

Appropriateness of scale

The main issue that came out of cognitive testing was that there were too many categories in the answer scale used for this question. 'Trying to give an accurate answer is difficult, although the questions themselves are not'. Respondents felt that

there was too much choice, and it was especially difficult to differentiate between some of the middle categories, e.g. 'sometimes' and 'occasionally'.

Recommendations

GREENTARRIF:

- Retain question as worded. The incidence of yes or seriously considering answers is likely to be very low but this question may have value in the medium to long term.

RECYCLE & RECYCLE2

- Retain questions as worded.

CARS IN HOUSEHOLD:

- Retain question as worded. The categories work well in enabling respondents to answer.
- Add an alternative way of expressing the numbers to the showcard., e.g.: up to 1400cc should include alternative of up to 1.4 litre

Q24:

- Put the word **personally** in bold, so that interviewers emphasise this, and add a clarifying note to respondent or interviewer making clear this asks about the respondent, not about other household members.
- Decision needs to be made about what is of interest in the question about leaving lights on. Respondents may leave one light on always but the "always" category doesn't seem to fit them.
- Consider an answer scale with fewer categories which would make the question less burdensome, for example:

Always

Sometimes

Rarely or

Never?

5 CONSUMPTION AND BENEFITS

Consumption

There were three versions of the consumption questions, and the main aim of cognitive testing was to uncover how respondents go about answering the three different versions and whether different response strategies are employed according to the detail required. The point of there being *three* versions was to determine how important examples are (A versus B) and whether it is sufficient to give the examples, or if, instead, it is better to ask a set of components one by one (B versus C). The testing also aimed to identify how easy or difficult it was for the respondents to answer the different versions.

Further issues addressed by cognitive testing were:

- Which is easier to answer, 'usual month' or 'last month'
- How easy or difficult is it to answer about other household members?
- Are there important categories of expenditure that have not been asked about?
- Are there gender and ethnic minority effects on recall and knowledge?

Version A

XPALL_G1 (VERSION A)

The next few questions deal with the expenses of your household. Apart from your housing costs and utility bills, about how much has your household spent on all other expenses in the last month, such as food, clothing, transport and entertainment costs?

IF 'DON'T KNOW / CAN'T REMEMBER' PROBE: 'Can you give me an approximate amount?'

WRITE IN TO NEAREST £

Findings

Respondents found this question extremely difficult to answer, both from the general population and the ethnic minority sample. Often respondents found it *too* difficult and just answered with a ball park figure which was a vague estimation of the actual answer. A great deal of probing was required by the interviewers to get an answer.

The main strategy used to work out the answer was to break the question down into sections, work out an answer for each and then sum these to reach a total. When respondents used this strategy, interviewers typically had to spend time repeating the examples included in the question. Another, though less frequent, strategy used was to deduct mortgage/rent and utilities from monthly income.

The following issues arose when the question was cognitively tested:

- Queries of what was included as a 'utility bill'
- Forgetting what was spent on other members of the household, particularly children
- Some respondents wanted to look at receipts

Inclusions in 'all other expenses'

The following are expenses respondents included in their answers (excluding items mentioned in the question):

- Mobile phone
- House and car insurance
- Ground rent
- Internet access
- House repairs
- Gifts
- Newspapers
- Toiletries
- Prescription charges
- Loan repayments
- Alcohol and tobacco
- Pet food

In general, respondents did not include durables or work-related expenses in their answers. A certain amount of 'rounding up' was done, typically to the nearest £50/£100.

Version B

XPALL_G2 (VERSION B)
 Apart from your housing costs and utility bills, about how much has your household spent on all other expenses in the last month? Please include food eaten at home and food eaten outside the home, alcohol and tobacco, clothing and footwear for all household members, medicines and health expenses, car and public transport costs, telephone and internet costs, entertainment, leisure activities and hobbies.

IF 'DON'T KNOW / CAN'T REMEMBER' PROBE: 'Can you give me an approximate amount?'

WRITE IN TO NEAREST £

Findings

Respondents felt that this question was too complicated to answer. Frequently interviewers were asked to repeat the question, and respondents were confused by the amount of information contained within it. Similarly to version A, respondents often had to guess/make rough estimates at the answer.

The following issues were also reported:

- Respondents wanted to write things down as they went along; this increased the amount of time spent answering the question

- Respondents found it difficult to think about the whole household rather than just themselves; and,
- Respondents experienced difficulties remembering everything the interviewer had listed.

Version C

Version C comprised a series of questions which together give an indicator of consumption.

XPFOOD1_G3
 Can you tell me approximately how much your household has spent on food and groceries at a supermarket or grocery store in the last month?

IF 'DON'T KNOW / CAN'T REMEMBER' PROBE: 'Can you give me an approximate amount?'

WRITE IN TO NEAREST £

Findings

Methods of calculation

When calculating the answer to this question, respondents tended to report having worked out the weekly amount spent by the household on food and groceries and multiplying this by four. It was common for the respondents in our sample to do a weekly food shop, and so this was the easiest method for them. Respondents found this question reasonably straightforward to answer as they tended to spend a similar amount each week. One respondent calculated how much he spent at the supermarket for the weekly shop, and then added an extra 10% to the total for additional visits to food shops in between. Methods of calculation were similar between the general population and the ethnic minority samples.

Concepts of 'supermarket' and 'grocery store'

Table 3 below illustrates respondents' interpretations of 'supermarket' and 'grocery store'. Answers were similar for respondents from the general population and the ethnic minority samples.

Table 3: Differences between 'supermarket' and 'grocery store'.

Supermarket	Grocery store
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 'The Big Four' (Tesco, Sainsburys, Asda, Morrisons) ▪ Big commercial shops ▪ Shops that sell almost everything from food to clothes to electrical items ▪ Where you buy the weekly shop ▪ Has more choice ▪ Bigger than other types of store ▪ 'Stocks almost everything, has a car park, easy access' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The local little store ▪ A smaller version of a supermarket ▪ Corner shops ▪ A store where the service is more personal and the focus is on the customer ▪ Smaller independent store ▪ More expensive than a supermarket

To summarise from the table above, respondents thought of supermarkets as larger and less expensive stores, with more choice than grocery stores. Both terms were well understood by respondents.

XPFOOD2_G3

About how much of this amount was for non-food items, such as paper products, detergents, home cleaning supplies, pet foods and alcoholic beverages?

IF 'DON'T KNOW / CAN'T REMEMBER' PROBE: 'Can you give me an approximate amount?'

WRITE IN TO NEAREST £

Non-food items included

Respondents included a wide range of items in their answers to question 5. These included the following:

- Magazines and books
- Toilet roll and kitchen towel
- Toiletries
- Household cleaning products
- Non-prescription medicines
- Alcohol
- Flowers
- Pet food
- Stationary
- Hobbies
- Tobacco
- CDs/DVDs/video games

Respondents worked out the answer to this question in a variety of ways. Where there were other household members who spent money on these items and they did not know the amount they just did not include their spending. This question will therefore underestimate household spending.

XPFOOD3_G3

In the past month, have you or any members of your household purchased any food or non-alcoholic beverages from places other than supermarkets or grocery stores, such as the bakers, butcher, delicatessen, home delivery, vegetable or farmer's markets?

EXCLUDE FOOD EATEN OUT AT RESTAURANTS OR CAFES OR TAKE AWAYS

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

{ASK IF Q6 CODED YES (1)}

XPFOOD4_G3

About how much has your household spent on food at these places in the last month?

IF `DON'T KNOW / CAN'T REMEMBER' PROBE: `Can you give me an approximate amount?'

WRITE IN TO NEAREST £

Money spent on food for the home

Overall, respondents had no problems answering these questions. Restaurants, cafes and meals at work were not included. The term delicatessen was not universally understood. Supermarket home deliveries were included in here as were specialist shops such as those selling Asian foodstuffs.

XPFDOUT_G3

And can you tell me approximately how much you (and members of your household) spent on meals or food purchased outside the home in the last month?

IF `DON'T KNOW / CAN'T REMEMBER' PROBE: `Can you give me an approximate amount?'

WRITE IN TO NEAREST £

Money spent on food outside of the home

This question caused some confusion to respondents as they were not sure what to include and exclude. They tended to include meals out, takeaways and children's school meals, but they were quite unsure about this: "*I found this confusing as I thought I had been asked a similar question*".

People were also not sure whether to include spending on meals at work. The question asks about "food purchased outside the home" which can be confusing to some respondents as they had already been asked about some food purchases.

XPALTOB_G3

About how much have you (and members of your household) spent on the following items in the last month?

READ OUT EACH and ENTER AMOUNT TO NEAREST £

IF `DON'T KNOW / CAN'T REMEMBER' PROBE: `Can you give me an approximate amount?'

- A Alcohol and tobacco
- B Clothing and footwear for all household members
- C Medicines, prescriptions and other health expenses

D	Car and public transport costs
E	Telephone, including landline, mobile and internet costs
F	Entertainment, leisure activities and hobbies

Money spent on items

The main issue with this question, in common with many other questions in this section, was that respondents were unsure which household members to include in their answers. Even if they did know who to include, and remembered to include all household members, they did not know how much other household members had spent in the particular categories.

Clothing and footwear

This category in particular was one where a large amount of difficulty was found in answering on behalf of other household members. If respondents had spent more money than usual on clothing in the last month, they sometimes decreased the amount, as they felt it did not reflect what they usually spent. One respondent, for example, decreased the amount as they 'didn't like to think about it'.

Car and public transport costs

There was confusion when answering this question about what exactly should be included. The following list shows what various respondents included/excluded when making their calculations:

- Petrol
- Car tax
- Insurance
- MOT and servicing
- Public transport costs

Insurance, tax and MOT costs provided particular problems. Frequently these costs are paid yearly, and there was uncertainty about whether these amounts should be divided by 12 and included, even if they were not actually paid out in the last month.

Entertainment, leisure activities and hobbies

There were no particular problems reported when answering this question and there were no differences between the types of activity included by the general population and ethnic minority groups. The only query was whether 'drinking alcohol in pubs' should be included.

The typical types of activities included were:

- Cinema
- Gym/swimming/other sporting activities
- DVDs
- Painting
- Photography
- Music
- Nights out

Additional categories

Additional categories that respondents thought should be included in question 9 were:

- Childcare
- School fees
- Money to family members not living in the household
- Travel and holidays

General findings

Respondents generally tended to work out weekly answers to the questions and multiply them by four to reach a monthly total. However, this was mainly the case when calculating money spent on food and groceries. It did not occur when calculating amount spent on clothing, telephone and Internet costs and health expenses (e.g. prescriptions). For these items respondents varied between reporting usual spending, what they would like to spend, what they spent in the last month with downward adjustments or what they remembered spending in the last month.

Comparison of versions A, B and C

Out of the three versions of the questions, respondents preferred to answer version C although it was more long-winded. Respondents did not report finding this section overly burdensome and interviewers gave positive feedback on this version at the debriefing. This version also seemed to give more accurate answers as respondents tended to forget to include certain types of item in versions A and B. Comparing answers to the three versions, the different approaches resulted in very different figures for consumption being reported, with the sum of the answers for version C often being larger than the answers to either A or B.

'Usual month' versus 'last month'

There was a very mixed response with regard to preferences between working out expenditure for the last month, or for a 'usual month', for both the general population and the ethnic minority sample.

Respondents who preferred to answer with respect to last month gave the reason that it was better in terms of recall, as it was fresher in their minds. One respondent for example said:

"It is much easier to remember and reflect on the last month as you're clearer on what you've spent and it'd be fresher in your memory".

(Male, 60+, White British, Phase 2)

The respondents who stated that it was easier to answer in terms of a 'usual month' gave the following reasons for their preference:

- Every month was different
- If the past month's spends were unusually high and would not give a true reflection of how much is usually spent
- "A usual month approach cuts out extra costs such as the cost of a birthday in one particular month, but allows inclusion of a third of the quarterly bills"*

(Female, 72, White British, Phase 2).

Inclusion of other members of the household

In general, ethnic minority respondents found it easier than general population respondents to take account of the amount spent by other members of their households. Ethnic minority respondents typically said that their families were ‘very close’ or that the person responding ‘had control of the family finances’.

General population respondents found it difficult thinking about other members of the household, particularly if they had separate bank accounts as some did with their spouse/partner. Respondents found it especially difficult to answer if they had children who, though living at home, were financially independent.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<p>➤ Overall we would recommend that Version C is used since it encourages respondents to think about different types of spending rather than ‘plucking a figure from the air’. Where respondents attempted to answer Versions A and B by adding up different types of expenditure this was more difficult than when they were taken through item by item in Version C.</p> <p>Some modifications are recommended to Version C.</p> <p>General</p> <p>➤ In the current format these questions could be asked of a young adult in a household who has little or no responsibility for household spending. An instruction should be included for interviewers to indicate that these should only be asked of the household reference person or spouse and ideally the questionnaire design should allow these questions to be returned to if the person completing the household questionnaire is someone different.</p> <p>➤ Retain the last month reference period but include an instruction to respondents to report on the last month even if it was not typical. In CAPI a textfill could be used to be explicit about what is meant by the last month (since date). However for respondents who arrange their spending in calendar months it might be easier for them to think about the last calendar month. A decision needs to be made on what is intended and respondents should be told.</p> <p>➤ Although it applied to all questions there was a problem for respondents who had other household members whose expenditure they were not aware of – this was particularly a problem for those with teenagers or young adults. One possibility would be to include a new question:</p> <p>Have any members of your household spent money on any of the items asked about in the previous questions which you have not included in your answers?</p> <p>If the answer is yes, it might be possible to include a small individual expenditure section in the individual questionnaire asking about the most problematic categories such as alcohol, toiletries and meals. This could lead to double counting but it is likely with the current questionnaire that for some types of households there will be substantial under-reporting.</p> <p>➤ Items of expenditure which were not covered by the existing questions included childcare, school fees, money sent to family</p>	<p>➤ Recommendation about clarity of time over which respondents were asked to report was implement. We used “the last four weeks” rather than “last month” or some other monthly designation so as to be clear about</p> <p>➤ Recommendation to include a question regarding whether amounts do not reflect moneys spent by other household members was not incorporated. Instead, preamble to section was amended to ask respondents to expressly include the expenditure for all household members, even if not sure how much people spend (see below). We did not include any questions in the individual questionnaire on personal expenditure.</p> <p>➤ Recommendation about dropping XPFOOD3 and retaining XPFOOD4 was not followed. However, the initial question in the series was a version of XPFOOD3 as we felt this was the core information we were seeking. (see below)</p> <p>➤ Recommendation about being explicit in XPFDOUT was followed insofar as the wording of the initial question was altered to</p>

outside the household and travel and holidays. A decision needs to be taken about whether these should be included and, if so, appropriate questions need to be included or existing questions could be reworded to incorporate them.

Specific

- XPFOOD3_G3 which asks a yes/ no question seems unnecessary. Drop this and retain XPFOOD4_G3. An instructions should be given to interviewers on all the questions that if the respondent has spent no money they should enter 0.
- XPFDOUT_G3: it was unclear to respondents what should be included here. Suggest rewording so it asks about 'meals and snacks'. A decision needs to be made on what to include here – for example should crisps and chocolate bars from newsagents and ice creams from vans be included here or is this question about cooked and prepared food? Examples of the types of outlet to be included should also be given: 'for example from takeaways, restaurants and sandwich shops'. Depending on the intention of this question the examples should be adjusted. Problem categories such as school or work canteen meals should be explicitly included or excluded in the question text.
- XPALTOB_G3: Car and public transport costs caused particular problems. Examples of the types of expenses should be included and guidance should be given on what to do if an annual expense happens to have fallen in the last month.

include instructions on how to answer the question. (see below)

- Recommendation at XPALTOB was followed, in part, as question is more specific about place of purchase. This was informed by discussion in cognitive interviewing report. Note, question was restricted to be only about alcohol (see below)

Benefits

The main aim of a section of questions about benefits is to exhaustively enumerate all sources of unearned income. Considering that only small proportions of respondents who are surveyed are expected to be receiving certain benefits, there would be little sense in asking all respondents all of the benefits questions as this will add unnecessary time to an already lengthily interview. It is therefore imperative that instead screening questions are successful in their ability to screen for certain benefits so that we can be confident that respondents for whom the questions do apply get asked them, and those for whom they don't are routed past them.

The benefits question module was asked to both general population (GP) and ethnic minority (EM) respondents. As already stated, the recruitment for people to take part in cognitive interviews specifically focussed on ensuring respondents receiving different types of benefits were interviewed.

Benefit screeners

INTRO

READ OUT INTRODUCTION: One of the most important parts of our research is how people are getting by financially these days. We have found that we need to ask about a number of different types of income because otherwise our results could be misleading. I'd like to remind you that anything you tell me is completely confidential.

{ASK ALL}

BENEFIT_G3

First, are you currently receiving any State Benefit or Tax Credit (including State Pension, Allowances, Child Benefit or National Insurance Credits)?

1Yes
2No

{ASK ALL}

PAYMENT_G3

Aside from any State Benefit or Tax Credit, are you currently receiving any other sort of regular payment such as from an employment or private pension, maintenance or alimony, an education grant, rent from property, sickness or accident insurance?

1Yes
2No

Interviewers and brackets

Interviewer feedback raised an important point with regards to which parts of the question they were supposed to read out. As NatCen interviewers are trained to refrain from reading parts of survey questions which are (in brackets), it is important that this is borne in mind when finalising this question, and the entire questionnaire, to ensure that only parts of questions interviewers are not supposed to read out are bracketed. For the purpose of the cognitive testing interviewers did read out the entire question.

Findings

In general if respondents were receiving benefits, they tended to know that they were. Otherwise people's knowledge around what different benefits were was hazy. With this in mind however, respondents were not always clear about the types of benefits they did receive and could quite easily become confused over the names of them, especially those classed as 'tax credits'.

BENEFIT_G3

The following cases are examples of when respondents displayed confusion when answering this question and provide evidence to suggest that the screening question does not always necessarily pick up on those receiving all types of benefits:

- One respondent was unsure about what she gets: *"I get some for the children, child benefit, and I think I get tax credits as well. I think it is child tax credit"*(answered YES);
- One respondent was unsure of the names of the benefits he receives: *"what's the name of the other one now, not attendance and Disability allowance?"* (answered YES);
- One respondent answered NO to this question, despite admitting that he was on income support and disability allowance (it appeared that he had concerns that this was a checking exercise); and,
- One respondent was confused about child tax credits and working tax credits, at this stage, but still answered yes.

Of those who found BENEFIT_G3 easy to answer, and answered promptly with little or no hesitation, tended to be respondents who:

- were claiming benefits because they were unemployed;
- were in full time employment and *"just knew"* they were not receiving any benefits;
- were receiving state pension (either as well as or instead of a private pension); or,
- were sure they were receiving working tax credit and child benefit.

Understandings of examples

Respondents were asked about their understanding of the different examples mentioned in the question. Although people tended to be able to give better definitions if they were receiving those given as examples, others who were not necessarily in receipt of them could on occasion broadly define them:

- **State benefit:** a benefit from the state;
- **Tax credit:** for families on low income with children; and/or,
- **Child benefit:** anyone with children receive this.

Other issues

Although there were cases where respondents were correctly disregarding payments that their spouses received (on behalf of their children or the household), we did also find that respondents could answer this question thinking about their family jointly: so a male respondent could answer YES even if it was his wife who received the child benefit. This could be problematic as it would result in double reporting but presumably this could be dealt with fairly easily either during or post data collection.

PAYMENT_G3

Respondents could report that there were too many examples to consider in this question: *"you're asking five things and I've got to remember what the first one was"*, and that it might be better to pause after each one.

A common mistake for respondents in our sample was to include their **income from work** after hearing the words 'payment such as from an employer'. Respondents heard the word 'employment' and did not link it to 'pension'. For example, one respondent said he heard the word 'employment' which made him think it applied to him. On the flip side respondents did not always include employment pensions, possibly because this is lumped together with, and comes prior to, private pension in the question.

Understandings of examples

- **Private pension:** money purchase pension, company pension
- **Maintenance or alimony:** money payments for ex-spouses and children following divorces
- **Education grant:** presumably to help with your children's education

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<p>➤ We recommend that the screening question is retained, however with an altered INTRO and is reworded. We also suggest that the list of benefits (as referred to as a-h) appear on the interviewers screen so that if a respondent is unsure they can check with the interviewer. Or if the interviewer has reason to believe that the respondent could be receiving a benefit (for example if they are visibly disabled, unemployed or have children in the household), they are able to check:</p> <p>➤ We recommend that the examples which are included in the question are those which are known to be underreported. We have suggested a few below but these could be altered – however we</p>	<p>➤ The introductory preamble was carried as per recommendation.</p> <p>➤ Contrary to the recommendation, the screening question for receipt of State benefits was not retained. Instead the specific forced choice for each major category of benefit will be presented to respondents.</p>

would recommend that child benefit is retained, as is a reference to tax credits.

INTRO

READ OUT INTRODUCTION: One of the most important parts of our research is how people are getting by financially these days. We have found that we need to ask about a number of different types of income because otherwise our results could be misleading. Please think about ALL of the extra sources of income you receive, as well as any benefits or tax credits. If you are at all unsure about whether something would count, you can check with me. I'd like to remind you that anything you tell me is completely confidential.

{ASK ALL}

BENEFIT_G3

First, are you currently receiving any State Benefit or Tax Credit including State Pension, Child Benefit, Working tax credits, National Insurance Credits or income support?

1Yes

2No

{ASK ALL}

PAYMENT_G3

Aside from any State Benefit or Tax Credit, are you currently receiving any other sort of regular payment such as a private or an employment pension, maintenance or alimony, an education grant, rent from property or sickness or accident insurance?

1Yes

2No

The actual categories were rephrased slightly for clarity as a result of cognitive testing findings.

- Note the “single person council tax discount” is expressly excluded from housing or council tax benefits in this listing as a result of cognitive interviewing findings.

First, we would like to know about your receipt of any state benefits. Which of the following types of benefits, tax credits or other payments are you currently receiving / [either just yourself or jointly] {hhsz > 1}?

INTERVIEWER: ASK EACH AND CODE

- 1 Unemployment-related benefits, or National Insurance Credits?
- 2 Income Support
- 3 Sickness, disability or incapacity benefits
- 4 Any sort of pension including a private pension or the State pension
- 5 Child Benefit
- 6 Tax credits, including working tax and child tax credits
- 7 Any other family related benefits or payments
- 8 Housing or Council Tax Benefit, other than the single person council tax discount {TFTax = 1} / Rent or Rate Rebate {TFTax = 0}
- 9 Some other state benefit
- 10 None of these

- Respondents who met certain conditions but answered “No” to Item 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 8 were double checked for their receipt of specific benefits at subsequent questions. For example, someone indicating they were disabled earlier in the questionnaire but failing to state they receive disability

	<p>benefits of any kind would automatically receive the disability specific benefit questions subsequently.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The filter “Payment” retained as per recommendation. The words “employment pension” were replaced with “occupational pension” as a result of cognitive interviewing findings but the recommended wording will not otherwise be used: ➤ Note that recommendations regarding the that the response category “any other regular payment” were not implemented because analysis of the IP data suggested no distributional differences for this category.
--	--

Benefits types

{ASK IF BENEFIT_G3 CODED YES (1)}

a - i

Which of the following types of benefits are you currently receiving either just yourself or jointly?

ASK EACH AND CODE:

a) Unemployment-related benefits, or National Insurance Credits?

1Yes

2No

b) Income Support?

1Yes

2No

c) Sickness or disability benefits?

1Yes

2No

d) State Pension?

1Yes

2No

e) Child Benefit?

1Yes

2No

f) Any other family related benefits?

1Yes

2No

g) Housing or Council Tax Benefit?

1Yes

2No

h) Tax credits?

1Yes

2No

i) Some other state benefit?

1Yes

2No

Findings

Here we discuss the findings which came out from testing the individual parts of this question and detail respondents' comprehension of the types of benefits. On the whole respondents either had minimal knowledge about the different types of benefits, could give clear definitions of some and not others and/or reported confusion around the names of different benefits and in particular terminology used to describe, and names of, 'tax credits'. Additionally there was some confusion around where to code Incapacity benefits.

The following sections show a combination of respondents understandings of the benefits along with where there was uncertainty around what to include and where confusion arose.

a) Unemployment-related benefits, or National Insurance Credits

- Job seekers allowance and the dole;
- Something you get when you are not working (unemployment-related); and,
- When you are not working you can get NI credits (National Insurance credits).

b) Income Support

- Low earners, low paid.

c) Sickness or disability benefits

- This is for people who are off work long term with sickness, e.g. back problems; and,
- Questioning over whether to include a long term disability benefit here.

d) State pension

- For the over 65's; and,
- State help for those who are retired.

e) Child benefit

- Not means tested and given to everyone who has a child;
- Available to anyone who has children (below the age of 16); and,
- Similar to the state pension, in the same way the state gives money to children as they do pensioners.

f) Any other family related benefits

- Questioning whether working tax credits should be included here and assuming they would be;
- Including tax credits here;
- Could be payments for adult dependants;
- Money you get for looking after a sick relatives / carer allowance; and,
- Money for fostering or being a guardian for someone else

g) Housing or Council Tax Benefit

- People on low income who get a percentage off their council tax bill;
- Including, or questioning whether to include, single person council tax discount; and,
- Financial help for those who can not afford their rent.

h) Tax Credits

- 'Top ups' for low income families;
- Confusion over tax credits, child tax credits and child benefit;
- Confusion over what these might be; and,
- Questioning over whether working tax credits should be included here and assuming they would.

j) some other state benefit

- war pension
- widows pension

Recommendations:

➤ We recommend that these questions are asked in the following order, with the following alterations to the wording:

- a) Unemployment-related benefits or National Insurance Credits
- b) Income support
- c) Sickness, disability or incapacity benefit
- d) State pension
- e) Child benefit
- h) Tax credits, including working tax and child tax credits
- f) Any other family related benefits
- g) Housing or Council tax Benefit
- i) some other state benefit (PLEASE SPECIFY)

Additional detailed questions about benefits

Due to the small number of respondents who were asked the individual subsequent questions, we are unable to give much detail about how they work in practice.

The following findings are worth noting:

- Confusion around what 'contracted out' of SERPS meant and therefore how you would answer the question which refers to SERPS

- Respondents would often say they were not sure what they received and would offer to go and retrieve documentation
- The words ‘Just yourself or jointly’ could make respondents think about, and sometimes include, a benefit which their spouse received for themselves
- Respondents could question whether to include the 25% single person council tax discount: We would recommend that a interviewer check is inserted at that question.

{ASK IF PAYMENT_G3 CODED YES (1)}

(Aside from the types of payments we’ve been discussing) / (And) which of the following types of payments are you currently receiving either just yourself or jointly?

ASK EACH AND CODE

1 Yes

2 No

(A) A pension from a previous employer?

(B) A pension from a spouse’s previous employer?

(C) A private pension or annuity?

(D) Education Grant other than a Student Loan or Tuition Fee Loan

(E) Trade Union or Friendly Society Payment

(F) Maintenance or Alimony

(G) Payments from a family member not living with you

(H) Rent from Boarders or Lodgers (not family members) living here with you

(I) Rent from any other property

(J) Sickness or Accident Insurance?

(K) Any other regular payment

Findings

Respondents who answered YES to PAYMENT_G3 then got asked this question. On the whole respondents were able to provide answers to this question, this of course was easier if they were clear on what they were currently receiving. The cognitive testing did reveal some problems which we now report on.

Current Vs regular payments

There were occasions where a respondent was asked all of those in the list and then could question whether some of the things they received should be included, if they were less regular or one off payments (for example those received annually). We suspect that this querying may have come about anyway or may have been a result of hearing (K) Any other regular payment?. This brings about concerns over how someone should answer parts (A)-(J) of this question if they do receive less frequent payments, or have received one off payments. An Education grant for example (D) would probably be a one off payment and equally someone could have just received a one off large sum of money from a family member (G). In both of these examples it would be unclear how the respondent should answer.

(A) A pension from a previous employer / (C) A private pension or annuity

Respondents did not always make a clear distinction between (A) and (C). Although they could be very clear on the difference, for example one respondent said was definite that he had an employer pension and not a private pension and said “you

couldn't afford it in those days", they could also see the two as the same thing and sometimes answer YES to both or YES to (C) despite having an employment pension and visa versa. One respondent for example said he thought an employment pension and a private pension was the same thing however he correctly only answered YES to (A).

(I) Rent from any other property

Interviewers reported that they thought there could be some confusion with 'payments received' and 'income'. For example one respondent answered NO to (I), explaining that the payments he receives just cover the mortgage he has on the property so he did not see this as income. Additionally there was some confusion with rent from a property and rent from lodgers.

(K) Any other regular payments

Finally respondents could become confused at this question. There were instances where respondents said they did not know what would be included here and other times where respondents were unsure whether to include payments or income here. One respondent for example had investments but was unsure whether to include them here as he thought they would come under 'income' so said NO. Another respondent hesitated here before answering YES as he does regular part time work.

Recommendations:

- We would recommend that the question is retained but is reworded:
Aside from the types of payments we've been discussing, which of the following types of payments or sources of income are you currently receiving, either yourself or jointly?
 - The aims of this question need to be readdressed. If the aim is to only pick up on regular payments then it would be ok to ask (A), (B), (C), (F), (H) and (I) as they are, as these type of payments are highly likely to be regular in nature. The other options would need to be reworded so that the question captures 'regular' payments, so for example (D) regular Education Grant other than a Student Loan or Tuition Fee Loan.
 - If the aim is different then we would suggest that separate questions are asked about (D), (E), (G) and (J) as these are more likely to be less regular payments.
- NOTE: May need to adjust question wording depending on what is decided.

6 MIGRATION HISTORY AND REMITTANCES

Migration history

These questions were asked only of the ethnic minority sample as they are designed to ask about degree of migration since first coming to the UK.

Country of birth questions

Q7a

Were you born in the UK?

1 Yes - GO TO Q14

2 No

{ASK IF Q7a CODED NO (2)}

Q7b

How old were you when you first came to the UK to live?

WRITE IN:

{ASK IF Q7a CODED NO (2)}

Q8

When you came to the UK to live, did you come directly from your country of birth or did you live in another country or countries before living here?

- 1) DIRECT FROM BIRTH COUNTRY
- 2) FROM OTHER COUNTRY

{ASK IF Q8 CODED 'FROM OTHER COUNTRY' (2)}

Q9

Which country or countries?

INTERVIEWER: Allow more than one response.

WRITE IN:

Findings

On the whole there were no problems with these questions. Respondents found these questions straightforward to answer. In the cases where respondents had lived in another country between leaving their country of birth and coming to the UK to live, they stated that this was a question they had been asked a number of times by the immigration authorities, therefore it was easy for them to recall the answer.

One respondent answered NO but questioned whether people who were born in former British colonies should be classed as being born in the UK: "*No, I was not actually born in the UK but I was part of the British colonies, I was in the British West Indies*".

There were no problems with recall reported. Recall was typically carried out by thinking back to a memorable event and placing moving to the UK in relation to this

on a timeline. Examples of this were the start of university study or the birth of a child.

Countries lived in questions

{ASK IF Q7a CODED 'NO' (2)}

Q10

Since you first came to the UK to live, have you returned to your country of birth to live for a year or more?

- 1) YES
- 2) NO

{ASK IF Q7a CODED 'NO' (2)}

Q11

Since coming to the UK have you lived in any countries other than the UK or your country of birth for a year or more?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

{ASK IF Q11 CODED YES (1)}

Q12

Which country or countries?

INTERVIEWER: Allow more than one response

WRITE IN

{ASK IF Q7a CODED YES (1)}

Q13

Have you lived in any countries other than the UK for a year or more

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

{ASK IF Q13 CODED YES (1)}

Q14

Which country or countries?

INTERVIEWER: Allow more than one response.

WRITE IN

Findings

There were no problems reported with this question, and respondents had no difficulty recalling the answers. There were no countries lived in that respondents were unsure whether to include or not. The way respondents went about answering the question was by thinking back to see whether they had returned to their native country. Evidence suggests that respondents found it easy to answer regardless of time period for example one respondent remembered he had returned to the Caribbean in the sixties.

Number of times moved

Q15

Roughly how many times have you moved home since you [were aged 14] [came to the UK to live] – either on your own or with family?

ENTER NUMBER, ENTER 0 TIMES AS 0

Findings

Two main issues arose from cognitive testing of this question:

- A difficulty distinguishing between the number of households lived in and the number of actual moves made; and,
- A question of whether to include house moves made whilst at university

Respondents who had these problems chose to discount their university days and it appears that respondents who had difficulty in distinguishing between moving and living estimated an answer.

Recall

There were some problems with recall experienced by the respondents. If respondents had moved a number of times, they sometimes reported having to give an approximation. On occasion respondents used significant life events to assist in recalling the number of times they had moved home. These included moving out of their parents' home, moving to be with partners, marriage, divorce and relocation for a new job.

Distances of residences

{ASK IF ANSWERED 1 OR MORE AT Q15}

Q16

How far do you now live from where you were living when [you were 14] [you came to the UK to live]?

- 1 Less than 2 miles
- 2 Between 2 and 5 miles
- 3 Between 5 and 20 miles
- 4 Between 20 and 50 miles
- 5 Between 50 and 100 miles
- 6 More than 100 miles

{ASK IF ANSWERED 2 OR MORE AT Q15, AND AT Q16 CODED 1 OR 2}

Q17

Since [you were 14] [you came to the UK to live], have you ever lived further than 5 miles from where you live now?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

{ASK IF Q17 CODED YES (1)}

Q18

What is the furthest away you've lived? READ OUT ...

- 1 Between 5 and 20 miles
- 2 Between 20 and 50 miles
- 3 Between 50 and 100 miles
- 4 More than 100 miles
- 5 In a country outside the UK?

Findings

On the whole respondents reported no problems answering this question. Generally miles were not a problem and all respondents gave answers. Those that were uncertain made an estimated guess by thinking of the time it takes to travel from their previous home so there were cases where respondents preferred to give their answer in terms of time rather than mileage: *"It's about an hour's drive so how far is that?"*. One respondent specifically stated that she would have preferred to give her answer in this format.

Concept of 'live'

Respondents were asked what the word 'live' meant to them. Respondents thought of 'living' somewhere as either being a feeling e.g. feeling settled, or as something more tangible e.g. owning a home.

Table 4 below shows examples of the different definitions respondents used when asked this question:

Table 4 Definitions used when asked this question

Tangible	Feeling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owning a home • Being with family • Having a job 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling settled • Having stability • Having commitments • Having no intentions to move

Respondents definition of 'live' was a permanent residency for a certain time period (at least six months). Respondents felt 'living' was *"staying at the same place...being with a family/belonging/owning a place of resident."*. Commonly respondents referred to setting up a family home when defining living they saw it as *"were you settle down"*.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ISER need to clarify what is meant by moving home – for example are student house moves to be included? Does it mean moving property or moving household? ➤ Need to clarify question, or have an extra answer category, 'Were you born in the UK? as it may be difficult to answer if someone was born in a British colony. ➤ We recommend that there is an answer code adapted for the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All recommendations have been implemented, however the entire sequence has been altered to reflect change in PI measurement interests:

question about number of moves which allows respondents to give the number of moves in ranges, rather than a number.

- Clarify that the question is about number of times moved, rather than number of homes lived in.

Q15

Roughly how many times have you moved to a new address since you [were aged 14] [came to the UK to live] – either on your own or with family?

READ OUT/SHOW CARD:

1-2 times

3-5 times

6-9 times

10 or more times

I have never moved

Remittances

The measurement objectives of this section are as follows:

1. To establish whether respondents send money to other households abroad, and how much.
2. To measure the amount of money going out of family / household income.
3. To measure the amount going into the country of 'origin' for respondent.
4. To determine whether such payments are to support kin, to provide help more generally for 'community' or a form of savings or investment (e.g. in property).

A key issue addressed by the cognitive testing was to establish what respondents understood by the term "anyone" in the first question i.e. do respondents think of just individuals they might send money to, or are institutions such as banks or mortgage providers also included in this concept? Another issue under investigation was what accounting period respondents think of when answering this section, and whether this varied for payments of different regularity and amount.

Q1

Did you send or take any payments to anyone in a country outside the UK in the last year?

1)YES

2)NO

{ASK IF Q1 CODED YES (1)}

Q2

What were the reasons for the payment or payments?

DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY:

1)Repayment of loan

2)Support for family member or members

3)Support for community

4)Investment/savings

{ASK IF Q1 CODED YES (1)}

Q3

How often did you make such payments in the last year?

READ OUT ...

- 1)once,
- 2)twice,
- 3)3 or 4 times,
- 4)5 to 9 times,
- 5)every month or most months, or
- 6)more than once a month?

{ASK IF Q1 CODED YES (1)}

Q4

Is this a regular payment you make?

- 1)Yes
- 2)No

{ASK IF Q1 CODED YES (1)}

Q5

What was the amount of the last payment?

WRITE IN AMOUNT:

{ASK IF Q1 CODED YES (1)}

Q6

Was this a usual amount?

- 1)Yes
- 2)No

{ASK IF Q6 CODED NO (2)}

Q7

What is the usual amount you send or carry?

WRITE IN AMOUNT:

{ASK IF Q1 CODED YES (1)}

Q8

To which country did you send or make this last payment?

WRITE IN COUNTRY:

Findings

Cognitive testing revealed that respondents encountered numerous problems when answering this question. Clarification of what the question meant was asked for and original responses given were seen to change as a result of further reflection and probing. Problems started with the initial question, with respondents being unsure

about what was being asked, namely what sort of payments they were meant to consider, and to whom. Some aspects of question wording also lead to respondents misinterpreting the question. Respondents could be suspicious about why the question was being asked and could also have difficulties in recalling specific details of payments made. All these findings are explained further below.

Concepts of 'payments'

The use of the word 'payment' was found to be problematic as respondents could interpret it in different ways. Respondents could understand the term in a manner that was either too narrow or too broad

Narrow concept of 'payments'

Respondents who held a narrow concept of 'payment' thought the term only implied formal business arrangements, and thereby did not associate it with giving money to family or friends. For example, one respondent said:

"It's that word, 'payments.' That means something commercial. If that had said money I would have immediately thought 'presents.'"

(Female, 50, ethnic minority, Phase 3).

Payments were associated with paying of money owed, for instance to lenders or mortgage brokers, and inferred large quantities of money.

Broad concept of 'payments'

Conversely, other respondents held a much broader idea of what to include as a 'payment to anyone in a country outside of the UK,' when answering the question. This meant that the measure, to determine money being sent abroad, was over inclusive in the case of certain respondents. For example, one respondent gave precise details of a small purchase (under £20) she made on E-Bay, as she was making a 'payment' to someone abroad. Other payments, which the question was not intended to measure, but which respondents included in their answers, were holidays bought directly from an agent abroad, paying for items on holiday, or sending small birthday gifts to young relatives abroad.

Concepts of 'anyone'

Another problem identified was that respondents held divergent beliefs about who the term 'anyone' referred to the initial question. Again, respondents could either take the term in two ways, narrow or broad:

Narrow concept of 'anyone'

Some respondents who held a narrow concept of 'anyone' only considered family members or friends living abroad when answering this question. They did not consider financial institutions, such as banks or lenders when answering. Alternatively, respondents who held a narrow concept of the term 'payment' only thought of financial institutions when answering, and did not include friends or family.

Broad concept of 'anyone'

Respondents who held a broad conception of what the question was about thought about a variety of reasons for sending money abroad, and took anyone to refer to both known individuals (such as friends or family), charities and financial institutions. It should be noted that providing money for friends was repeatedly mentioned as

being a possible reason for sending money abroad so it is recommended that it is included in the list of reasons for payment coded at Q2.

The divergent interpretations exhibited in this section result from respondents being provided with very little information about the specifics of what the question is intended to measure. It is therefore recommended that an introductory sentence should be used to illustrate what sort of things respondents should consider when answering this question. Once respondents have been given clarification on what sort of payments are worth considering, and to whom, the process of answering should become simpler, with key concepts more convergent between respondents.

Further ambiguities regarding question wording

Aside from the issues already discussed the following problems were found with wording of the question:

- 1) The word 'take' in the phrase 'send or *take* payments to' was repeatedly misinterpreted as meaning *receiving* money from someone outside of the UK rather than *giving* money to someone outside of the UK. The verb *to take* can be synonymous with the verb *to get*, and therefore is confusing in this context, particularly for respondents who may not have English as their first language.
- 2) The word 'carry' in Q7 ('What is the usual amount you send or carry?') is ambiguous, as it could refer to either how much money you take abroad when you travel, or the amount you make as a payment whilst abroad.

It is therefore recommended that the words 'take' and 'carry' are replaced with less ambiguous substitutes.

Undesirable connotations of question

Further to the problems about ambiguities in the questions' wording and scope, the concern was raised that the question held negative connotations. Interviewers were worried that not all respondents were answering the question honestly, or that the respondents seemed uncomfortable answering. The following issues are potential reasons why respondents felt uneasy being asked this question:

- Respondents were suspicious about the motivations behind the question as they could not see why it was being asked;
- Respondents thought the question implied money laundering, a black economy or "*under the table*" activities; and,
- Respondents could feel this question might be a way of authorities checking up on them, for instance if they are sending benefit money abroad.

It is therefore recommended that the question is introduced with a short sentence normalising the practise of sending money abroad, to reduce these possible negative connotations and hereby reduce question sensitivity.

Issues of timeframe and recall

Respondents had different conceptions of what was meant by, 'last year' with some thinking about the last whole calendar year (i.e. 2007) and others thinking about the last 12 months. Therefore it is recommended that a more specific timeframe is defined.

A final problem regarding this question was that not all respondents were able to accurately recall the amounts they sent abroad, or how often they had done so in the past year. This was particularly true for respondents who made multiple payments at irregular times of irregular quantities. However, it should be noted that during the cognitive interviews respondents were not asked about how much and how regularly they sent payments for each of the categories mention at Q2 but rather how much money they sent abroad in total, and how regularly. It should be easier for respondents to accurately recall information if the cognitive task is broken down into smaller chunks as the original routing recommended, and therefore some of these recall problems may be alleviated in the main stage of the survey.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Alter the word 'payments' to the word 'money' in the first instance to prevent respondents thinking of only formal arrangements with financial institutions at Q1 ➤ Provide an introduction with diverse examples of reasons people may send money abroad so respondents have a broad understanding of the term 'anyone.' ➤ Use the introduction to normalise money sending behaviour and hopefully reduce question sensitivity. ➤ Omit the word 'take' as it can be misconstrued as receive or get. Replace with something very specific such as hand-deliver. ➤ Omit the word 'carry' as it can be misconstrued as to have on one's person rather than to deliver. ➤ Include friends in the answer code 'support for family members' at Q2. ➤ Provide a more specific time for respondents to consider. 	<p>Recommendations accepted.</p>
<p>READ OUT There are many reasons people send money abroad. For example, people may have savings or investments outside the UK (such as a property abroad). People may also send money to provide support for family, friends or communities outside the UK.</p> <p>FOR ISER TO CONSIDER: This read out could encourage people to include charity donations e.g. sponsor a child or regular direct debit with a charity - is this question intended to pick up on this?</p> <p>Q1 Did you send, transfer or hand-deliver any money to any people or organisations in a country outside the UK in the last 12 months?</p> <p>1)YES 2)NO</p> <p>{ASK IF Q1 CODED YES (1)}</p> <p>Q2 What were the reasons for providing the money? DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY: 1)Repayment of loan 2)Support for family members or friends 3)Support for community</p>	

4)Investment/savings (whose are these? Respondents own?)
{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q2}

Q3

How often did you send, transfer or hand-deliver money for this in the last 12 months?

READ OUT ...

- 1)once,
- 2)twice,
- 3)3 or 4 times,
- 4)5 to 9 times,
- 5)every month or most months, or
- 6)more than once a month?

{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q2}

Q4

Is this a regular payment you make?

- 1)Yes
- 2)No

{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q2}

Q5

What was the amount of the last payment?

WRITE IN AMOUNT:

{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q2 WHEN Q3 > 1 & Q4 CODED YES (1)}

Q6

Was this a usual amount?

- 1)Yes
- 2)No

{ASK IF Q6 CODED NO (2)}

Q7

What is the usual amount you send, transfer or hand-deliver?

WRITE IN AMOUNT:

{ASK FOR EACH CODED AT Q2}

Q8

To which country did you send or make this last payment?

WRITE IN COUNTRY:

7 COHABITATION AND DATA LINKAGE

Cohabitation

The measurement objective of this section is to identify respondents who have ever lived with a partner outside of marriage. The section also aims to measure whether or not married (or formerly married) respondents ever lived with their spouse prior to marriage.

The issues examined during cognitive testing were whether the term living together 'as a couple' was meaningful to respondents, whether this was a sensitive question to ask ethnic minority respondents and whether the timeframe under consideration was appropriate. These questions were asked of Ethnic Minority (EM) respondents only.

{ASK ALL}

INTERVIEWER READ OUT....

LCOH

As you know some couples live together without actually getting married. Have you ever lived with someone as a couple for three months or more without being married?

1Yes

2No

{Ask those who are (or who have been in the past) married or in a civil partnership}

INTERVIEWER READ OUT.. (Note: IF RESPONDENT SAYS THEY HAVE HAD MORE THAN ONE SPOUSE OR CIVIL PARTNER, ASK THEM TO THINK ABOUT THEIR CURRENT/ MOST RECENT).

LCMCOH/ LMCOH

Did you and your [husband/wife/civil partner] live together as a couple before you [got married/formed your civil partnership]?

1Yes

2No

Findings

In general no major problems were detected with these questions during the cognitive testing. Findings from the three main cognitive testing areas are reported below.

Concepts of living together 'as a couple'

Respondents held a fairly consistent understanding of what was meant by the term living together 'as a couple.' Descriptions given by the respondents included;

- Being in an intimate relationship;
- Living with someone who is your partner;

- Like being married, a personal partnership;
- Carrying out your life with someone as you would a spouse; and,
- Two individuals living together having a sexual relationship.

Respondents who did not overtly state the sexual nature of the relationship implied it, for instance, a common theme was that living together ‘as a couple’ meant doing all the things that married people do without actually being married.

Mostly, the concept of living as ‘a couple’ was not confused with the concept of living with someone who was just a friend. One respondent asked for clarification about whether the phrase could refer to friends but went on to say that he would read it as being more about people who lived as though they were married, or who had a family together. Areas where concepts of ‘a couple’ may diverge between respondents were whether short term relationships or non-exclusive relationships should be considered in this question.

Sensitivity

One key concern with this question was that it might be considered as too sensitive or embarrassing for respondents from different cultural backgrounds to answer. The cohabitation questions were tested on ethnic minority respondents as part of the Phase 3 testing and both those who had cohabited outside of marriage and those who had not answered it.

None of the respondents interviewed felt that the questions were too intrusive, regardless of whether or not they had cohabited with a partner outside of marriage. Respondents who felt that they personally would not cohabit with someone outside of marriage did not mind answering the question, or demonstrate any signs of discomfort. Therefore the cognitive testing unearthed no evidence to suggest that this question would be too sensitive for certain respondents.

Timeframe

No major issues were raised regarding the timeframe specified in the question. The only problem reported regarding timeframe was that one respondent found it hard to recall whether a previous relationship had lasted more than 3 months or not (the relationship in question had occurred more than 30 years ago). No other problems in recall were reported.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As cognitive revealed no fundamental problems with these questions it is recommended that no alterations are necessary. ➤ A routing question was included for the purposes of cognitive testing. In the main stage this routing question may not be needed if there are other questions which collect the same information elsewhere but the questionnaire will need to collect the information necessary for routing these questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The concept of “cohabitation” was used in the marital history protocol because the cognitive interviewing analysis suggested that there were little or no sensitive issues around this concept.

Data linkage consents

The purpose of the consent question is to inform respondents about data linkage and encourage them to give consent to link their survey data with in government administrative data. The main aims when developing a consents questions are to explore issues around sensitivity and ways in which asking for consents might be introduced in the least alarming or most reassuring way. There is concern that non-UK born respondents may be more anxious about the prospect of being matched to official records either for reasons of a national 'surveillance' culture or due to forced migration and/or mistrust in the UK government.

Particular aims of the cognitive question testing were:

- to assess whether there is anything in particular about the preamble which militates in favour or against the giving of consent;
- to explore whether the information could be presented in a more helpful way, or in a way which would be more likely to induce consent; and,
- to explore respondents' understandings of what they think will be done afterwards, if they were to give consent. For example how the link will be done, what data will be included etc.

Interviewers were instructed to read out the preamble, verbatim, and then give respondents the consents form and let them read it before they made their own decision. For particular queries, such as if a respondent asked why we wish to have them sign the form, interviewers were instructed to read further verbatim text-designed to alleviate concern. The consents form can be found in Appendix B.

The consents question was tested on both general population (GP) and ethnic minority (EM) respondents.

IP Consent preamble

INTERVIEWER READ OUT...

"We have asked you a wide range of questions relating to your life, economic circumstances, experiences, behaviour and beliefs. We would like to complement the information you have provided with additional information from administrative records held by different government departments. Like the answers you have given us, the information collected from these records will be completely confidential in accordance with the Data Protection Act. We need your permission for any information to be released. Could you please read through this form and sign it if you wish to give permission."

INTERVIEWER: HAND CONSENT FORM TO RESPONDENT.

IF RESPONDENT ASKS "WHY" READ:

"By linking data, we can avoid asking you many additional questions as the information is held in official records."

IF RESPONDENT ASKS ABOUT THE CONSEQUENCES OF SAYING "YES" READ:

“Like everything else you have told us, this information will be treated in strict confidence and will be used solely for research purposes. Taking part in this study will not affect your future dealings with the departments holding the records. You may withdraw your consent to linkage at any time.”

IF RESPONDENT ASKS HOW THE LINK WILL BE DONE READ:

“To link the information held in administrative records with your answers, we shall work with the government departments using information such as your name, address, sex and date of birth. These personal details will be removed as soon as the information has been linked.”

Findings

The consents question, as would be expected, evoked mixed reactions, concerns and queries. When they agreed to sign the form, respondents mentioned similar reasoning for having done so. On occasion, ethnic minority (EM) respondents raised additional concerns which did not arise among the general population (GP) respondents (these are marked below as EM only). It is difficult to say if these concerns would be exclusive to people from different ethnic groups.

Agreement to give consents

Those who were happy to give consent, reported having understood the request and did not find anything confusing about it. On occasion respondents would spend some time digesting the information on the form but after doing so gave consent for data linkage.

Those respondents who gave consent, did so for the following reasons:

- were not concerned or worried as understood it to be for research purposes only;
- said they had “*nothing to hide*” or that the information they had given was the truth and/or no secret;
- assumed that it was a check that the information they had provided was the truth: “*they want proof that I’m not lying*”;
- thought that it was about DWP gaining further information from the respondent, such as about earnings and income, benefits or NI contributions;
- assumed that the information could be found out anyway: “*they could find out anyway, if they wanted to...doesn’t bother me them knowing what I get*”;
- displayed an appreciation for the importance of social research;
- understood that the information would be kept confidential however still had concerns about how it would be used by other agencies, for different purposes; and,
- had concerns that their tax would be increased as a result of giving consent but were assured by the statement that it is for research purposes and would be kept confidential; and,
- signed the form because they had felt they had to, having agreed to take part in the research (EM only).

Refusals to give consents

Among those who refused to give consent there was a mix of respondents who understood the request and those who were uncertain about what it was about or what they were giving consents to. On the whole though those who did not give consent reported being either confused, reluctant or concerned, regardless of interviewer attempts to alleviate concerns. The following reasons were given by

respondents for refusing to give consent and came up among general population (GP) and ethnic minority (EM) respondents:

- confusion over why the information was needed;
- worry and reluctance to sign it;
- concerns that the information given as well as respondents own personal details would all go to “others”;
- lack of confidence that the information would be used for research purposes only;
- concerns about negative repercussions following signing the form, such as details being passed onto different companies who would then start contacting respondents.

The following additional reasons were given by respondents from ethnic minority groups only:

- concerns that their bank, past employers and the benefit agency might be contacted;
- concerns about data being lost and mistreated by the government– which seemed to arise from recent events with the Child Benefits Records mistake: “*I don't really want to share information.. with people leaving discs here there and everywhere*”.
- willingness for NatCen to keep the information but reluctance to it going out to many other people/agencies as respondents feared others being dissatisfied with their points of view;
- concerns over who the information would be passed onto: The DWP? Other agencies?; and,
- concerns over people going through their records: too much of an invasion on their private lives.

Other issues

There was most certainly evidence to suggest that the recent loss of child benefit records had a important role to play in respondents' decisions around giving consents. Respondents displayed lack of faith in what would happen to the information despite interviewer attempts to reassure respondents.

On the consent form itself (see appendix B) the words ‘revoked by me in writing’ on occasion seemed to confuse or concern respondents (both GP and EM). One respondent, for example, who was concerned about the length of the study and how long the information would be kept for, said, “*this consent will remain valid until revoked by me in writing...so this is an open one...until I say you can't get any information you can carry on for the rest of my life.*” Another said that they thought the words ‘revoked by me in writing’ may be difficult for people who have difficulty with English.

One respondent remarked that if she had been given the other government departments names it would have appeared more official and she might have given consent.

Understandings of what was meant by giving consent:

In addition to those mentioned above, which tended to be linked to respondents' decisions, other explanations of consenting to data linkage included:

- the government want to check we are not claiming anything we shouldn't be;
- names and addresses are never included, it is just data...no individual can be identified; and,

- to go through the channels mentioned on the form to look into people's finances and all other things mentioned on the form.

Recommendations:

Recommendation	Final decision/ implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The consent form, and possibly interviewer instructions/read outs, needs to make it explicitly clear that the direction of information is from the <u>DWP/HMRC to NatCen/ISER</u> and not the other way round, as respondents often perceive it to be. Additionally we need to specify somewhere that their answers (the survey data) are NOT PASSED ONTO anyone. The only information which is passed to DWP and HMRC would be their names, addresses and date of birth. The DWP and HMRC then give NatCen/ISER the relevant data (from their records). ➤ There needs to be clearer information available to respondents, either in the form or given to them by the interviewer, about the security procedures that are in place to protect data and ensure confidentiality, such as the fact that data is always password protected and transferred securely, via registered post etc. This may alleviate concerns over mistreatment and loss of data, which respondents in the sample clearly displayed. ➤ Finally the words 'This consent will remain valid until revoked by me in writing' should, if possible, be reworded so to not confuse or concern respondents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The consent forms themselves were revised extensively over the course of negotiations with data providers, as a result of cognitive testing and through consultation with other survey administrators obtaining consents for data linkage on their surveys. ➤ As a result of cognitive testing, extensive interviewer instructions and information help screens were built into the CAPI script. ➤ As a result of cognitive testing and Research Ethics Committee review, respondents will receive an information leaflet about data linkage consents, visibly health consent in advance of interviewer contact with the household. ➤ As recommended, the words 'This consent will remain valid until revoked by me in writing' have been changed to 'Your permission will stay in place unless you write to us to say you want it removed.'

APPENDIX A TECHNICAL DETAILS OF COGNITIVE PHASE

This appendix describes in further detail the design and conduct of the cognitive testing.

Study Design

This project was designed to test a batch of new questions, on 16 topic areas, intended for use in *Understanding Society*: the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS). Forty thousand households in the UK will soon be taking part in *Understanding Society* making it the largest household panel survey in the world. The study is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council.

Before such a large scale longitudinal study is commenced it is important that the questions are thoroughly tested for the following reasons:

- 1) To ensure that certain screening questions are successful at identifying the types of individual and household that are to be included in the main sample (for instance the ethnic screen must be successful at identifying and categorising the ethnic minority households who are to comprise the ethnic minority boost sample).
- 2) To ensure that the questions both accurately and consistently capture the respondent characteristics and experiences they are designed to measure.
- 3) To test to what extent the consent preamble works to inform and encourage respondents to give their consent to link their responses to government data.
- 4) All the above information gleaned from the cognitive testing can then be used to inform what the most appropriate language to use is when asking the proposed questions.

Understanding Society will include a boost of ethnic minority respondents, and aims to address issues specifically relevant to ethnic minority groups such as migration history, parental and grandparental country of birth, national identity and so forth. Therefore, it was necessary that the cognitive testing involved respondents from a variety of ethnic backgrounds.

Due to the large volume of questions to be tested, and the fact the questions needed to be tested on a diverse population, three phases of cognitive interviewing were carried out. Question topic areas and respondent type explored at each phase are detailed below:

Phase	Topic Areas	Respondent Type	
		White UK	Ethnic Minority
Phase 1	Household Membership	Yes	Yes
	Ethnic screen/ Ethnic identity		Yes
	Parental Immigration		Yes
	National Identity	Yes	Yes
	Parental Ethnicity		Yes
	Benefits	Yes	
	Neighbourhood		Yes
	Life Satisfaction	Yes	Yes
	Remittances		Yes

	Discrimination	Yes	
	Data linkage consents	Yes	Yes
Phase 2	Consumption	Yes	Yes
	Environment	Yes	Yes
	Ethnic screen/ Ethnic identity		Yes
	Migration History		Yes
	Parental Ethnicity		Yes
	Benefits	Yes	
	Neighbourhood	Yes	
Phase 3	Migration History		Yes
	Remittances		Yes
	Benefits		Yes
	Discrimination		Yes
	Cohabitation		Yes

Further details of sample composition are explained in the Recruitment Section below. Questionnaires for each phase were administered face to face in the respondent's own home by interviewers trained in cognitive testing techniques. All interviews were recorded. After the interviews, interviewers listened to the recordings and made detailed notes on each interview. Notes were analysed using a content analysis approach described in the Analysis and Reporting Section.

Cognitive Methods

Cognitive interviewing methods, which are derived from cognitive psychology, enable researchers to examine (in greater detail) the question and answer process, helping to identify problems with questions and possible solutions. Cognitive interviewing techniques focus on four main processes:

- How respondents understand and interpret questions;
- How respondents recall the information required to answer questions;
- The judgements respondents make as to what information to use when formulating their answers; and,
- How respondents decide on their final response².

The two most frequently used cognitive interviewing techniques are 'think aloud' and probing. In this study, a mixture of think aloud and probing techniques were used. In the think aloud technique, respondents are asked to say out loud what they are thinking as they go about completing the task. For example, respondents would be encouraged to articulate what they think a particular data item means, what information they are drawing on to complete each section, what decisions they make about what they are being asked to provide or what information is required to answer it and how they provide their (final) information for each item.

In the probing technique the interviewer asks specific, usually scripted, questions which provide similar information. These 'probes' are partly pre-scripted and provide a guide to the topics to be covered in the cognitive interview. Probing was carried out concurrently, once the respondent had answered one or a number of survey questions.

² Tourangeeau

Recruitment

To identify people with particular characteristics whom we wanted to take part in a cognitive interview, we re-contacted people who had previously taken part in the Health Survey for England 2004 (HSE) and who said that they would be willing to be contacted again by NatCen. The advantages of using this approach were:

- Firstly, the survey data could be used to identify eligible respondents with a range of characteristics of interest, meaning that quotas could be filled in the office (although details were still checked with respondents prior to the cognitive interview);
- Secondly, the collection of a telephone number for most respondents who took part in the HSE survey meant that contact could be made by telephone making this a cheap and efficient sampling strategy.

Using the HSE survey data we were able to identify respondents with the characteristics to fill our quotas. The HSE data was particularly useful as it contained a large ethnic minority boost from which we were able to identify and recruit our ethnic minority sample.

The 2 main types of respondent recruited for this study were:

1. Those who were from the **general population** (White UK people who took part in the HSE);
2. Those who were **ethnic minorities** (Respondents who took part in the HSE ethnic boost, including white Irish). The ethnic minority respondents were divided into 5 subgroups:
 - **Mixed Race**
 - **Chinese**
 - **Asian**
 - **Black**
 - **Other Ethnic Minority**

The types of respondents recruited also varied along the following dimensions:

- **Ethnic subgroup:** For Asian sample- Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi/Other
For Black sample- African/Caribbean/ Other
For Other sample- Irish/ All other.
- **Age Group:** 18-30 years old, 31-59 years old or over 60 years old;
- **Gender:** Male or female;
- **Benefit receipt:** Whether or not respondents were in receipt of any benefits;
- **Migrant generation:** Whether (in the case of Ethnic Minorities) respondents were 1st or 2nd generation migrants.

Our telephone unit made contact with the respondents and conducted a short screening interview over the phone to a) seek co-operation in the study and b) confirm contact details (telephone number and address) if they were happy to take part. The telephone unit were asked to recruit a number of reserves as well as 'definites' for the cognitive interviews. The telephone unit then passed on the contact details of each potential respondent on to the interviewers who followed up by calling to make an interview appointment.

The cognitive testing aimed to conduct 70 interviews, across the 3 phases, covering a range of different types of respondents. In total 70 interviews were conducted. Please refer to research background for precise details of sample composition achieved.

Conduct of Interviews

Interviews were carried out by the 6 interviewers who form NatCen's core team of cognitive interviewers. Interviews were also carried out by 2 researchers from NatCen's Longitudinal Studies Group. The areas where interviewing took place were:

- Birmingham and the Midlands,
- Essex,
- Greater Manchester,
- Lancashire,
- Leeds and Yorkshire,
- London; and
- Nottingham and Nottinghamshire.

Cognitive interviews took place in respondents' homes and were conducted face-to-face, on a one-to-one basis, to ensure respondent confidentiality. In total the interviews lasted approximately one hour. Interviews were recorded with respondents' consent. All respondents were given a £20 High Street voucher to thank them for taking part.

Analysis and reporting

The interviewers, all of whom are trained in cognitive methods, made detailed notes on their cognitive interviews, with reference to the recording of the interview. These notes, recordings of the interviews and the completed test questionnaires were reviewed as part of the analysis process.

Notes were analysed using a content analysis approach based on Framework, an analytical tool developed by the Qualitative Research Unit at NatCen. A matrix was set up, which listed the respective areas interviewers were asked to probe on across the page and cases down the page. The matrix included a summary of the characteristics of respondents; such as their gender and age. Under each question a summary was made of each respondent's understanding of the question, recall strategies used, judgements made in formulating an answer and the answer provided. Any other problems were also recorded. Thus data could be read horizontally as a complete case record for an individual, or vertically by question, looking across all cases.

Once the matrix was completed the data were reviewed. In reviewing the matrix the full range of problems with the question were explored and reported. All questions are reported on in individual sections with recommendations for suggested rewordings summarised at the end of each section.

APPENDIX B TEST CONSENTS FORM



Serial number

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Living in Britain

We have asked you a wide range of questions relating to your life, economic circumstances, experiences, behaviour and beliefs. To make this information complete, we would like to find out:

- more about your National Insurance contributions, benefits, employment and earnings, savings and pensions, and your participation in any government schemes from data held by Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs and the Department for Work and Pensions.

We need your permission for any information to be released. Like the answers you have given us, the information collected from these records will be completely confidential in accordance with the Data Protection Act. Names and addresses are never included in the results and no individual can be identified from the research. Please ask the interviewer about anything that concerns you or you can call the research team on Freephone 0800 252 853 or in writing to University of Essex, FREEPOST CL2610, Colchester, CO4 2BR.

I have read or heard this information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that all the information about me will be treated in strict confidence and used solely for the purpose of research.

NATIONAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS, BENEFITS, EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME, SAVINGS AND PENSIONS

I authorise the Department of Work and Pensions and Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs to disclose to the organisation responsible for the Living in Britain Survey, currently the Institute for Social and Economic Research, information about my National Insurance contributions, benefits, employment and earnings, savings and pensions, and my participation in government schemes. This consent will remain valid until revoked by me in writing.

If you give permission for us to collect this information please sign below.

Signature		Date	
Print name			