



THE UNIVERSITY OF
MELBOURNE

**HILDA PROJECT TECHNICAL PAPER SERIES
NO. 1/04, January 2004**

Wave 2 Survey Methodology

Nicole Watson and Mark Wooden

**The HILDA Project was initiated, and is funded, by the Australian
Government Department of Family and Community Services**



Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| SURVEY INSTRUMENTS..... | 2 |
| FOLLOWING RULES | 3 |
| TRACKING PROCEDURES | 4 |
| FIELDWORK | 6 |
| INTERVIEWERS | 6 |
| FIELDWORK PROCESS | 6 |
| Pilot Testing | 6 |
| Data Collection Mode | 6 |
| Timeline | 6 |
| Survey Notification Material | 7 |
| Call routine, Follow-Up and Refusal Aversion | 7 |
| Foreign Language Interviews | 8 |
| RESPONSE | 8 |
| DATA PROCESSING | 11 |
| CODING..... | 11 |
| REFERENCES | 12 |
| APPENDIX 1 – CODEFRAME EXTENSIONS FOR WAVE 2..... | 13 |

Introduction

This paper details the survey methodology employed for Wave 2 of the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey. Many of the fieldwork procedures for Wave 2 concord with those used in Wave 1 and are documented in Watson and Wooden (2002). Any modified fieldwork procedures are reported in this document along with the response rates for Wave 2. An example of a procedure that is unchanged from Wave 1 that is not reported below is the use of incentives – \$50 for fully responding households and \$20 for partially responding households.

Survey Instruments

The Wave 2 questionnaires were developed over a 9-month period using a similar procedure to the development of the Wave 1 questionnaires. The content of the Wave 2 questionnaires followed much of that asked in Wave 1, though there were four substantial points where they differed:

- The Person Questionnaire was split into two new questionnaires. The people who had previously participated in the survey received a Continuing Person Questionnaire (CPQ). The people who had not responded to the survey before received a New Person Questionnaire (NPQ). This latter group included new entrants to the household, those who had recently turned 15 and previous non-respondents.
- A wealth module was added to the Household Questionnaire and the Person Questionnaires. In the CPQ the wealth questions replaced the background questions asked of the respondents in Wave 1.
- In several places in the CPQ, the questions were modified to ask about the time since the previous interview (such as marital status changes, employment status changes, etc) so that a continuous picture could be drawn with the Wave 1 and Wave 2 data.
- The observations about the dwelling were collected on the Household Questionnaire rather the Household Form once the identity of the household was established. As a result, in Wave 2, this information will only be available for responding households. (This approach avoids situations where it is impossible or impractical to collect information about non-responding Wave 2 households, such as when the households are untraceable or where the contact is only by telephone. For analysis of non-response, we have rich information about these households from Wave 1.)

The average time taken to complete each of the questionnaires and the number completed are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Average time taken to complete Wave 2 questionnaires and number completed

| <i>Questionnaire</i> | <i>Time taken to complete</i> | <i>Number completed</i> |
|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Household Form | Approx 5 minutes for responding households (not timed) | 7,245 (responding) 8,394 (all) |
| Household Questionnaire | 10 minutes | 7,245 |
| Continuing Person Questionnaire | 31 minutes | 11,993 |
| New Person Questionnaire | 36 minutes | 1,048 |
| Self-Completion Questionnaire | Approx 20 minutes (not timed) | 11,633 |

Following Rules

The fully and partially responding households in Wave 1 form the basis of the indefinite life panel. Members of these households are followed over time and the sample is extended to include:

- Any children born to or adopted by members of the selected households; and
- New household members resulting from changes in the composition of the original households.

Continuing Sample Members (CSMs) include all members of Wave 1 households (including children). Any children born to or adopted by CSMs are also classified as CSMs. Further, all new entrants to a household who have a child with a CSM are converted to CSM status. CSMs remain in the sample indefinitely. All other people who share a household with a CSM in Wave 2 or later are considered to be Temporary Sample Members (TSMs).

Where the household has moved, split or moved and split, the interviewers and office staff track the CSMs. The CSMs (along with their new household) are then interviewed, where applicable, at their new address or by phone.¹ While it is not relevant to Wave 2 (as there were no TSMs in Wave 1 households), it is important for future waves to know that TSMs that split from a household and are no longer part of a household with a CSM are not followed. However, if the TSM is converted to a CSM, then they are followed for interview as any CSM would be.

¹ Note that if a child CSM moves without any other adult CSMs, they are followed to their new household and the eligible members of that household are then interviewed.

Tracking Procedures

Prior and during the fieldwork period, some respondents forwarded their changed address to ACNielsen via the 1800 number, email, or the reply paid notification cards sent with the gift (this was a calendar in Wave 1) or Primary Approach Letter for Wave 2.² The tracking procedures were initiated for:

- all people who said during their Wave 1 interview that they were very likely to move;
- any return-to-sender mail from dispatching the cheques and gifts in Wave 1 and the primary approach letters in Wave 2; and
- households where contact could not be made or where a refusal was received but the interviewer could not determine if a sample member still lived there.

The following procedures were used to trace households that moved:

- *Matching address file to Australia Post records prior to fieldwork* – When a person moves house, they may register their address change with Australia Post. While providing a useful forwarding address on some occasions, more often than not it provided a flag for which households may have moved and further tracking procedures were implemented to actually locate these households.
- *Asking the remaining sample members at the last known address.*
- *Asking the new occupants at the last known address.*
- *Calling all contact phone numbers for sample members at the address* – the interviewers were provided with the contact phone numbers for the household reference person (i.e., the main person completing the Household Questionnaire in the previous wave). The contact phone numbers for the household reference person included home, work and mobile if they were provided by the respondent in Wave 1. If these phone numbers failed to reach the sample members, then the phone numbers for the other sample members in the household were also tried from the office.
- *Asking neighbours at the last known address if no contact had been made with remaining sample members.*
- *Searching the Electronic White Pages for a new phone number for the sample member* – Sometimes some information, such as town or suburb, was obtained from other sample member or the new occupants at the last known

² Interviewers also called the 1800 number to alert the office of households that had moved. The distinction between calls from interviewers and calls from respondents was not made when monitoring this activity. Therefore, we cannot determine what proportion of respondents who moved alerted ACNielsen of their change of address.

address. The office used this information when searching the White Pages online for a new phone number for the sample member.

- *Emailing sample members* – The office sent an email to the address provided during the previous interview.
- *Contacting the relatives or friends whose details were provided during the previous interview* – During the previous interview, one to two contacts were obtained from the sample members of people who were most likely to know where they were if they moved. Work, home and mobile phone numbers, email addresses and postal addresses were collected for these contacts. The office contacted these relatives or friends via any of these methods until all leads were exhausted.

Of the 1176 households that were issued to tracking, 80 per cent were found.

Fieldwork

Interviewers

A total of 142 interviewers were used for the Wave 2 fieldwork. Of these, 90 (63 per cent) had worked on Wave 1.

All interviewers were briefed through a two-day briefing session, with the new interviewers having an additional day to become familiar with the fieldwork procedures and questionnaires, and to participate in additional refusal aversion training.

Fieldwork Process

Pilot Testing

The Wave 2 pilot testing involved a similar process to that used in Wave 1. The Skirmish participants were new, but the Pre-Test and Dress Rehearsal participants were carried forward from the Wave 1 pilot samples to test the tracking procedures.

Data Collection Mode

The vast majority of the data was collected in Wave 2 using face-to-face interviews. Due to the fact that some households moved outside of the 488 areas selected across Australia in Wave 1 and the desire to interview as many people as possible, some telephone interviews were necessary. The following table shows the proportion of people interviewed by telephone in Wave 2. The incidence of telephone interviews for the previous respondents and non-respondents is low at around 3 per cent. For the children turning 15 and the new entrants, the rate more than doubles. While a higher rate of telephone interviewing was expected (to help achieve a low attrition rate), it was made clear to the fieldwork company that face-to-face interviewing was by far the better option.

Table 2: Proportion of people interviewed by telephone of all Wave 2 interviews

| <i>Sample Member Type</i> | <i>Interviewed face-to-face</i> | <i>Interviewed by phone</i> | <i>% phone interviews</i> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Previous respondents | 11,674 | 319 | 2.7 |
| Previous non-respondents | 205 | 17 | 7.7 |
| Previous child, now turned 15 | 242 | 8 | 3.2 |
| New entrants (TSMs) | 533 | 43 | 7.5 |
| All Wave 2 respondents | 12,654 | 387 | 3.0 |

Timeline

The fieldwork for Wave 2 occurred between 22 August 2002 and 19 March 2003. By the end of December 2002, 97.7% of the interviews had been completed. Compared with the fieldwork timing for Wave 1, the Wave 2 fieldwork period was extended by

several months into 2003 to focus on tracking and interviewing hard to find cases.³ The interviews conducted after December were by a relatively even mixture of face-to-face and telephone modes.

Survey Notification Material

A primary approach letter and newsletter were sent to the last known address of the households approximately one month prior to when the interviewer was scheduled to make contact with the household. This pre-interview material covered:

- feedback on some of the results from the previous wave;
- what is involved in participating in the current wave;
- the cash incentive offered; and
- some frequently asked questions, including who was conducting the research, privacy issues and what to do if the household has moved.

In addition to the posted pre-interview material, households with people who had not been part of the household in the previous wave were given a New Entrants Brochure. This brochure provided more information about the purpose of the study, why they had been asked to participate, and a method to opt out of the study if they chose to.

Call routine, Follow-Up and Refusal Aversion

The fieldwork was split into three distinct stages. All households were issued into the field for the first stage, and where all the interviews had not been completed, they were reissued into the field in the next stage. If a household could not be found at either one of these stages, they were put into tracking and once found were issued back into the current stage if found quickly or more generally into a later stage. The third stage was used to finalise households that had to be traced and could not be immediately issued back into the field and also to contact some households where it was deemed beneficial to contact them in the third stage (for example, a household member may have been away from the household at earlier contacts or they may have been temporarily unwell or busy).

When initially making contact with a household, the interviewer had up to six calls to make contact and a further six calls to undertake all of the interviews once contact had been made. If a household had to be put into tracking and was found, the initial call allocation to make contact with the household was carried over to the next stage of the fieldwork. Households that had not fully responded during the initial fieldwork period were followed up in the next fieldwork stage where it was sensible and practical to do so. When following up a household, the interviewer had a total of five calls to finalise the household. The day and time the Household Questionnaire was completed in the

³ A total of 299 interviews were conducted between January and March 2003, 233 of which were with respondents from Wave 1 (thus reducing the attrition rate from 14.9 per cent at the end of December 2002 to 13.2 per cent at the end of March 2003).

previous wave were provided to the interviewer as a guide for when the household might best be found at home.

Foreign Language Interviews

There were 19 households to which a professional interpreter accompanied the interviewer, resulting in interviews being conducted with 30 individuals in a language other than English.

Response

A summary of the outcomes of the Wave 2 fieldwork is provided in Tables 3, 4 and 5. Table 3 shows that an additional 712 households were created from household splits, resulting in a total of 8395 households. Of these, 69 households moved out of scope and interviews were obtained from 7245 households, resulting in a household response rate of 87.0 per cent. Table 4 shows that 13,041 people provided an interview from 16,038 eligible people. Table 5 shows the outcome of Wave 2 against the outcome of Wave 1 at the individual level. The following response rates were obtained in Wave 2 (after adjusting for out of scope people, that is people whom have died or moved overseas):

- 86.8 per cent of respondents in Wave 1 were re-interviewed in Wave 2 (resulting in an attrition rate of 13.2 per cent).
- 19.7 per cent of non-respondents in Wave 1 provided an interview in Wave 2.
- 80.4 per cent of people who turned 15 after 30th June 2001 provided an interview in Wave 2 (these were considered children in Wave 1, so were ineligible for interview).
- 73.4 per cent of new entrants to the Wave 2 households who were eligible for an interview actually provided an interview.

A total of 203 people who were part of the Wave 1 sample have now moved out of scope – 68 because they have died and 135 because they have moved overseas. In Table 5 above, there are 19 Wave 1 children that have moved out of scope (3 due to death and 16 due to moving overseas), 3 of whom would have been aged 15 in Wave 2.

Not all of the people who moved were successfully traced. A total of 458 people (328 adults and 130 children) were deemed to be untraceable after all leads were followed up. Table 5 shows 133 Wave 1 children as being lost to tracking, 3 of these turned 15 for Wave 2 (and thus were eligible for interview) and the remaining 130 were still children for Wave 2.

Of the 13,041 people completing a Person Questionnaire, 11,691 completed and returned the Self-Completion Questionnaire. However, a small number of these SCQs – 55 – could not be successfully matched to a Person Questionnaire. Note the return rate for the SCQ has fallen from 94% of PQ respondents in Wave 1 to 90% in Wave 2.

Table 3: Wave 2 Household Outcomes

| <i>Sample Outcome</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>%</i> |
|---|---------------|----------|
| Households issued | 7,682 | |
| <i>Plus</i> split households | 712 | |
| <i>Less</i> out of scope households (due to death or move overseas) | 68 | |
| <i>Total households</i> | 8,326 | 100.0 |
| Refusals to interviewer | 490 | 5.9 |
| Refusals to fieldwork company (via 1800 number or email) | 132 | 1.6 |
| Non-response with contact | 134 | 1.6 |
| Non-contact, not lost to tracking | 75 | 0.9 |
| Lost to tracking | 250 | 3.0 |
| Fully responding households | 6,541 | 78.6 |
| Partially responding households | 704 | 8.5 |

Table 4: Wave 2 Person Outcomes

| <i>Sample Outcome</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>%</i> |
|--|-----------------------|----------|
| Wave 1 enumerated persons | 19,914 ⁽¹⁾ | |
| <i>Plus</i> new entrant adults | 784 | |
| <i>Plus</i> new entrant children | 347 | |
| <i>Enumerated persons</i> | 21,045 | |
| <i>Less</i> ineligible children (under 15) | 4,820 | |
| <i>Less</i> out of scope adults | 187 | |
| <i>Eligible adults</i> | 16,038 | 100.0 |
| Refusals to interviewer | 1,739 | 10.8 |
| Refusals to fieldwork company (via 1800 number or email) | 278 | 1.7 |
| Non-response with contact | 321 | 2.0 |
| Non-contact, not lost to tracking | 337 | 2.1 |
| Lost to tracking | 322 | 2.0 |
| Responding individuals | 13,041 | 81.3 |

Note:

- (1) This figure of 19,914 is 3 fewer than that reported in Watson and Wooden (2002) as it was found during the Wave 2 fieldwork that three children had been counted twice as they had been listed in two households.

Table 5: Wave 2 Person Outcomes against Wave 1 Person Outcomes

| <i>Wave 1</i> | <i>Wave 2</i> | | | | | <i>TOTAL</i> |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <i>Respondent</i> | <i>Non-respondent</i> | <i>Lost in tracking</i> | <i>Out of scope</i> | <i>Child</i> | |
| <i>Respondent</i> | 11,993 | 1,591 | 233 | 152 | - | 13,969 |
| <i>Non-respondent</i> | 222 | 812 | 92 | 32 | - | 1,158 |
| <i>Child</i> | 250 | 58 | 133 ⁽¹⁾ | 19 ⁽²⁾ | 4,327 | 4,787 |
| <i>New entrant</i> | 576 | 208 | - | - | 347 | 1,131 |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 13,041 | 2,669 | 458 | 203 | 4,674 | 21,045 |

Notes:

- (1) Of the 133 Wave 1 children that were lost to tracking, 3 had turned 15 for Wave 2 (thus eligible for interview) and the remaining 130 were still children.
- (2) Of the 19 Wave 1 children that have moved out of scope, 3 had turned 15 for Wave 2 and the remaining 16 were still children.

While a future technical paper will consider the Wave 2 response rates, it is worth comparing in Table 6 the response rates achieved in the HILDA Survey to those from the British Household Panel Study (BHPS). Given the second wave of the BHPS was conducted 10 years ago and it has been generally accepted that response rates to surveys has been falling over this period, the attrition rate of 13.2 per cent obtained in the HILDA study compares well to the BHPS figure of 12.4 per cent (which excludes proxies). In 1999, the British added a Welsh and Scottish sub-sample onto the BHPS which achieved attrition rates of 15.0 per cent and 12.2 per cent respectively in the second wave (note these rates *include* proxies).

While the HILDA response rates for children turning 15 and new entrants are below those obtained in the BHPS, the response rates obtained are still reasonably good. The conversion rate of Wave 1 non-respondents is particularly good with 20 per cent of the previous non-respondents being interviewed in Wave 2, whereas the British only achieved 15 per cent.

Table 6: Response rates for the HILDA Survey and the BHPS compared

| | <i>HILDA Survey</i> | <i>BHPS¹</i> | <i>Difference</i> |
|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Wave 1 respondents | 86.8 | 87.6 | -0.8 |
| Wave 1 non-respondents | 19.7 | 15.0 | 4.7 |
| Wave 1 children turning 15 | 80.4 | 89.0 | -8.6 |
| New entrants | 73.4 | 78.0 | -4.6 |

Notes:

- (1) BHPS response rates relate to Wave 2 conducted in 1992. The response rate for children turning 15 was obtained from personal communication with Heather Laurie and the remaining three response rates were calculated from Table 19a of the BHPS Manual (Taylor, Brice, Buck and Prentice-Lane, 2003).

Data Processing

Coding

The questionnaires contained items for which a partial list was provided with an 'other, please specify' category and some of these lists needed to be further extended. There were two items in the Household Form for which the codeframe was extended:

- Why living with household (HF 10); and
- Why left household (HF 12).

There were five items in the Household Questionnaire for which the codeframe was extended:

- Work related childcare for school aged children during term time (Q7);
- Work related childcare for school aged children during school holidays (Q8);
- Work related childcare for pre-school aged children (Q10);
- Non-work related childcare (Q13); and
- Frequency of Child Care Benefit payment (Q15).

There were 9 items in the Person Questionnaires for which the codeframes was extended:

- Why not living with both parents (BB2 NPQ);
- Qualifications since leaving school (A7/A9 CPQ and A7a/A12 NPQ);
- Reason for difficulty getting a job (D7/8 CPQ and NPQ);
- Reasons not looking for work in last 4 weeks (D13/14 CPQ and NPQ);
- Main reason stopped working (C39/47 and D23/25 CPQ and D31 NPQ);
- Deductions from wages and salaries (F4c/8c/21b CPQ and NPQ);
- Current benefits (F17a CPQ and NPQ);
- Financial year benefits (F32a CPQ and NPQ); and
- Main reasons for moving in last 12 months (K10 CPQ and K12 NPQ).

The list of extended codes for these questions is provided in Appendix 1.

References

Watson, N, and Wooden, M, (2002), 'The Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) Survey: Wave 1 Survey Methodology', HILDA Project Technical Paper Series No. 1/02, Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne.

Taylor, MF, Brice, J, Buck, N, and Prentice-Lane, E, (eds., 2003), 'British Household Panel Survey User Manual, Volume A: Introduction, Technical Report and Appendices', Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex.

Appendix 1 – Codeframe Extensions for Wave 2

Household Form

HF_Q10 Why living with

- 9 Share/financial
- 10 Return to family household
- 11 Moved with family member
- 12 Care/support
- 99 Don't know

HF_Q12 Why left

- 10 To marry/live together
- 11 To live independently
- 12 Bought own home
- 13 Returned to family household
- 14 To live with other parent
- 15 Left with family member

Household Questionnaire

Q7 Work related childcare for school aged children during term time

- 13 Other parent not living in household/ex-partner
- 14 Boarding school
- 15 Not applicable – me or my partner (For households who only use childcare during school holidays)

Q8 Work related childcare for school aged children during school holidays

- 13 Other parent not living in household/ex-partner
- 14 Boarding school

Q10 Work related childcare for pre-school aged children

- 11 Other parent not living in household/ex-partner
- 12 Not applicable – me or my partner

Q13a and 13d Non-work related childcare

- 10 Not applicable – me or my partner

Q15 Frequency of Child Care Benefit payment

- 10 Fortnightly payment

Person Questionnaires

QBB2 (NPQ) Why not living with both parents

- 10 Boarding school/studying
- 11 One parent setting up for family to move to a new country
- 12 Parent/s living overseas
- 13 Did not get on with parents
- 14 Was working at 14
- 15 Fostered/adopted out
- 16 Parent/s were ill (mentally/physically)

QA7/A9 (CPQ) and A7a/A12 (NPQ) Since leaving school what qualifications completed

- 400 Diploma NFI
- 500 Secretarial Certificate NFI
- 500 Computer Certificate NFI
- 995 Don't know
- 998 Other/NEI

QD7 (CPQ and NPQ) Reasons for difficulty getting a job

- 15 Overqualified

QD13 (CPQ and NPQ) Reasons not looking for work in last 4 weeks

- 21 Not interested
- 22 Taking a break/rest from working
- 23 Do voluntary/unpaid work

QC39/C47/D23/25 (CPQ) and QD31 (NPQ) Main reason stopped working

- 16 Migrated to a new country
- 17 Change of lifestyle
- 95 NEI to classify

QF4c, F8c, F21b (CPQ and NPQ) Deductions from wages and salaries

- 10 Social club/staff club
- 11 HECS

QF17a (CPQ and NPQ) Currently receive any of these other pensions, allowances or other forms of assistance

- 10 Mobility Allowance
- 11 Bereavement Allowance
- 12 Pensioner Education Supplement
- 13 GST compensation/Govt pension bonus
- 14 Child Care Benefit
- 15 Double Orphan Pension

- 16 CDEP (Community Development Employment Project)
- 95 NEI to classify

QF32a (CPQ and NPQ) During the last financial year did receive any of these government pensions or allowances

- 20 Mobility Allowance
- 21 Bereavement Allowance
- 22 Pensioner Education Supplement
- 23 GST compensation/Govt pension bonus
- 24 Child Care Benefit
- 25 Double Orphan Pension
- 26 CDEP (Community Development Employment Project)
- 95 NEI to classify

QK10 (CPQ) and QK12 (NPQ) Main reasons for moving in last 12 months

- 22 Moved to Australia (NFI)
- 23 Government housing (no choice)
- 24 Travelling/returned from overseas
- 25 Personal/family reasons (NFI)
- 26 Work reasons (NFI)
- 27 Housing/neighbourhood reason (NFI)
- 95 NEI to classify