RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
(Survey Methodology #2005-08)

The Respondent Identification Policy and its Impact on Wave 2 and Wave 3 Follow-up Interviews in the 2004 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) Panel

Anna Y. Chan and Jeffrey C. Moore

Statistical Research Division
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, DC 20233

Report Issued: August 30, 2005

The Respondent Identification Policy and its Impact on Wave 2 and Wave 3 Follow-up Interviews in the 2004 SIPP Panel

Anna Y. Chan and Jeffrey C. Moore
Statistical Research Division
U.S. Census Bureau

Executive Summary

The goal of the Respondent Identification Policy (RIP) is to extend the Census Bureau's confidentiality protections so that they apply to members of a respondent's own household. After the initial wave 1 interview, SIPP makes extensive use of dependent interviewing in subsequent interviews, in which responses from the prior wave are fed back to the respondent. With the implementation of RIP, the sharing of information reported by one member of a household with other household members cannot take place without the consent of the original respondent. If the original respondent has not consented to the information sharing request, and a new respondent is providing the next wave's interview, dependent interviewing cannot be used. This paper reports on how SIPP 2004 panel respondents responded to RIP's information sharing request, and the impact of those responses on SIPP's ability to use dependent interviewing in its follow-up interviews.

The major findings of this research are as follows:

(1) The overwhelming majority of SIPP 2004 wave 1 respondents (90.9%), when asked the RIP question, agreed to allow their answers to be used "as a starting point" during the follow-up interview (see Table 2). Only 7.6% explicitly declined the RIP request. (Another 1.5% said "don't know," or refused, or otherwise provided no valid response to the RIP question.) Not surprisingly, the data reveal a slight tendency for respondents who reported both for themselves and at least one other household member to disagree to the RIP request at a significantly higher rate (9.4%) than those who reported only for themselves (6.0%).

(2) The actual impact of RIP on the use of dependent interviewing is very small. Only 1.7% of all wave 2 person interviews, and 0.7% of all wave 3 person interviews, were not conducted with the use of dependent interviewing procedures because of RIP (see Table 7). These figures are substantially less than the proportion who decline the RIP request because the same person often serves as the respondent from one wave to the next, thus rendering their lack of consent irrelevant.

3) Compared to those who consented to the RIP information sharing request, respondents who declined the RIP request in the initial wave 1 interview were less likely to have provided a complete or partially completed interview in the wave 2 interview (non-participation rate: 7.9% versus 12.1%; see Table 8). The test result ($\chi 2=267.0$, df=3 $p<.0001$) suggests that respondents' confidentiality concern may be related to their future survey participation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Census Bureau established the Respondent Identification Policy (RIP) in 1998 (Bates, Doyle, and Gates 2001) to extend confidentiality protections so that they applied within a respondent's household as well as to the world outside the household. The new policy prohibits the disclosure of a respondent's answers to other household members unless the original respondent gives consent to such disclosure. Since the advent of RIP, all demographic surveys conducted by the Census Bureau must obtain a respondent's permission before prior information can be shared with other household members during follow-up interviews. RIP was introduced in the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) starting with the 2004 SIPP panel.

The SIPP 2004 interview makes extensive use of dependent interviewing during its follow-up interviews, feeding back to subsequent wave respondents prior wave information about school enrollment, health insurance, income sources (and in some circumstances income amounts), and other characteristics. The prior-wave data are used to remind respondents of their previous circumstances, making it easier for them to provide updated information for the current interview period. Dependent interviewing in a longitudinal survey, when used appropriately, can enhance data quality, reduce respondent and interviewer burden and certain types of measurement error, and improve efficiency in data collection (Mathiowetz and McGonagle 2000). Despite the obvious merits of the new RIP procedures for the respondent, RIP also raised new concerns for researchers: If a large proportion of respondents declined the RIP request, this would seriously affect the ability of longitudinal surveys like SIPP to use dependent interviewing techniques in conducting follow-up interviews, and hence could also affect data quality.

This paper reports on the impact of the new Respondent Identification Policy implemented in the SIPP 2004 Panel. It provides details on the implementation of RIP in SIPP 2004, reports on respondents' tendencies to agree to or decline the disclosure request, and describes the impact of RIP on SIPP's ability to use dependent interviewing techniques in its follow-up interviews.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)

SIPP is a nationally representative longitudinal survey of adults in the United States. It collects information on income, wealth, poverty, and the dynamics of program participation. Currently, the SIPP 2004 panel is collecting its fifth wave (or round) of interviewing, out of an expected total of 15 waves of interviewing. Interview waves are administered at four month intervals; the reference period for each wave is the prior 4 calendar months, and that portion of the interview month up to the date of the interview. All SIPP interviews are conducted with a computer-assisted questionnaire; the first interview is administered in-person, subsequent interviews are often conducted by telephone.

2.2 Prior RIP Research

Early versions of a RIP question have been tested in numerous Census Bureau production and

experimental surveys, including: the 1999 Questionnaire Design Experimental Research Survey (QDERS), the 1999 American Housing Survey (AHS), and the experimental versions of the current SIPP production instrument tested via the SIPP Methods Panel project (MP) in its 2000, 2001, and 2002 field tests (Loomis 1999; Bates et al. 2001; Doyle, Moore, and Martin 2000, Doyle 2002; Pascale 2002). In each of these surveys, a RIP question was administered only to respondents residing in two-or-more-adult households. The various versions of the RIP questions used in previous RIP research are listed in Appendix A.

The 1999 QDERS was a random digit dialing (RDD) telephone survey conducted with one respondent in each household. It had a low response rate (about 40%) common to RDD surveys, exacerbated by a short field period and the absence of any refusal conversion procedures. Of the 1,304 households with completed interviews, 905 contained more than one adult, and thus were eligible to be asked the RIP question (see Appendix A for the exact text of the QDERS RIP question). According to Loomis (1999), six percent of those asked the RIP question declined the information disclosure request. Using data from the August to November 1999 American Housing Survey (AHS), and the SIPP Methods Panel 2000 (MP2000) field test, Bates et al. (2001) also examined responses to a RIP question. Both surveys had relatively high response rates (91% and 83% respectively). The authors found that among all eligible AHS respondents, 8% objected to information sharing (another 3.4% answered "don't know" or refused). Among MP2000 respondents the numbers were somewhat higher – 17% did not agree to information sharing, and another 4.8% answered "don't know" or refused to answer. Doyle (2002), in an analysis of MP2001 data, reported that 12% of respondents explicitly said no to the RIP question (another 1% said "don't know" or refused). Pascale (2002) examined RIP responses in the MP2002 field test (the MP wording was identical to the wording used in SIPP 2004) using only data from the first rotation of MP2002 interviews. She reported that 8.5% of respondents who were asked the RIP question said no (another 0.4% said "don't know" or refused).[1]

In sum, prior studies of response to a RIP question have found that the percentage of respondents who refuse the information disclosure request ranges from 6% to 17% (Bates et al. 2001; Doyle 2002; Loomis 1999; Pascale 2002).

Two of the studies noted above examined the reasons why respondents may have declined the RIP request (Loomis 1999; Pascale 2002). A follow-up question was administered to respondents in both studies who said 'no', 'don't know' or who refused the RIP question, to probe their reasons for declining the RIP request. Both studies found that only a small portion of respondents gave reasons that suggested true concerns about sharing information (17% of respondents in Loomis' study and 24 % of respondents in Pascale's study). Most stated reasons

[1] In the above studies that used the QDERS, AHS and the MP2002 data, the unit of analysis was responses from all respondents who were asked the RIP question. However, in the studies that used the MP2000 and MP2001 data, the RIP response results presented include not just the respondents themselves, but all persons reported for as well. Thus, for those who provided a self and one or more proxy interviews, their single RIP response was treated by the authors as multiple RIP responses in those analyses. We suspect the differences in SIPP Methods Panel estimates of the proportion declining the RIP request (17% in MP2000; 12% in MP2001 and 8.5% in MP2002) are due in part to different denominators and different definitions of RIP response. The higher estimates in the MP2000 and MP2001 field tests can also be attributed to flawed RIP procedures in these earlier field tests (Pascale and Mayer 2004).

that had little or nothing to do with confidentiality. Rather, they reflect respondents' assumption that other adult members would be unwilling or unable to respond (e.g. due to illness, or a language barrier), or that they would lack the necessary knowledge to participate in the survey (39% in Loomis' study and 47% in Pascale's study); or declining RIP was actually an expression of the respondent's own aversion to be re-interviewed (12% in Loomis' study). The remaining respondents did not provide a reason for rejecting the RIP request or the reasons were not decipherable (32% and 29% for the two respective studies). The findings suggest that some respondents may have misunderstood the RIP question and its purpose.

Several versions of the RIP question have also been cognitively tested at the Census Bureau. The SIPP 2004 RIP question uses wording that was recommended by DeMaio and Hughes (2003), as it was well understood by their cognitive interview respondents. In another exploratory study, Pascale and Mayer (2004) used paraphrasing and vignettes to cognitively test their respondents' understanding of the current SIPP 2004 RIP question. Respondents were asked to paraphrase the RIP request to see how well they understood its meaning and intent. They were then provided with vignettes describing different ways the information might be shared with a different household respondent during the follow-up interview. The authors found that most respondents had a fairly good idea of the ways in which one household member's survey responses may be shared with another household member. However, a small number of the respondents who responded 'no', 'don't know' or who refused the RIP request, did not seem to understand the RIP question, based on their paraphrasings and their responses to the vignettes. Hence, the current wording of the RIP question may overstate respondents' confidentiality concerns, and protect the confidentiality of some respondents who, were they to be asked a better question, would not object to their information being shared with other household members.

2.3 Impact of RIP on Dependent Interviewing and Survey Outcomes

Doyle (2002) examined the impact of RIP on the use of dependent interviewing using data from the 2001 SIPP Methods Panel. Doyle reported that roughly 5% of all MP2001 wave 2 interviews were not conducted by dependent interviewing but would have been in the absence of RIP. In about half of these cases the respondent explicitly declined the information disclosure request; the remaining observations did not have a "yes" response (but instead were "don't know," refused, or missing). The RIP question was not asked in MP2001 wave 1 if the respondent was in a one-person or one-adult household or if the interview terminated before the RIP question could be administered.

Previous research has shown that respondents' privacy concerns are related to their survey response behavior (Singer, Mathiowetz, and Couper 1993; Singer, Hoewyk, and Neugebauer 2003). Singer et al. (1993) found that privacy and confidentiality concerns significantly predicted 1990 census participation (at least among white respondents). The effect, though significant, only accounts for a small proportion of the explained variance. Singer et al. (2003) found a similar effect in Census 2000 results – in particular, that concerns about the misuse of census data were a negative predictor of participation with Census 2000 (this result held for both whites and nonwhites). It is a reasonable conjecture that a person's RIP response offers some evidence with regard to his or her level of privacy concern. Doyle (2002), in the MP2001 SIPP field test, found some evidence of an association between RIP responses in wave 1 and

subsequent survey participation in wave 2, but the difference was not statistically significant. In this study we further explore the follow-up survey participation rate of respondents who declined our disclosure request, in this case with the added benefit of a much larger sample than was available to Doyle.

2.4 Characteristics of respondents who decline the RIP disclosure request

Prior research suggests that respondents who respond with a "no" to the RIP question may be systematically different from those who agree to the request (Loomis 1999; Bates et al. 2001). These earlier studies report that respondents who are not married, female, age over 65, or non-white, are more likely to disagree to the disclosure request. Also respondents in households with fewer financial resources are less likely to agree to the disclosure request (Bates et al. 2001). Since the focus of this report is on the impact of RIP on the use of dependent interviewing, information on the characteristics of respondents declining the disclosure request will be explored in greater detail in a separate report.

3. METHODS

3.1 Data

TransCASES data from the first three waves of the SIPP 2004 Panel are used for the analysis in this paper. These data are derived directly from the survey instrument without any data editing or imputation. Thus, estimates provided by this report may not match completely with those derived from subsequent datasets which have been edited, and which include imputed data. The wave 1 instrument included complete or partially completed interviews from 43,711 households (for a household response rate of 85%; see Appendix B), and from 84,926 eligible person interviews (for a person interview completion rate of 99%). The wave 2 instrument included 40,587 households (92% household response rate) and 78,326 person interviews (97% person interview rate); the comparable wave 3 figures are 39,117 interviewed households (88% household response rate) and 74,801 person interviews (96% person interview rate[2]).

In all interviewed households, a person interview is attempted on all eligible adult household members, defined as age 15 or over. Although a self-response interview is preferred, SIPP procedures permit proxy reporting for adult household members who are unavailable for the interview. In wave 1 of the SIPP 2004 panel, 33% of all completed person interviews were proxy interviews; in waves 2 and 3 the proxy response proportions were, respectively, 39% and 40%. These figures are consistent with the rate of proxy interview from prior SIPP Panels (U.S. Census Bureau 2001).

[2]The person interview completion rates were estimated using available edited SIPP 2004 data. A person interview is considered complete if there were valid data for at least one of the four reference months and the person to whom the information pertains remains in the household in month 4 of the reference period.

For SIPP, the Census Bureau's RIP policy affects the use of dependent questions in the second of two interviews conducted in two consecutive waves – here, the wave 1 RIP outcome affects the wave 2 interview, and the wave 2 RIP affects wave 3. Thus, when examining the impact of RIP responses on the use of dependent interviewing, we include in the analysis all observations with a complete or partially complete person interview in two consecutive waves. This yields 75,644 observations in wave 2 and 69,778 in wave 3.

3.2 Eligibility for the RIP question

RIP is designed to offer confidentiality protection to respondents in households where, in a subsequent interview, personal information provided in the current interview might be shared with other household members. Thus, the RIP question is not administered in one-adult households because, unless a new member joins the household in the interim, the respondent will be the same in the subsequent interview, and thus there would be no reason for concern about information sharing. Hence, the RIP question requesting permission to disclose information during follow-up interviews to other household members was administered only to respondents in two-or-more-adult households. Of course, the cost of not asking the RIP question in a one-adult household is that dependent questions may not be used in the next wave should another adult join the household and serve as a respondent. However, this situation occurs only rarely — across waves 1, 2, and 3, about half a percent of one-adult households acquired a new adult member in the subsequent interview. The SIPP 2004 panel wave 1 interview yielded 56,880 self-response interviews, of which 13,748 were from persons who resided in a one-adult household, yielding a sample of 43,132 respondents for the RIP response analysis[3].

3.3 Administration of the RIP question

During the wave 1 interview in the 2004 SIPP panel, the RIP question was administered to each respondent in two-or-more-adult households[4] at the end of his or her "session," prior to switching to another respondent. In effect, RIP was asked of all self-respondents, some of whom provided only a self-response interview, while others also provided one or more proxy interviews.

Upon learning that the interview with the current respondent was ending – either because another respondent was going to begin answering the survey questions, or because all adult interviews had been completed – the wave 1 RIP question was administered, as follows:

"One last question for you: We will recontact this household in 4 months to update

---

[3] 285 interviews were excluded from the analysis because their self/proxy status was uncertain — according to one indicator, they were proxy interviews (SLFPRX=1, interview provided by proxy), but they were self-response interviews according to another (L_NO=LNOPRX, line number of person interview is same as the respondent's line number).

[4] If at least one child in a one-adult household was going to turn 15 before the interview month of the subsequent wave interview, the household was treated as a two-or-more-adult household and the RIP question was administered to the respondent.

information. If we talk to someone else in your household next time, instead of you, is it OK if we use your answers as a starting point?"

A "yes" response to the RIP question provides the necessary consent to reveal this respondent's answers to other adult household members serving as respondents during the follow-up wave 2 interview. All other outcomes – a "no," a "don't know" or refusal, or a missing response – are treated as the absence of consent. Under these conditions, the original respondent's wave 1 answers may not be used in wave 2 dependent questions, should someone other than the original respondent be providing the wave 2 interview[5].

A "yes" response to the RIP question is assumed to confer consent to share the information provided by that respondent during all subsequent interview waves, as long as that respondent continues to report for the same household members and the household does not acquire any new adult members. For these respondents, the RIP question will not be reasked. Table 1 summarizes the administrative rules for the RIP question in all wave 2+ interviews. During the subsequent follow-up interview, the RIP question is administered again to respondents in two-or-more-adult households if:

(1) there are new adult household members (regardless of prior wave's response); or
(2) the respondent providing information for the current person interview (either proxy or self-interview) was not the prior wave's respondent; or
(3) the respondent in the previous interview did not answer 'Yes' to the RIP question.

3.4 RIP "response" versus RIP "status"

It is important to distinguish between a person's RIP response in one wave, and his or her RIP status going into the next wave. A person can only have a RIP response if the person provided a self-interview and was asked the RIP question. As noted above, only respondents residing in a household containing two or more adults are asked the RIP question, and thus provide a RIP response. If the same respondent provides information for more than one person (observation), the RIP question is asked only once and his or her response determines the RIP status for each of these observations in the next interview. Hence, each person interview will have a RIP status even if the interview was provided by a proxy respondent, or even if the respondent was not asked the RIP question, as is the case in one-adult households. RIP status is a crude indicator of the likely proportion of the next wave's individual interviews which may not be able to use dependent interviewing. When examining the frequency with which respondents agreed to or did not agree to the RIP disclosure request (RIP response) in SIPP, the unit of analysis is current wave respondents who were asked the RIP question, not interview observations. When examining the impact of RIP on the use of dependent procedures in the next wave (RIP status), the unit of analysis is individual

[5]This is true even for proxy wave 1 interview information, even if the proxied-for person serves as a self-respondent in wave 2. Given the self-respondent is a different respondent from the last interview, dependent interviewing will not be used for his follow-up interview even though the information collected from last interview pertains to himself. The policy has effectively kept the information provided by the last respondent confidential.

interview observations in the follow-up interview.

3.5 Dependent interviewing

The SIPP 2004 questionnaire has the capacity to make extensive use of dependent information in its wave 2+ interviews. The two primary purposes of the dependent procedures are: 1) to remind respondents of prior characteristics (e.g., jobs, program participation, asset holdings, school enrollment, health insurance) in order to improve the reporting of spells, and 2) as a nonresponse follow-up procedure, providing information about prior-wave income amounts to help reduce nonresponse to initial amount questions. RIP and the presence of the same or a different respondent establish the ability to use the dependent procedures in follow-up interviews. If the same respondent provides information in both waves, then dependent questions are administered for that interview regardless of its RIP status . If the respondent for the subsequent interview is not the same respondent who provided the information in the preceding interview wave, then the ability to use dependent questions depends on the RIP status for that information. If the prior respondent did not respond to the RIP question with a "yes" response, then no dependent questions will be administered.

4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This paper addresses the following research questions:

(1) What is the likelihood that respondents, when asked, agree or disagree with the RIP information sharing request?

(2) What proportion of follow-up interviews are subject to RIP?

(3) How does RIP response change from one wave to the next? In particular, how often do respondents who initially say "no" to RIP change their answer to "yes" when asked again in the next wave?

(4) What is the actual impact of RIP on the use of dependent interviewing?

(5) Does objecting to information sharing with other household members relate to future survey participation behavior?

5. RESULTS

5.1 Respondents' likelihood to disagree with the RIP information sharing request

In examining the proportion of respondents who agree and disagree with the information disclosure request, the analysis is restricted to respondents who were asked the RIP question. These are

persons age 15 and over who provided a self-response interview and who resided in a household containing two or more adults. Slightly more than half (53%) of the 43,132 respondents *only* provided their own self-response interview; the remainder (47%) also provided at least one proxy interview for another adult household member. Table 2 summarizes their responses to the RIP question in the initial wave 1 interview. Overall, the vast majority (90.9%) of respondents said "yes" to the RIP question and gave permission to share information with other household members, should someone other than themselves provide data in the subsequent interview. Only 7.6% explicitly declined the disclosure request; another 1.5% had missing data (due to a "don't know" response or a refusal[6], or because the RIP question was not administered for some reason — most likely because of an interruption in their interview). It is of interest to note that there is a slight tendency for respondents who provided information for themselves and at least one other household member to disagree with the RIP request at a significantly higher rate (9.4%) than those who provided information only for themselves (6.0%) ($\chi 2=175.3$, 1 df, $p<.0001$, excluding those with missing RIP responses).

5.2 RIP Status

As noted earlier, RIP status is a crude indicator of the likely proportion of the next wave's individual interviews where dependent interviewing may or may not be used. RIP status is created for complete or partially-complete observations at the end of the SIPP 2004 panel's wave 1, 2, and 3 interviews. In comparison to wave 1, in which about 8% of the next wave's interviews may be restricted in their use of dependent interviewing procedures, the "at risk" proportion is substantially smaller in waves 2 (4%) and 3 (5%) (see Table 3). As we will see, these figures overstate the true rate of non-dependent interviewing actually employed in subsequent interviews, since they do not include the relevant characteristics of those interviews (same/different respondent). As shown in Table 4, less than a quarter of all wave 2 (23%) and wave 3 (19%) re-interviews were conducted with a respondent different from the prior interview.

5.3 Changes in RIP status between consecutive waves

Because of the way the SIPP questionnaire is constructed, in subsequent interview waves it is impossible to differentiate RIP responses in that particular wave from those carried-over from a prior wave. Thus we are unable to provide RIP response information after the initial wave 1 interview to address research question 4.3 — "How does RIP response change from one wave to the next?" As a substitute, we offer Tables 5 and 6, which show the changes in RIP status from one wave to the next for each complete or partially completed observation in both consecutive waves. The increase across subsequent waves in the proportion of observations in which information sharing is likely to be permitted in follow-up interviews is due in part to respondents who did not initially agree to the RIP request, but changed their answer when asked in the next wave. Table 5 shows that 73.0% of all observations with a RIP status of "no" in wave 1 changed to a "yes" status at the end of wave 2. Change in the other direction, from "yes" to "no," was very rare – only 1.1%. As noted earlier, whenever a follow-up interview is conducted with a respondent different than the

[6]Due to instrument error, 'don't know' and 'refused' responses were not stored.

prior wave interview respondent, or if a new adult member has entered the household, the RIP question will be asked of the current respondent even if the prior RIP status for that case was 'Yes'. Table 6 shows a similar pattern for wave 2 to wave 3, which shows that 54.3% of all observations with a RIP status of "no" at the end of wave 2 changed to a "yes" status at the end of wave 3, as compared to only a 1.4% yes-to-no change rate. The lower no-to-yes conversion rate from wave 2 to wave 3 is consistent with the notion that the concentration of those truly concerned about privacy/confidentiality issues, and who truly object to information sharing, is likely to be higher among those who maintain a "no" status at the end of two interview waves, compared to those with a "no" status at the end of wave 1.

5.4 Impact of RIP on Dependent Interviewing

Tables 7 shows that the new RIP rules actually had a very small impact on SIPP's ability to use dependent interviewing in waves 2 and 3. Among all complete or partially-complete person interviews, only 1.7% in wave 2 and 0.7% in wave 3 were not conducted with the use of dependent interviewing procedures because of RIP. As reported earlier, these figures are substantially less than the proportion who decline the RIP request because the same person often serves as the respondent from one wave to the next, thus rendering RIP irrelevant. Another 3.3% of all wave 2 person interviews, and 6.2% of all wave 3 person interviews, were not conducted with the use of dependent interviewing procedures for reasons unrelated to RIP — specifically those with no prior wave interview.

5.5 Declined Disclosure Request and Future Survey Participation

Table 8 shows that overall, about 8.8% of all wave 1 respondents did not complete (or partially complete) a wave 2 interview. Respondents who said 'no' to the RIP question had a higher survey non-participation rate in the subsequent wave (12.0%) than respondent who agreed to information sharing (7.9%). The non-participation rate was even higher for those with a missing, 'a 'don't know' or a 'refused' RIP response from the prior wave (23.5%; $\chi 2=267.0$, df=3 $p<.0001$). These results suggest that respondents' confidentiality concerns may be related to their future survey participation.

6. CONCLUSION

The findings of this analysis suggest that the implementation of the Respondent Identification Policy in the SIPP 2004 panel has had minimal impact on SIPP's ability to use dependent interviewing techniques. In less than 2% of wave 2 interviews, and less than 1% of wave 3 interviews did RIP restrict the use of dependent data (see Table 7). First, only a small percentage of respondents in the SIPP 2004 panel declined the disclosure request when asked the RIP question (see Table 2). And second, among those who did decline, the vast majority also served as the same respondents across interview waves, thus rendering their lack of consent irrelevant (see Table 4). Our minimal impact conclusion is consistent with Doyle's (2002) report.

Our preliminary analysis suggests that respondent's privacy concerns may be related to their future survey participation. We recommend more detailed analysis of the reasons for this relationship in follow-up interviews.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We owe a large debt of gratitude to many Census Bureau colleagues who assisted us in carrying out this research. In particular we thank our long-time SRD colleagues on the SIPP Methods Panel project, Julia Klein Griffiths and Joanne Pascale; Johanna Rupp (TMO) and Heather Holbert (DSD), who provided important (and embarrassingly frequent) guidance on how RIP procedures were actually implemented in the SIPP 2004 questionnaires; Elaine Hock (DSD), whose expertise we drew upon repeatedly in matters having to do with the structure and location of SIPP data files, and to Linhchi Conghuyen (DSD) and Lam Nguyen Nhu (DSD), who provided specific and much-needed assistance with data merging across waves; our official reviewers, Nancy Bates (DSD) and Terry DeMaio (SRD), whose thoughtful and constructive comments on drafts of this report made it better; and of course our late, lamented friend and colleague Pat Doyle, whose contributions are too numerous and fundamental to list.

Table 1: Administration of RIP Question in SIPP 2004 Panel Wave 2+ Interviews as a Function of Prior Wave RIP response, Same/Different Respondent (R), and the Presence of New Adult* Household Members

Presence of new adult in household?	***RE-ASK Question in wave2+?*** ("XXX"-Don't re-ask RIP)		
	Prior wave RIP response = "yes"		Prior wave RIP response **NE** "yes"
	same R	different R	
yes	RE-ASK	RE-ASK	RE-ASK
no	XXX		

*include returning household member who turned 15 since prior wave interview

Table 2: SIPP 2004 Wave 1 RIP Question Response Distribution for All Self-Respondents in Two-or-More-Adult Households (Complete or Partially Complete Interviews Only)

Type of Interview Report	N	**Response to RIP Question**		
		Agree to RIP Request	Decline RIP Request	Missing*
Self response only	22,860	91.9%	6.0%	2.1%
Self & proxy response	20,212	89.8%	9.4%	0.8%
Total	43,132	**90.9%**	**7.6%**	**1.5%**

* Responded "don't know" or refused the RIP question, or the question was not administered.

Table 3: RIP Status at the End of Each Interview for All Complete or Partially Complete Wave 1, 2, and 3 Interviews					
	Probably CAN Use Dependent Questions in the Next Wave		Probably CANNOT Use Dependent Questions in the Next Wave		Total
	one-adult hh	RIP = "yes"	RIP = "no"	(missing)*	
Wave 1 (N=84,870)	16.2%	75.7%	7.0%	1.0%	100%
Wave 2 (N=78,290)	15.2%	81.1%	2.8%	0.9%	100%
Wave 3 (N=74,772)	14.9%	80.4%	2.9%	1.8%	100

* Responded "don't know" or refused the RIP question, or the question was not administered.

Table 4. Unweighted Percentage of Person Interviews with Different Respondents in Two Consecutive Waves in SIPP 2004		
Respondent	**Wave 2 (N=75,644)**	**Wave 3 (N=69,778)**
Same as last interview	77.4%	81.0%
Different from last interview	**22.6%**	**19.0%**
Total	100%	100%

Table 5. Changes in RIP Status from Wave 1 to Wave 2 Among All Observations with Complete or Partially Completed Interviews in Both Waves

RIP status as collected in wave 1:	Percent distribution of RIP status as collected in wave 2				
	Probably CAN Use Dependent Questions in the Next Wave		**Probably CANNOT Use Dependent Questions in the Next Wave**		Total
	one-adult hh	RIP = "yes"	**RIP = "no"**	**Missing***	
one-adult hh	92.6%	5.0%	1.0	1.4%	100%
RIP = "yes"	0.3%	98.0%	1.1%	0.5%	100%
RIP = "no"	1.8%	73.0%	22.8%	2.4%	100%
Missing*	4.8%	76.2%	6.5%	12.7%	100%
Total	15.6%	80.9%	2.6%	0.9%	100%
Unweighted counts					
one-adult hh	11,500	619	125	169	12,413
RIP = "yes"	201	56,363	638	290	57,492
RIP = "no"	93	3,702	1,155	124	5,074
Missing*	32	504	43	84	661
Total	11,826	61,188	1,961	667	75,640

*The missing column indicates respondent is no longer available to ask the RIP question or the response to RIP was 'don't know' or 'refused'. Due to instrument error, the 'Don't know' and 'Refused' responses were not stored.

Table 6. Changes in RIP Status from Wave 2 to Wave 3 of all observations with complete or partially completed interviews in both waves

RIP status as collected in wave 2:	Percent distribution of RIP status collected in wave 3				
	Probably CAN Use Dependent Questions in the Next Wave		**Probably CANNOT Use Dependent Questions in the Next Wave**		Total
	one-adult hh	RIP="yes"	RIP="no"	Missing*	
one-adult hh	93.7%	3.6%	1.1	1.6%	100%
RIP="yes"	0.4%	97.2%	1.4%	1.0%	100%
RIP="no"	2.5%	54.3%	36.8%	6.4%	100%
Missing*	17.9%	50.6%	6.2%	25.4%	100%
Total	15.2%	81.0%	2.3%	1.4%	100%
Unweighted counts					
one-adult hh	11,500	393	123	170	10,960
RIP="yes"	218	54,885	776	577	56,456
RIP="no"	45	996	674	118	1,833
Missing*	95	269	33	135	532
Total	10,632	56,543	1,606	1,000	69,781

*The missing column indicates respondent is no longer available to ask the RIP question or the response to RIP was 'don't know' or 'refused'. Due to instrument error, the 'Don't know' and 'Refused' responses were not stored.

Table 7. Impact of RIP on Dependent Interviewing in SIPP 2004 Wave 2 and Wave 3 Interviews (Among all Complete and Partially Complete Adult (15+) Interviews)		
Interview Conducted Using ...	Wave 2 (N=78,302)	Wave 3 (N=74,783)
... Some Dependent Questions	95.0%	93.1%
... Only Non-Dependent Questions	5.0%	6.9%
due to RIP	**1.7%**	**0.7%**
due to non-RIP reasons*	3.3%	6.2%
Total	100%	100%

* Some wave 2+ interviews are necessarily non-dependent for reasons having nothing to do with RIP – specifically, those with no prior wave interview. This can be due to: (1) a new household member; (2) a returning member with a non-interview in the previous wave; or (3) a household member who has turned 15 since the last interview.

Table 8. Wave 2 Survey Non-Participation Rates for Respondents Provided a Self-Response Wave 1 Interview by RIP Responses					
	RIP response from prior wave				
Follow-up Interview Survey Participation	**Not asked (one-person or one-adult household) N=13,754**	**Yes (Information can be shared) N=39,486**	**No (information cannot be shared) N=3,287**	**Missing* N=651**	**Total N=57,181**
Unweighted %	9.7%	7.9%	12.1%	23.5%	8.8%
Unweighted counts	1,334	3,137	396	153	5,020

*The missing column indicates respondent is no longer available to ask the RIP question or the response to RIP was 'don't know' or 'refused'. Due to instrument error, the 'Don't know' and 'Refused' responses were not stored.

References

American Sociological Association. 1997. *American Sociological Association Style Guide*. 2nd ed. Washington DC.: American Sociological Association.

Bates, Nancy, Pat Doyle, and Gerald Gates. 2001. "Striking the Balance Between Privacy and Production in Demographic Surveys: Implementation of the Respondent Identification Policy" in Proceedings of the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Research Conference, 2001. Statistical Policy Working Paper Number 34. Washington, DC: Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology, Office of Management and Budget, 2001. Retrieved May 24, 2005 (http://www.fcsm.gov/01paper/Doyle.pdf).

DeMaio, Theresa and Kristen Hughes. 2001. "Report on Cognitive Testing of Question to Address the Respondent Identification Policy." Study Series, Survey Methodology #2003-06. Statistical Research Division, Washington DC: U.S. Census Bureau, report issued June 30, 2003.

Doyle, Patricia, Elizabeth Martin, and Jeffrey C. Moore. 2001. "The Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) Methods Panel Improving Income Measurement." SIPP Working Paper 234. Washington DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved May 25, 2005 (http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/ssm2003-06.pdf).

Doyle, Patricia. 2002. **"**Further Analysis of the Impact of the Respondent Identification Policy." Demographics Statistics Division, Washington DC: U.S. Census Bureau. July 16.

Loomis, Laura. 1999. "Preliminary Results of an Analysis to Examine Respondents' Reactions to the Respondent Identification Policy (RIP)." Statistical Research Division, Washington DC: U.S. Census Bureau, September 24.

Pascale, Joanne. 2002. "SIPP Methods Panel 2002 Rotation 1 RIP Followup Questions Preliminary Results." Washington DC:U.S. Census Bureau. Unpublished tables. September 19.

Pascale, Joanne and Thomas S. Mayer. 2004. "Exploring Confidentiality Issues Related to Dependent Interviewing: Preliminary Findings." *Journal of Official Statistics* 20:357-377. Retrieved July 19, 2005 (http:www.jos.nu/Articles/abstract.asp?article=202357).

Mathiowetz, Nancy and Katherine A. McGonagle. 2002. "An Assessment of the Current State of Dependent Interviewing in Household Surveys". *Journal of Official Statistics* 16:401-418.

Singer, Eleanor, John Van Hoewyk and Randall J. Neugebauer. 2003. "Attitudes and Behavior. The impact of privacy and confidentiality concerns on participation in the 2000 Census." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67:368-384.

Singer, Eleanor, Nancy Mathiowetz and Mick Couper. 1993. "The Impact of Privacy and Confidentiality Concerns on Survey Participation: The Case of the 1990 U.S. Census." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 57:465-482. Retrieved May 24, 2005 (http://www.jstor.org).

U.S. Census Bureau. 2001. *SIPP Quality Profile*. 3rd ed. SIPP Working Paper No. 230. Washington, DC:U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved August 4, 2005 (http://www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/usrguide/sipp2001.pdf).

Appendix A Versions of RIP Question fielded in Experimental and Production Surveys

Surveys & Reference	Exact RIP question wording used
American Housing Survey 1999 (Bates et al. 2001)	"We contact households every two year for this survey. If we talk to someone else in your household next time, instead of you, is it OK if we use your answers as a starting point?"
QDERS 1999 (Loomis 1999) and SIPP Methods Panel 2000 (Bates et. al. 2001)	One last thing: The Census Bureau sometimes recontacts households, for quality control or to update information. If we do that and talk to someone else in the household, is it OK to refer back to the answers you gave today?
SIPP Methods Panel 2001 (Doyle, 2001)	"One last thing... We re-contact households once over a 4-month period to update information. If we talk to someone else in your household next time, instead of you, is it OK if we use your answers as a starting point?"
2001 Cognitive Laboratory Testing (DeMaio and Hughes 2001)	Round 1 Version 1 (revised QDERS): "The Census Bureau may call back and talk to someone else in your household to update information. Is it okay with you if we refer back to the answers you gave today?" Version 2 (New RIP question): " Do you care if any other **adult** in your household knows how you answered? Because the Census Bureau may call back to update this information, and we'd like to be able to refer to the answers you gave today." Round 2: Version 1 (Revised new question): "Do you care if any other **person** in your household knows how you answered? Because the Census Bureau may call back to update this information, and we'd like to be able to refer to the answers you gave today." Version 2 (Revised AHS):"We re-contact household over a 2-year period to update information. If we talk to someone else in your household next time, instead of you, is it OK if we use your answers as a starting point?"
SIPP Methods Panel 2002 (Pascale 2002) and SIPP 2004 Panel Cognitive test Pascale and Mayer 2004)	"One last question for you: We will recontact this household in 4 months to update information. If we talk to someone else in your household next time, instead of you, is it OK if we use your answers as a starting point?"

Appendix B

The SIPP 2004 Panel			
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3
Number of Interviewed Household	43,711	40,587	39,117
Household Response Rates	85.1%	91.9%	87.7%
Number of Completed* Person Interviews	84,926	78,326	74,801
Person Interview Completion Rates	98.5%	97.1%	96.1%
Number of Respondents providing information	56,884	47,873	44,921
Number of eligible respondents who were asked the RIP question	43,132	NA	NA
Number of (complete or partially-complete) Person Interview in current and prior wave interview	NA	75,644	69,778

*A person interview is considered completed if the interview was at least partially completed.