

The Future of HILDA: Design and Content Issues

Mark Wooden

Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and
Social Research

University of Melbourne



Mode Change

- Costs may dictate need for a change in mode from F2F to CATI, with possible ramifications for:
 - Comparability of data items
 - Ability to collect data on complex topics (e.g., wealth)
 - Amount of data collected
 - Attrition
 - Response to SCQ
 - New set-up / learning costs



Mode Change (cont'd)

- CATI does have advantages
 - Info from previous waves can be more easily used
 - Scope for interviewer error reduced
 - Can design questionnaires with more complex routing sequences
 - Internal consistency of responses can be validated on-the-spot
 - Greater fieldwork flexibility (potentially)
 - Reduced data entry / editing costs



Questionnaire Content

- How stable should the content remain?
What topics should be moved to a rotating schedule?
- How frequently should the wealth module be repeated?
- What topics remain the most glaring omissions?
Would such topics be suited to occasional modules?
Who would fund such modules?



Other Issues

- Survey frequency – how long do we remain annual?
- An immigrant top-up sample.
 - When do we need it?
 - How big should it be?
 - From where will be obtain the population frame?
- How do we ensure the data provider faces the correct incentives?
- What would be the impacts of changing data providers?
- Should we be doing more to encourage use of the data?



The Budget Constraint

- In the event of a tight budget, aside from shifting to CATI, what else could we change?
- Some possibilities include:
 - Drop the respondent incentive (\$50 / household)
 - Reduce the amount of fieldwork (e.g., fewer visits, drop the 3rd stage)
 - Cut back on tracking initiatives
 - Drop the SCQ
 - Shorter questionnaires / interviews
 - Reduce level of user support (i.e., no user training, conferences, derived variables, imputation, etc.)

