

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
(Survey Methodology #2007-41)

**Report on the New “Type 2 People Questions:
A Pretesting Study for the Re-Engineered SIPP**

Anna Y. Chan
Jeffrey C. Moore

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

Report Issued: December 18, 2007

Disclaimer: This report is released to inform interested parties of research and to encourage discussion. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

Executive Summary

The purpose of this research is to evaluate a set of new questions proposed for use in the re-engineered Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). An “original sample person” (OSP) is anyone residing at a sample address at the time of the SIPP interview. The new questions attempt to capture very basic information about “Type-2” people – people who do not live at sampled addresses at the time of the SIPP interview, but who lived with an OSP for at least one month of the re-engineered SIPP reference period (currently, the previous calendar year). The new questions seek to identify the Type-2 people associated with each household member, and to capture information about their relationship, months of co-residence, age, sex, education, employment status, and approximate annual income. Subject-matter experts in the Census Bureau’s Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division (HHES) were largely responsible for determining the content to be covered in the question series. If successful, the Type-2 questions will permit a more complete understanding of the socio-economic circumstances of SIPP respondents during the reference period of interest.

In the spring of 2007, we conducted two rounds of cognitive interviews with a total of 13 participants to pretest the new questions. We recruited participants through a variety of methods, including on-line and newspaper advertisements and word-of-mouth contact, looking for people who (a) lived with at least one other person at the time of recruitment, and (b) had lived with someone else for at least one month of 2006. The initial round of testing was quite limited – five respondents – because problems surfaced quickly for some items, especially Q1 and Q2, which dealt with the identification of a “clump” of household members who lived together for all of the previous calendar year (and who thus could be assumed to hold all Type-2 people (if any) in common), and Q4 and Q5, which were the primary questions to identify Type-2 people. As initially designed, these items required extensive probing and clarification in order to elicit adequate responses from the participants. We encountered very little difficulty with any of the questions concerned with the substantive characteristics of the Type-2 people. We revised the four problematic items and tested the revised set of questions with eight new respondents in a second round of interviews.

With the revisions used in round 2 we found that, overall, the Type-2 questions were easy for respondents to understand, and as a result many of them successfully identified Type-2 persons and reported their basic demographic information. Although the revisions seemed to resolve problems of question wording and design, we still observed problems of another, more fundamental kind: several respondents who were simply not very good at recalling Type-2 people, resulting in response error, especially in proxy interviews. In addition, even where reporting seemed to be reasonably accurate and complete, several respondents (especially in proxy interview situations) said they found aspects of the reporting task to be somewhat “inappropriate,” “strange,” or “awkward.” The primary reasons offered for these reactions were respondents’ lack of knowledge about the Type-2 people, and thus their concern about the reliability of the data they provided (again, especially in proxy interview situations), and concerns about confidentiality, privacy, and the sensitive nature of income information. The

majority of our respondents did not have these concerns, however, and others' incipient concerns were allayed by explanations of the basic nature of the survey ("a survey about the economic circumstances of people and families") and the purpose of the collection of Type-2 information. Because of these issues, we recommend that optional explanatory text be made more prominent, and that the Type-2 questions be administered to self-respondents to the maximum extent possible. In most cases, the "clump" approach will render the household respondents's self response Type-2 report sufficient for the entire household, thus removing the need for any concern about proxy reporting about Type-2 people.

1. Introduction and Overview

People don't live in a vacuum. A survey of the economic well-being of individuals becomes more complete and informative to the extent that it also captures basic information about all of the people with whom those individuals live. This is a fairly straightforward matter for point-in-time, "snapshot" surveys, which simply have to collect information on the target individual and all current members of his/her household. For surveys which seek to describe economic circumstances across some span of time – a "reference period" – during which time household composition can change, the problem becomes more complicated. The Census Bureau's Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), because it uses a relatively short, 4-month reference period, has always opted to ignore within-wave comings-and-goings that are not evident in a comparison of household rosters from one interview wave to the next. For example, at its first interview, SIPP simply assumes that the people (aside from newborns) found to reside at each sample address lived at the address during the entire 4-month period of interest, and ignores the possibility that others might have lived there and left. At subsequent interview waves, as long as the current and previous household rosters look the same there is no attempt to determine whether anyone else came and went during the reference period, or whether anyone who continues on the current roster might have lived elsewhere for part of the reference period. Again, these simplifying assumptions are reasonable in the context of a relatively brief span of time.

A likely feature of the re-engineered SIPP, however, is a survey reference period that spans an entire calendar year, a duration of time that renders the traditional SIPP assumptions substantially less defensible. With a one-year reference period there is simply much more opportunity for movements into and out of co-residence that are invisible to a point-in-time household roster, and for longer periods of invisible co-residence that could have large potential impacts on someone's economic circumstances. Therefore, re-engineered SIPP planning includes asking a brief set of questions designed to identify and capture basic information about people who are not "original sample people" (OSP) – the set of individuals who live at sample addresses at the time of the SIPP interview, and who are the main targets of that interview – but who lived with an OSP for at least one month during the reference period. We refer to these individuals as "Type-2" people. A successful Type-2 question series will permit a more complete understanding of the socio-economic circumstances of SIPP respondents over the entire reference period of interest. Consider, for instance, a single mother who is unemployed and on food stamps at the time of the

SIPP interview. Analysts would no doubt make a very different assessment of her and her children's income and poverty status during the survey reference period if it were known that her spouse had only recently left the household. Hence, such information on Type-2 people are crucial if we were to provide accurate estimates on household for the reference period of interest.

Census Bureau staff drafted a brief question series designed to identify the Type-2 people associated with each household member, and to capture information about a limited set of characteristics deemed critical by HHES subject-matter experts: the Type-2 person's relationship to the OSP, months of co-residence, age, sex, education, employment status, and approximate annual income. In accordance with both Census Bureau policy and with accepted best questionnaire design practices, staff of the Statistical Research Division conducted a cognitive interview evaluation of the proposed new question series in the spring of 2007. This report describes that evaluation and its results.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows: Section 2 presents a very brief overview of the current SIPP program and its eventual successor, the re-engineered SIPP. Section 3 describes the research methods used in the current study. Section 4, comprising the bulk of the report, presents our findings and recommendations.

2. SIPP Background

2.1. SIPP, Historically and To Date

SIPP is a nationally representative longitudinal survey of adults in the United States. Since 1984 it has collected information – generally at the monthly level – on income, wealth, poverty and the dynamics of program participation. New panels have been introduced in SIPP approximately every three or four years. The current SIPP panel, which started in 2004, will ultimately consist of twelve waves (rounds) of interviewing, with each wave covering the preceding four calendar months. Thus, SIPP interviews are conducted three times a year, at four month intervals. In order to smooth out the administration of the survey in the field, the sample is split into four subsamples (called “rotation groups”), each of which is interviewed in successive months. For example, the first interview wave for the 2004 panel was conducted in February 2004 for rotation group 1, and in March, April, and May for rotation groups 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Wave 2 was then conducted in June (for rotation group 1), July (2), August (3), and September (4), and so on for subsequent waves. The final 2004 panel wave 12 interviews will be completed in January 2008, and a new panel is then scheduled to start in February. More detailed information on the SIPP program can be found at [<http://www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/>].

2.2. Re-Engineered SIPP

SIPP's longitudinal design offers many advantages, and over the years has provided policy makers and researchers with invaluable data, but it does so at considerable cost. The dollar costs of conducting three interviews every year are perhaps the most obvious costs, but the survey also

imposes considerable costs in the form of burden on respondents, and its complex design makes review and data processing difficult and time consuming. In an effort to reduce costs, both financial and otherwise, the Census Bureau has proposed an eventual re-engineering of the SIPP program. One of the cost cutting ideas is to field the survey once every 12 months instead of once every 4 months. One major concern regarding this idea is the potential impact on data quality of a longer recall period. To address this concern, the Census Bureau is exploring the use of Event History Calendar (EHC) interviewing methodologies in the re-engineered SIPP, which offer the potential for higher quality retrospective reporting by utilizing landmark events as memory cues for respondents to recall the start and end dates of certain events (Belli 1998), such as when a job starts or ends. A central feature of re-engineered SIPP is expected to be the use of EHC methods as a major component of the procedures for gathering data from respondents, using a 12-month, calendar year reference period in a single interview per year.

Current plans call for an initial field test of EHC methods in early 2008, focused on a comparison of data quality between the EHC-derived data and data from a set of three SIPP interviews covering the same time period. Sufficiently positive results from that test would then lead to a large-scale “dress rehearsal” of the re-engineered SIPP in 2009, and full-scale production implementation in 2011 or 2012.

2.3. Type-2 Questions

As noted above, the planned expansion of the SIPP reference period to an entire calendar year brought with it increased concerns about undetected periods of co-residence of SIPP sample people with Type-2 individuals – those who do not live at the sample address at the time of the SIPP interview, but who lived with a sample person for at least one month during the reference period. In some easy-to-imagine circumstances, a Type-2 person’s characteristics and resources could have a profound impact on the economic well-being of the people he/she lives with. Thus, in order to permit a more accurate and comprehensive accounting of economic well-being, Census Bureau staff decided to add a brief set of questions to the re-engineered SIPP interview to identify and capture basic information about Type-2 people – specifically, their relationship to the SIPP sample people, months of co-residence, age, sex, education, employment status, and approximate annual income.

For the most part, household membership in the U.S. is quite stable. Using longitudinal data from the SIPP 2001 Panel, Bauman (2006) reported that only 6.5% of original sampled persons who were interviewed in wave 4 had lived with Type-2 people at some point in the prior 12 months. Given the majority of the people found to live together at one point in time are likely to have lived together for a substantial period of time, in designing the Type-2 question series, we exploited this fact to improve efficiency. Since any Type-2 person identified for one household member would be shared by all other household members who lived with him/her for the entire year, we started the question series with questions to identify a subset of household members (a “clump”) who lived together for the entire year. For any such clump, one person can respond to the Type-2 questions for him/herself and all other fellow clump members.

Both Census Bureau policy and accepted best questionnaire design practices dictate that, before new questions can be implemented in a “live” survey, they must undergo some form of pretesting to demonstrate their likely ability to perform in the field as intended. Therefore, in the spring of 2007 staff of the Statistical Research Division conducted a cognitive interview evaluation of the proposed new question series. In the next section we summarize the design of the research.

3. Methods

3.1. Background and Overview

We used cognitive interviews to pretest the new Type-2 questions. Cognitive interviews attempt to bring to the surface the cognitive processes respondents use in answering survey questions – “in particular, their comprehension, recall, decisions and judgments and response processes” (Willis, 2005, p6). Cognitive pretesting of questionnaires is a useful way to detect problems in one or more components of the response process and identify possible causes of survey response error. In this method, respondents are often asked to “think aloud,” to paraphrase a question’s intent, to offer their understanding of the meaning of key terms and phrases (Hughes, 2003), and otherwise asked probing questions to reveal their thought processes as they answer the survey questions. Cognitive testing generally uses small numbers of individuals (between 5 to 15) in an interview round (Willis, 2005, p7).

Between mid April and early June, 2007, we conducted a total of thirteen cognitive interviews in two rounds of testing. Most interviews were conducted in the Statistical Research Division’s cognitive laboratory; a few were conducted off-site at a location more convenient to the participant. Participants were recruited through a variety of methods, including on-line and newspaper advertisements and word-of-mouth contact. After initial recruitment, they received a follow-up telephone call to remind them of their appointments. Recruiting efforts focused primarily on conducting interviews with people who (a) lived with at least one other person at the time of recruitment, and (b) lived with someone else – not a current member of his/her household – for at least one month of 2006, the reference period used in the test question series. We conducted the cognitive interviews using a paper-and-pencil mock-up of what will be, in the actual re-engineered SIPP instrument, part of an automated (computer-assisted) questionnaire. In the first round we administered the initial draft question series to five respondents; as described in Section 4, these early interviews revealed problems with several questions almost immediately. We revised the questions and administered a second round of interviews to eight additional respondents. In the end, we found that the revised questions worked very successfully.

3.2. Cognitive Interview Procedures

We primarily used “concurrent” (as opposed to “retrospective”) methods in our cognitive interviews – asking respondents to “think aloud” as they answered the Type-2 questions, probing about hesitations and other indicators of uncertainty or confusion, exploring the meaning of terms and phrases as they were encountered, etc. (In some instances, we trained respondents

to use the think-aloud technique before the interview began.) We also asked a few general questions retrospectively. We asked respondents to provide feedback and comments on any issues they encountered while answering the Type-2 questions, and, in particular, whether they found the questions about former household members “strange” or “inappropriate.” We also asked respondents whether they felt they had enough information to answer the questions adequately, and whether they wondered why such questions were asked.

All interviews were tape-recorded – with participants' permission – to facilitate analysis of the results. Each interview lasted about 30 to 45 minutes, depending on the number of Type-2 people that each respondent reported and the presence and nature of any difficulties each experienced. Participants were informed that their response was voluntary and that the information they provided was strictly confidential, to be seen only by Census Bureau staff directly involved in the research project. Respondents were paid \$40 for their participation.

3.3. The Type-2 Question Series

We began each interview, just before launching into the Type-2 questions themselves, with a standard household roster question to enumerate all current residents at the respondent's current address. We note this design decision because in a small number of cases respondents exhibited some confusion with regard to the switch from talking about current household members, for purposes of developing the household roster, to talking about people they used to live with, for purposes of the substantive Type-2 questions. We suspect that these troubles were a result of the artificial context of the new questions in the cognitive interview questionnaire – in the actual SIPP implementation there is likely to be much more separation between the rostering questions and the Type-2 questions.

To maximize efficiency, we designed the new series to first determine whether there is a group of household members who lived together for the entire preceding calendar year (we came to refer to such a group as a “clump;” see Q1 to Q3). As noted above, all of the people in a “clump” share any Type-2 experiences, thus necessitating that only one clump member be asked the Type-2 question series. (For simplicity, we designed the question series to only explore “clump” possibilities for the initial, household respondent.) Following the clump questions, the interview then identified all Type-2 people associated with each household member, and captured information about their relationship to each relevant household member, their months of co-residence, and their age, sex, education, employment status, and approximate annual income. These questions were first administered to (and about) the household respondent – in our case, the cognitive interview respondent along with all members of his/her clump (if any) – and then individually to all other household members who were not in a clump with the household respondent. In the cognitive interview study we conducted at least one proxy interview if there was an adult household member who was not part of a clump with the household respondent. Four of the 13 interviews (two sets of two) were conducted with people who were housemates. This allowed us some ability to assess potential reporting errors, especially when using proxy respondents to collect information on Type-2 persons associated with other household members.

Interviews with the first several respondents surfaced some fairly obvious problems with the design of key initial questions in the Type-2 series – in particular, the questions which were intended to identify the household respondent’s clump of all-year co-residents (Q1, Q2), and the question which determined the presence of any Type-2 people (Q4). Thus, we ended the first round of interviews after the first five, made revisions to the problematic items noted above (as well as minor revisions to a few other items), and then conducted eight additional interviews in a second interview round.

3.4. Respondent Demographic Characteristics

There was no formal procedure during the interviews to collect respondents’ demographic information. However, our recruiter conducted an initial screening survey with potential subjects and collected the basic demographic information of our final respondents. Our participants were a relatively young group. Most were in their twenties; the oldest was in her late forties. Ten of the 13 respondents were female. Nine of the thirteen respondents were non-Hispanic white and the other four respondents were African American. Four respondents lived in “family” households, two of which were married couple households and two were single-parent households. The other nine respondents were living with non-relatives exclusively. See Table 1 for details.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Cognitive Interview Respondents		
Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Age Range		
20-29	7	54%
30-39	4	31%
40-49	2	15%
Sex		
Female	10	77%
Male	3	23%
Education Completed		
High School	2	15%
College degree	5	39%
Postgraduate degree	6	46%
Race		
White	9	69%
Black	4	31%
Household Type		
<u>Family households:</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>31%</u>
Married couple household	2	15%
Female-headed household*	2	15%
<u>Non-relative households:</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>69%</u>
Unmarried partners	4	31%
House-mates	5	39%

*NOTE: These households also include a non-relative; in one case a tenant, in the other a boyfriend.

4. Results and Recommendations

4.1. Identification of Household Members who Lived Together All Year (the “Clump”)

As noted earlier, following the listing of the current household roster, the new Type-2 series begins (Q1 and Q2) by determining whether there is a group of household members who lived together with the household respondent for the entire preceding calendar year (in our case, 2006), and if so, which household members comprise that “clump” (Q3). We included these questions to enhance the efficiency of the Type-2 question series. Since many households contain long-time co-residents whose Type-2 people (if any) would be shared, only one member of the clump would need to be asked the Type-2 questions. In this section we summarize the cognitive interview results for these initial questions.

Q1 – Round 1

Did you and [READ NAMES] [both/all] live together for all of 2006?

- Yes
- No
- D/R

Round 1 cognitive interview results

Five respondents interviewed during the first round of cognitive interviewing received this question in the form shown above. Only one respondent answered in the affirmative, indicating that the entire household had lived together for all of calendar year 2006. However, despite the question’s apparent simplicity, it proved problematic for several respondents. We observed the following issues and problems:

(1) confusion about the reference period

Q1 was positioned immediately after the initial household roster procedures which asked respondents to report who they lived with *now*, at the time of the interview. The shift to the 2006 reference period seemed not to register with at least two respondents, who thought this question was still asking about 2007, since we just finished collecting the current household roster. The confusion was apparent when one respondent was asked to paraphrase the question. “You wanted to know who lives in the house [*referring to the roster question*] so I took that to mean today, then you mentioned 2006? [*referring to Q1*]” As noted earlier, the negative influence of the immediately-preceding roster question is probably an artificial circumstance of the format of the cognitive interview questionnaire, which would not be repeated in the actual re-engineered SIPP instrument. Some of the problem, however, also seemed to derive from the fact that the new date receives no particular emphasis in the initial wording of Q1, leading some respondents to fail to attend to it.

(2) recall difficulty

One respondent who answered “no” to this question turned out to be incorrect. The interviewer found out much later in the interview that one of his three current housemates was living in his house during all of 2006. The respondent forgot about this tenant, whose room is in the basement of the house, and who seldom uses the house’s common area. It was a long, drawn-out process for this respondent to recall his living situation in 2006, which was both complex and emotionally painful – his wife and children moved out during the year and two other tenants moved in.

(3) ambiguous concept subject to respondent interpretation

The phrase “...all of 2006” proved to be less clear-cut and unambiguous than we had anticipated; respondents arrived at multiple interpretations depending on their own particular living situation. One respondent decided (correctly, according to typical survey rules) that her boyfriend, a part-time resident, should be included as a member of her household since he typically spends at least 4 days a week there, “and that’s a majority of the time.” However, without any hesitation on her part she did not name him as someone she lived with for all of 2006, even though his “majority of the time” residency pattern had been stable for years. She reasoned: “He only stays with me 4 out of 7 days, so that’s not ‘all’ of 2006... only my daughter and I were there full time.” Another respondent decided that since the lease on his new apartment started at the beginning of January 2006, he and his girlfriend lived together there all year, even though they lived separately elsewhere before moving in together, which didn’t happen until February: “To me it feels like it was all of 2006.”

Recommended revision for round 2

After the first five interviews, Q1 was revised with the goal of emphasizing the reference period. We moved initial mention of the reference period to the beginning of the question, and added a very clear definition of “all year” – “from the beginning of January through the end of December” (see revised Q1 below).

Q1 – REVISED for Round 2

In 2006, did you and [READ NAMES] [... / all] live together all year, from the beginning of January through the end of December?

Yes

No

D/R

Round 2 cognitive interview results

Eight round 2 respondents were administered this revised version of Q1. In its revised form we observed none of the problems we had seen with the first version. Probing, observation, and paraphrasing suggested that all respondents understood the question as intended; no one exhibited any confusion about the reference period. However, we did continue to observe response error. The one participant in round 2 who reported having lived with her entire

household for all of 2006 was revealed, later in the interview, to have misreported – she had simply forgotten that her grandmother lived with another family member for a couple of months early in 2006.

Q1 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

We recommend the revised form of Q1 tested in round 2 [see above], which seemed to resolve the problems observed in round 1. The one respondent’s recall error was unrelated to the design of the question, and did not signify any problem in how well she understood it.

Q2 – Round 1

Did you live with [either/any] of your current housemates for all of 2006?

Yes

No

D/R

Round 1 cognitive interview results

Q2 was administered to respondents who said “no” to Q1 – they did not live with their entire current household for all of 2006 – and whose current household consisted of at least two other people. At this point we know that the entire household is not a single clump; the intent of Q2 is to determine whether a subset of the household, including the household respondent, form a clump, and thus share any Type-2 experiences. Four round 1 respondents were administered this question, two of whom responded “yes.” We identified two issues in the round 1 administration of this version of Q2:

(1) problematic term: “housemates”

Although it did not seem to lead to any significant problem with regard to understanding the meaning or intent of the question, four of the five respondents defined the term “housemates” not as it was intended – as a generic label for the people one lives with – but as unrelated individuals with whom one lives (“somebody unrelated to me by marriage or by blood”).

(2) recall error

One respondent who answered “no” to this question forgot that one of his tenants was living in his house during all of 2006. This was revealed much later in the interview.

Recommended revision for round 2

Although no respondent exhibited any difficulty understanding the question, it was clear that the term “housemate” did not convey the intended meaning, so we replaced that term with more direct and explicit wording. Simple recall failure is a problem for which we have no recommended solution.

Q2 – REVISED for Round 2

Did you live all year (in 2006) with [either / any] of the people you currently live with?

Yes

No

D/R

Round 2 cognitive interview results

Five round 2 participants who responded “no” to Q1 were administered the revised Q2 question, which seemed to be clearly understood by all five respondents and to work as intended (as had been the case with the round 1 version). Q2 posed problems for one respondent in round 2, but those problems were due to her complex living arrangements – she had moved four times during 2006 – and had nothing to do with question wording or construction. (With substantial effort from the participant herself, and with the help of the interviewer’s probing, she eventually recalled that she was actually living with her boyfriend the last two months of 2006.)

Q2 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

We recommend the revised, round 2 version of Q2 [see above]. The one respondent’s difficulties were unrelated to the design of the question, but simply reflected the difficulty of the recall task for her.

Q3 – Rounds 1 and 2

Who was that? (Which of these people did you live with for all of 2006?)

Cognitive interview results (rounds 1 and 2)

Five respondents reported in Q2 having lived with some (but not all) of the other current members of their household during all of 2006, and thus were asked this question. We observed no problems with this question among any of the five to whom it was administered.

Q3 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change – use Q3 as tested.

4.2. Identification of the Presence of Type-2 People

If the initial questions identified a “clump” for the household respondent, the interview first asked questions about Type-2 people for the clump members, as a group, and then followed with questions asked separately for each household member who was not part of a clump with the household respondent. The clump and individual questions differed only very slightly. We discuss them together for purposes of this report.

Q4 (clump) – Round 1

Universe: Respondents who lived with any other current household member for all of 2006

(Other than the people who are living here now, was/Was) there anyone else who lived with you for one month or more during calendar year 2006?

- Yes
- No
- D/R

Q4 (individual) – Round 1

Universe: Respondents (or their proxies) who did not live with the household respondent for all of 2006

(Next let's talk about [NAME].) Other than the people who are living here now, was there anyone else who lived with [you/NAME] for one month or more during calendar year 2006?

READ IF NECESSARY: This survey is about people's economic situation during calendar year 2006. In order to get an accurate picture, we need to ask a couple of questions about any other people [you/NAME] lived with during 2006 but who aren't living here now.

- Yes
- No
- D/R

Round 1 cognitive interview results

In round 1 of our cognitive pretesting, five participants were administered one or both versions of Q4. As shown above, the exact question wording differed slightly depending on the responses to Q1 and Q2, and whether it was self or proxy interview, but the stem question – “Was there anyone else who lived with you for one month or more during calendar year 2006?” – was basically the same for all respondents. Three participants had identified themselves as part of a clump and so were administered the clump version of Q4. These three respondents also provided proxy response to the Q4 (individual) question for one of the household members who did not live with the respondent for all of 2006. The two remaining respondents who did not live with any of their current household members last year were only asked the Q4 (individual) question. After the completion of their self-response interview, these two respondents also provided proxy information for at least one other current household member by responding to the Q4 (individual) question series.

All five round 1 respondents had difficulty with Q4, regardless of whether it was the clump or the individual version, and regardless of whether they were self-responding or responding as a proxy. The intent of the question is to find out whether the person being interviewed lived with anyone else for one month or more during the prior year, either at the current address or any other previous address. Respondents had difficulty understanding the question and found it confusing, resulting in interruption of the smooth flow of the interview and response error. The problems were caused by:

(1) overly complex question

One respondent answered “no” when serving as a proxy respondent for his housemate, but he interpreted the question to be asking whether anyone else was living with his housemate in the housemate’s room. Another respondent was thoroughly confused: “I’m sorry, could you repeat the question?...Are you asking did the people that I’m living with now live with my brother where he was?”

(2) question order effect

One respondent failed to catch the shift from initial questions Q1 & Q2): “No...Oh, yes, there is....When you first asked me you had just asked whether anyone else was living in the house, so I assumed you were asking about anyone else living there outside of us.” Another respondent had a similar response: “Oh, because the previous questions were about where you lived now, so I assumed that’s what this was about, too...don’t say ‘here,’ maybe ‘either here or at another residence.’”

(3) sensitive and inappropriate question

One respondent refused to talk about who lived with her boyfriend: “I can’t answer that question because it has no bearing on my address...If you want to ask people about what goes on in their houses then you got to get it from them.”

(4) differing interpretation of key phrases

The intent of the question – and in particular the phrase “... was there anyone else who lived with you...” – was to identify Type-2 people who had either resided at the current address and left, or who had resided with the respondent at a previous address. Most respondents had a much more restricted interpretation, which focused only on the current residence. One respondent, responding as a proxy for his girlfriend, initially said “no” to Q4, despite having just completed a detailed discussion of how she had lived with her parents until she moved in with him in February: [I: How do I make this question make sense to you?] “To me it sounds like you’re asking the same question twice – by asking did anyone live with [K] you’re asking did I live with [K]...” [I: What if I flipped it around – did [K] live with anyone else – would that make a difference?] “Yes, it does, and then I would say ‘yes,’ she did.” Another respondent argued with great vehemence that “did anyone live with you” and “did you live with anyone” are very different questions: [I: Paraphrase?] “Did I have anybody that stayed with me, not permanently, but it had to be at least a month.” [I: Here’s another way I could have asked that Q – “...anyone else you lived with..”] “That I lived with, or who lived with me?” [I: re-read] “Then my answer is no.” [I: Tell me about that.] “Because that’s the difference – did I live with them or did they live with me?” [I: So those are different?] “Oh yes – one refers to somebody living in my house, the other is me living in someone else’s house.”

Recommended revision for round 2

A key factor in respondents’ difficulty with Q4 as originally designed seemed to be its failure to clearly communicate our intent – that in thinking about Type-2 people respondents consider both

the current residence and any previous residence(s) where the person lived during the year. Our recommendation for round 2 was a 2-stage solution: First, before asking about any Type-2 people, we added a new question (Q4a) to determine whether the respondent (or the person being proxied for) had one residence in 2006 or more than one. Then, based on that information, we more explicitly tailored the main Type-2 question (re-numbered Q4b) to make it clear that we want to know about Type-2 people regardless of location, that is, at either the current residence or any other previous address.

Q4a (clump) – NEW for Round 2

Universe: Respondents who lived with any other current household member for all of 2006

Did you and [READ NAMES] move to this address before or after January 1st, 2006?

- Before
- After
- other answers
- D/R

Q4a (individual) – NEW for Round 2

Universe: Respondents (or their proxies) who did not live with the household respondent for all of 2006

(Next let's talk about [NAME]). Did [you/NAME] move to this address before or after January 1st, 2006?

- Before
- After
- other answers
- D/R

Round 2 cognitive interview results

Eight respondents were administered new question Q4a – as self-respondents, three were asked the clump version of the question and five the individual version. All eight subsequently served as proxies for at least one other household member, and in that role were asked the individual version.

We observed no respondent difficulties with this new question. All respondents answered the new Q4a question promptly and confidently, and all paraphrased it correctly. As is indicated in the description of the Q4b results, the addition of this new question, in combination with the revised wording of Q4b, seems to have eliminated the problems round 1 respondents encountered with the initial design of Q4.

Q4a – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

We recommend including new question Q4a in the final Type-2 question series.

Q4b (clump) – REVISED for Round 2

Universe: Respondents who lived with any other current household member for all of 2006

[Other than the people you live with now, was/Was] there anyone else who lived

FILL if Q4a = “before” – here with you and [READ NAMES] for one month or more during calendar year 2006?

FILL for all other responses to Q4a – with you and [READ NAMES] for one month or more during calendar year 2006, either here or at a previous address?

Yes

No

D/R

Q4b (individual) – REVISED for Round 2

Universe: Respondents (or their proxies) who did not live with the household respondent for all of 2006

[Other than the people [you/NAME] [live/lives] with now, was/Was] there anyone else who lived

FILL if Q4a = “before” – here with [you/NAME] for one month or more during calendar year 2006?

FILL for all other responses to Q4a – with [you/NAME] for one month or more during calendar year 2006, either here or at a previous address?

Round 2 cognitive interview results

Four round 2 respondents who lived with at least one other household member for all of 2006 were administered the clump question – three with the fill for those with only one residence in 2006 (Q4a = “before”) and one with the fill for people with multiple 2006 residences. Four others, responding for themselves, were administered the individual version of the question; all eight respondents were also administered the individual version of Q4b as a proxy respondent for another member of the household. The one residence and multiple residence fills were used approximately equally across both self and proxy administrations. We detected no problems in understanding the revised question. In particular, all those who had multiple residences to consider gave evidence that they clearly understood that they were supposed to think about Type-2 people at both their (or the target person’s) current and past residences.

The major issue for this question appears to be respondents’ ability to recall the desired information, rather than any problem of understanding or interpretation. For example, one respondent who said “no” to Q4b simply forgot about her Type-2 brother, who had lived with her for two or three months early in the year during a rocky period in his marriage. She did not recall this episode during the interview, but later called back to confess her error and apologize to the interviewer.

We also gained insights into respondents’ reporting difficulties through interviews with two sets of housemates, each of whom reported both as a self-respondent and as a proxy for the other person. We detected response error (recall error and incorrect information) in both sets of

housemates. In one pair of unmarried partners, the boyfriend provided inaccurate information both about himself and as a proxy for his partner. In his own interview he deliberately did not report a period of two months in which he lived on a cruise ship rather than with his parents (justifying the omission as “too complicated to report”). He also provided inaccurate Type-2 information for his girlfriend. He reported that before he and she had moved in together she had lived with her family; in reality she lived during that period in a dorm-like situation with roommates on board a cruise ship. The girlfriend provided a detailed (and presumably accurate) account both for herself and as a proxy for her boyfriend – for example, reporting his Type-2 persons as both his family members, while he lived with them, and his roommates on the cruise ship where the two of them had met. In the second set of housemate interviews (a landlady and her tenant), both respondents provided inaccurate proxy interview reports. The landlady provided information on her tenant’s Type-2 situation based on what her tenant has told her about the people. She reported that he had two roommates (consistent with what the tenant himself remembered, he reported much later in the interview that he has had a third roommate for a couple of months) and has only a very rough idea on the demographics of these people, hence her response is at best approximation and were slightly different from the tenant’s report. In his proxy interview for her, the tenant reported one Type-2 person for his landlady in 2006 when in fact, according to her interview, the supposed Type-2 person had moved out in late 2005.

Q4b – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Q4b (clump and individual)

This survey is about people’s economic situation during calendar year [YEAR]. The picture would be incomplete if we didn’t get a little information about people [you/NAME] used to live with. [Other than the people.... [etc.]

With the revised question we continued to observe response error, due primarily to recall difficulty and lack of knowledge among proxies. However, because respondents appeared to find the revised Q4a-Q4b question set easy to understand, we recommend its use in the final instrument – but our concerns about the quality of proxy reports lead us to also recommend that the Type-2 questions be administered only to self-respondents, to the maximum extent possible.

We do recommend one small change to Q4b. The “read if necessary” text (or something like it) proved to be effective in several instances where respondents expressed some concerns or doubts about the reasons for the Type-2 questions (not necessarily at this point in the interview – generally later, in fact). Thus, we recommend that the optional text be included in the Q4b question text, as part of a brief introduction.

Q5 (clump and individual) – Round 1

Can you tell me who that was, please? (That is, the people who lived with [you/NAME] for some part of calendar year 2006 but who don’t live here now?)

READ IF NECESSARY: We don’t need full names – first name and last initial is fine. I only need a name so you and I can be clear about who we’re talking about.

Round 1 cognitive interview results

Q5 was administered to round 1 respondents who said “yes” to Q4. We observed some confusion concerning the phrase “...lived with you...” in a “clump” situation where “you” was intended as a plural pronoun. Other response difficulties were, again, attributable not to problems of question design, but rather to the inherent difficulty of the task – in particular, proxy respondents’ lack of knowledge. We also observed a problem in one interview which had clear origins in the respondent’s difficulties at the household roster stage. This respondent initially listed his children as members of his current household, which subsequent probing revealed to be incorrect. When the time came to report about Type-2 people – which his children clearly were for him – he neglected to report them.

Recommended revision for round 2

We recommend avoiding the singular/plural “you” problem by making the wording explicit in “clump” cases where the plural meaning is intended – by changing “you” to “you and [NAME(S)],” in other words. We also recommend implementing wording variations in Q5 parallel to those implemented in Q4b, focusing attention on “here” if there was only one residence (i), and on all residences if there was more than one (ii).

Q5 (clump) – REVISED for round 2

Can you tell me who that was, please? (That is, the other people who lived
i. here with you and [READ NAMES]
ii. with you and [READ NAMES], either here or at a previous address
for a month or more during 2006?)

Q5 (individual) – REVISED for round 2

Can you tell me who that was, please? (That is, the other people who lived
i. here with [you/NAME]
ii. with [you/NAME], either here or at a previous address
for a month or more during 2006?)

Round 2 cognitive interview results

The revised question worked as intended, resolving all comprehension issues; respondents clearly understood the question. We observed no confusion about either the individual or collective focal point of any Type-2 people or about the location or number of residences to be considered.

Q5 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

We recommend the revised version of Q5 as tested in round 2.

Q6 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

That’s five other people who lived with you last year, which is all this questionnaire has room for. How many more were there?

None; no more (there were exactly 5)

_____ enter the number of additional people, beyond the 5 already reported

D/R

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

Q6 was administered to only two respondents. We encountered no particular problems with the question – certainly there were no problems of comprehension or interpretation. Nevertheless, the restriction on the number of Type-2's to be listed seemed somewhat unnatural, and disrupted the normal reporting process of thinking about each residence and continuing to list all eligible Type-2 people at each place.

Q6 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Delete Q6.

We recommend that the names of all (maximum: 30) former housemates/co-residents be captured in Q5. If it is necessary to restrict the number of Type-2's for which detailed information is to be captured, we recommend implementing those restrictions in the detailed questions themselves; thus, the number of “missing” Type-2's can be determined directly, and Q6 can be eliminated.

4.3. Questions Concerning the Characteristics of Type-2 People

The remainder of the Type-2 series consists of questions which attempt to capture information on the relationship of each Type-2 person with each relevant household member, their months of co-residence, as well as age, sex, educational attainment, whether they were employed during their period of co-residence, and the Type-2 person’s approximate annual income. Except for Q7, these questions were identical in their “clump” and individual formats – Q7 only varied in that it used a topic-based format in the clump version to identify all relationships for one Type-2 person before continuing with the next Type-2 person.

For the most part we offer little commentary on these questions, because they were largely unremarkable. We combine results across the two interview rounds because, aside from a very minor wording change in Q12, we used identical wording in both rounds. Respondents had very little difficulty understanding the meaning/intent of the questions, and clearly understood each response task. The only difficulties we observed had to do with a general lack of respondent knowledge about the Type-2 people (and occasional recall difficulties, in particular for months of co-residence). These difficulties appeared more acute and more likely in a proxy interview than a self-response interview. Again, however, these were knowledge/recall issues, not at all indicative of any problems with regard to how the questions were formulated.

Q7 (clump) – Rounds 1 and 2

How was [T2-1 NAME] related to you?

How about [NAME of next CLUMP member]...?

(How was [T2-1 NAME] related to [him/her?]) [etc.]

How about [T2-2 NAME]...?

(How was [T2-2 NAME] related to you?) [etc.]

- Husband-Wife
- Unmarried Partners
- Parent-Child
- Grandparent-Grandchild
- Siblings (e.g., brother-sister)
- Other Relatives (e.g., aunt/uncle-niece/nephew, cousins, parent-child-in-laws, etc.)
- Foster Parent-Child
- Friends, Roommates, or Other Non-Relatives
- [D/R]

Q7 (individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

How was [T2-1 NAME] related to [you/NAME]?

How about [T2-2 NAME]...?

(How was [T2-2 NAME] related to [you/NAME]?)

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

We observed no problems with Q7.

Q7 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change.

We note that the primary purpose of this question is to provide analysts with sufficient information to decide whether to count each Type-2 person as a member of the sample person's "economic unit" during his/her period of co-residence – generally, whether the person is a relative (variously defined) or not. Thus, we used a somewhat abbreviated set of response categories for this test, compared to the standard array. We also re-formulated the categories to informally explore an approach which would avoid reporting errors due to relationship "flips." While we observed no evidence in the test to suggest that the new categories are not appropriate for full-scale implementation, we recognize that the decision to use the new categories or a more traditional set is largely one for analysts and data processing experts to make.

Q8 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

In what months of 2006 did you and [T2-N NAME] live together?

How about [T2-N NAME]...? [etc.]

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

Respondents had no difficulty comprehending the intent of this question, and no difficulty understanding their response task. There was much uncertainty of recall, however. Another potential problem – what to do with partial months – did not seem to bother respondents. Two quite reasonable strategies for dealing with this common issue were predominant: providing a somewhat detailed report (“... she came down right at the end of February and stayed for exactly one month”), thus leaving the matter for the interviewer to decide how to code the month in question, or applying a simple rounding rule (“...they moved in... in February” [most of February?] “yes” [and they lived with you for how long?] “six months” [so February through... do you remember when they left?] “maybe it was 5 months because I think they moved right before July 4th”).

Q8 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change. Analysts should be aware, however, that data on months of co-residence for Type-2 people are likely to be rather imprecise. Precision may be improved in the re-engineered SIPP if reporting for this item can be designed so that it is incorporated with other event history calendar reporting tasks.

INTRO (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

Next are a few questions about [T2-N NAME] specifically.

[NOTE: The INTRO was omitted where there was only 1 Type-2 person]

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

[Not probed.]

INTRO – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change.

Q9 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

What was [T2 NAME]’s age (at the beginning of 2006)?

READ IF NECESSARY: Your best guess is fine.

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

Again, the only issue we observed with this item was uncertainty – although many answers were given precisely, and with confidence, many others came with qualifiers (e.g., “about 50”; “I guess probably 48”; “either 22 or 23”). This is not a major problem, however, since, as indicated by the “read if necessary” statement, there is no need for great precision. In addition, the categorical follow-up question, Q10, serves as an effective back up.

Q9 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change.

Q10 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

Was he/she....

- ... under 5?
 - ... 5 to 14?
 - ... 15 to 20?
 - ... 20 to 30?
 - ... 30 to 50?
 - ... 50 to 70?
 - ... or over 70?
- [D/R]

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

As noted above, in cases where respondents could not provide an approximate age in the form of a single number in response to Q9, this item served as an effective back up option. We observed no problems with its use in the test interviews.

Q10 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change.

Q11 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

ASK IF NECESSARY. OTHERWISE MARK WITHOUT ASKING.

Is [T2 NAME] male or female?

- Male
 - Female
- [D/R]

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

This item was asked very rarely, and verified only occasionally. We did not probe on this item, but observed no evidence of any problems.

Q11 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change.

Q12 (clump and individual) – Round 1

What [is/was] the highest level of school [T2 NAME] [has/...] completed, or the highest degree he/she [has/...] received?

- Did NOT graduate from high school
 - Graduated from high school (high school diploma or GED)
 - College graduate – bachelors degree or beyond
- [D/R]

Round 1 cognitive interview results

As with many other Type-2 questions, the main issue with Q12 was respondents' lack of knowledge (e.g. "I am guessing he has a college degree"; "not sure, I don't think he graduated from high school"). Some problems with lack of knowledge were resolved once the respondent became aware of the broad response categories employed in the question. Other than the now-familiar lack of knowledge issue, Q12 posed no problems for respondents. We observed no evidence of difficulty concerning comprehension of either the meaning of the question or the nature of the response task. On the administration side, however, the question's verb tense fills were barriers to a smooth reading of the question, since it was never clear which option was most appropriate.

Recommended revision for round 2

Eliminate the verb tense options; script the question using the simple past tense.

Q12 (clump and individual) – REVISED for round 2

What was the highest level of school [T2 NAME] completed, or the highest degree he/she received?

Round 2 cognitive interview results

Respondents reacted to the round 2 version of Q12 no differently than to the initial version – i.e., problems were due to lack of information rather than anything having to do with the formulation of the question. For interviewers the round 2 changes made the question much easier to administer.

Q12 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

We recommend use of the revised version tested in round 2.

Q13 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

Did [T2 NAME] work for pay during the time you lived together in 2006?

Yes

Yes, some of the time (volunteered)

No

[D/R]

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

As with many of the questions in this series, the meaning of Q13 was not an issue (paraphrase: "did she work at a job where she was getting paid money, either full or part-time"), but lack of knowledge occasionally was ("I have no idea. Is it expected that I know the answers to these questions?"). For the most part, however, respondents answered this question easily and with no hesitation, seemingly quite confident in their answers.

Q13 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change.

Q14 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

Including all income sources, what would you guess was [T2 NAME]’s annual income?

READ IF NECESSARY: We don’t expect an exact amount. Your best guess is fine.

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

Perhaps because of the term “guess,” and the explicit de-emphasis on a precise income figure – and also perhaps because of the nature of a cognitive test’s volunteer subjects, who are almost guaranteed to be cooperative – we encountered little resistance to the income amount questions. Not surprisingly, some respondents simply lacked the knowledge required to answer the question (“I have no clue”), but for the most part respondents were both willing and able to supply at least an approximate income amount (“about \$35,000”; “in the 30’s”; “right around \$95,000”).

An exchange with one respondent did suggest a possibility for misinterpretation and response error that we had not previously considered:

R: “When you asked about their income, are you also considering child support?”

[I’er re-reads Q14 – What do you think about child support?]

R: “Because you asked about working at a paid job, I was initially thinking you were talking about job income, but I did include child support when I gave my answer.”

[I’er: So you caught the “including all sources,” and factored that into her amount?]

R: “Mmm-hmm.”

Q14 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Q14 (clump and individual)

Including [HIS/HER work and/...] all [other/...] income sources, what would you guess was [T2 NAME]’s total annual income?

READ IF NECESSARY: We don’t expect an exact amount. Your best guess is fine.

To avoid the sort of confusion suggested in the exchange summarized above, we recommend a slight modification to Q14, in the form of fills to be implemented depending on the response to Q13, to make the intent of the question explicit, as shown.

Q15 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

Was it more than \$25,000?

[] Yes (more than \$25K)

[] No (\$25K or less)

[D/R]

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

[Not probed.]

Q15 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change

Q16 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

Was it more than \$50,000?

Yes, more

No

[D/R]

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

[Not probed.]

Q16 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change.

Q17 (clump and individual) – Rounds 1 and 2

Was it more than \$10,000?

Yes, more

No

[D/R]

Round 1 and 2 cognitive interview results

[Not probed.]

Q17 – FINAL RECOMMENDATION

No change.

4.4. General Retrospective Debriefing Results

At the end of the interview we asked respondents a few additional questions regarding their overall reaction to the Type-2 series. These retrospective probes were listed on the cognitive interview guide as follows:

Any issues about reporting about people you used to live with?

Did it seem like a strange task? Did it seem inappropriate?

Did you wonder at all about why we want to know this stuff?

Any issues about reporting re: other hh members?
Did you feel you had enough information to answer?
Did reporting about others' former housemates seem strange? Inappropriate?

Although most respondents said it was relatively easy to provide information about Type-2 people, over half still admitted to finding it somewhat “inappropriate,” “strange,” or “uncomfortable” to do so. Respondents gave several reasons why they felt this way; most prominent among these reasons were the following:

(1) Concerns about confidentiality and privacy. A couple of respondents noted that while *they* had voluntarily consented to participate in the survey, their housemates had not, which made them somewhat reluctant to provide possibly private information about those housemates. For example: “I may be willing to reveal my information but it isn't my place to reveal someone else's.”

(2) The sensitive nature of some of the information. Often, this concern was associated with the particular information being sought, income being the primary example (“People don't talk about their income, especially when it is someone else's”). But in one case it had to do with the very emotionally-laden reasons why the people being discussed were no longer in the household (“Wow, this hurts... This is an emotional topic... to think about my wife left me and my kids are young... I have a great deal of embarrassment and shame about it.”)

(3) Lack of knowledge about the Type-2 people. Some respondents' lack of knowledge made them feel inadequate to the task, or simply that the questions were being directed at the wrong target. As noted often above, this was especially true when respondents were asked to report Type-2 information on behalf of other household members.

Among those who were not similarly bothered by the Type-2 questions, several reported that they clearly understood and appreciated the rationale – that it was an economic survey for which the Type-2 questions were obviously relevant. Some respondents – including some who did report being bothered – noted specifically that the interviewer's note (see Q4/Q4b) explaining the purpose of the collection of such information had eased their concerns about the inquiry.

5. Summary and Conclusions

We draw several broad conclusions from the cognitive test results:

(1) We are encouraged that the Type-2 questions are feasible. Our findings suggest that the questions will work as intended (especially in their modestly revised versions implemented for round 2), and will permit the identification of Type-2 people and the collection of basic information about them. As long as they possessed the required information, respondents showed little evidence that they found the Type-2 information onerous or otherwise difficult to report. A brief explanation of the rationale for the Type-2 questions was generally convincing and effective at overcoming occasional mild resistance.

(2) Several of the Type-2 questions pose substantial problems for respondents in proxy interviews, because they often require information that the respondent simply does not have. This is especially true in non-family situations – it is hardly surprising that information is sparse about former housemates of a current housemate. Thus we conclude that it is important to design the Type-2 questions so that they are answered, to the maximum extent possible, by self-respondents. Proxy data can be collected successfully – and it is helpful in this regard that many of the Type-2 questions overtly call for “best guesses” and otherwise high level, non-detailed responses – but the quality of those data will be much more questionable than self-report data, and item nonresponse is also much more likely.

(3) Self-response does not assure high data quality. We observed clear evidence of response error even under what were likely the most optimal reporting conditions – self-respondents who mis-reported their own Type-2 circumstances involving close family members. However, since it is not realistic to think that we could track down the Type-2 individuals and interview them for themselves, somewhat “noisy” data are inevitable. Our impression is that respondents’ reports will provide a reasonable general picture of Type-2 people, and that this information will be useful to analysts – certainly more useful than having no information at all about such people, as would otherwise be the case.

(4) Although we faced the situation only once in our interviews, the Type-2 questions need to be administered with some sensitivity to the painful emotions they may arouse in respondents. Interviewers need to be alerted to the fact that someone’s status as a Type-2 person may be due to death, separation, divorce, family dissolution, or any of a number of other very difficult circumstances.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Jennifer Day, Kurt Bauman, and Terry DeMaio for reviewing an earlier version of this report and for providing constructive comments which made it better.

7. POSTSCRIPTS:

(1) One reviewer of an early draft of this paper expressed concern about potential negative impacts of the Type-2 questions on attrition in future waves of the panel. Our suspicion is that this is unlikely. It is true that a couple of respondents were somewhat uncomfortable with the questions, mainly due to their having to provide proxy data. But the circumstances that seem most likely to produce those reactions are also likely to be quite rare -- most households will not have any Type-2 people to report about, those that do will in most cases be reported by a single self-respondent, and where one respondent cannot report for everyone, the survey design of SIPP will still attempt to maximize self-response by requesting an interview with the person of interest first before seeking a proxy interview. Another consideration in this regard is that the Type-2 content covers the same ground as the main SIPP survey, although much less intensively. Any

important dismay about survey content is much more likely to arise from the main survey itself, as opposed to the Type-2 questions. But in fact this is all conjecture -- the present research was not designed to address this issue, and so can shed little light on it. While we doubt that the risk of increased attrition justifies the major effort and expense of a research program that would be truly illuminating, we do recommend that future large-scale field implementations of the Type-2 series remain alert to the possibility of negative impacts on cooperation.

(2) Several reviewers of an early draft requested changes in the response categories for four of the questions (Q4a,(clump), Q4a (individual), Q10 and Q13), which allow more meaningful analyses and/or clarify some of the response categories. The revised recommendation (see below) will be submitted to Demographics Survey Divisions to be implemented in the 2009 field test.

Revision Recommendations (*Italicized*)

Q4a (clump) – NEW for Round 2

Did you and [READ NAMES] move to this address before or after January 1st, 2006?

- Before January 1, 2006
- On or After January 1, 2006*
- other answers
- D/R

Q4a (individual) – NEW for Round 2

(Next let's talk about [NAME]). Did [you/NAME] move to this address before or after January 1st, 2006?

- Before January 1, 2006
- On or After January 1, 2006*
- other answers
- D/R

Q10. Was he or she...

- ... under 5?
- ... 5 to 14?
- ... *15 to 17?*
- ... *18 to 29?*
- ... *30 to 49?*
- ... *50 to 69?*
- ... *or 70 or over?*

Q13. Did [T2NAME] work for pay during the time you lived together in 2006?

- Yes
- Yes, some of the time (*DO NOT PROBE*)
- No
- [D/R]

8. REFERENCES

Bauman, Kurt. 2006. Internal unpublished email memorandum. November 29, 2006.

Belli, Robert F. 1998. "The structure of Autobiographical Memory and the Even History Calender: Potential Improvements in the Quality of Retrospective Report in Surveys." *Memory* 6, p383-406.

Hughes, Kristin A. 2003. "Comparing Pretesting Methods: Cognitive Interviews, Respondent Debriefing, and Behavior Coding." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology, November 17-19, Arlington, VA.

Willis, Gordon B. 2005. *Cognitive Interviewing: A Tool for Improving Questionnaire Design*. Sage Publications, inc.

RE-ENGINEERED SIPP TYPE-2 QUESTION SEQUENCE

>ROSTER<

First I need to make a list of all the people who live or stay here at this address. Be sure to include:

- people who stay here only some of the time;
- non-relatives who live here;
- and of course any babies and small children.

Let’s start with you – what is your name?

PROBE IF NECESSARY: Please give me the names of everyone else who lives or stays here most of the time. Anyone else? RECORD UP TO 8 NAMES.

PROBE IF NECESSARY TO CAPTURE SEX AND RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONDENT.

	FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	SEX	RELATIONSHIP TO HH RESP
01				
02				
03				
04				
05				
06				
07				
08				

1-PERSON HOUSEHOLD -> Goto Q4a[individual]

2+ PERSON HOUSEHOLD -> Continue with Q1

Q1.

In 2006, did you and [READ NAMES] [... / all] live together all year, from the beginning of January through the end of December?

Yes - Circle all names on ROSTER, and continue with *CHECK ITEM B*

No - Continue with *CHECK ITEM A*

D/R - Goto *CHECK ITEM B*

CHECK ITEM A

How many people are listed on the household roster?

2 - Goto *CHECK ITEM B*

3 or more - Continue with *Q2*

Q2.

Did you live all year (in 2006) with either / any of the people you currently live with?

Yes

No - Goto *CHECK ITEM B*

D/R - Goto *CHECK ITEM B*

Q3.

Who was that? (Which of these people did you live with for all of 2006?)

REFER TO THE ROSTER. CIRCLE THE NAME OF THE HH RESPONDENT AND EACH PERSON THAT HE/SHE LIVED WITH FOR ALL OF 2006.

CHECK ITEM B

How many names are circled on the roster?

- ALL names –

CONTINUE WITH Q4a[clump]. THE HH RESPONDENT WILL ANSWER THE “CLUMP” SERIES FOR THE ENTIRE HOUSEHOLD.

- Some (but not all) names –

CONTINUE WITH Q4a[clump]. THE HH RESPONDENT WILL ANSWER THE “CLUMP” SERIES FOR HIM/HERSELF AND ALL OTHER CIRCLED PEOPLE – HIS/HER CO-RESIDENTS FOR ALL OF 2006

WHEN THE “CLUMP” SERIES IS COMPLETED, GO TO Q4a[individual] AND ADMINISTER THE “INDIVIDUAL” SERIES SEPARATELY FOR EACH PERSON WHO IS NOT CIRCLED.

- None; no names are circled –

GO TO Q4a[individual] AND, STARTING WITH THE HH RESPONDENT,
ADMINISTER THE “INDIVIDUAL” SERIES SEPARATELY FOR EACH
PERSON WHO IS NOT CIRCLED.

Q4a. [clump]

Did you and [READ NAMES] move to this address before or after January 1st 2006?

BEFORE January 1, 2006 – *ASK Q4b-i*

AFTER January 1, 2006 – *ASK Q4b-ii*

[other answers] – *ASK Q4b-ii*

D/R – *ASK Q4b-ii*

Q4b.[clump]

[Other than the people you live with now, was/Was] there anyone else who lived

i. here with you and [READ NAMES] for one month or more during calendar year 2006?

ii. with you and [READ NAMES] for one month or more during calendar year 2006, either here or at a previous address?

NOTE: “ONE MONTH OR MORE” MUST BE CONTINUOUS TIME.

READ IF NECESSARY: This survey is about people’s economic situation during calendar year 2006. The picture would be incomplete if we didn’t get a little information about people you used to live with.

Yes - *continue with Q5 (if necessary, read i or ii, as appropriate)*

No - Goto *CHECK ITEM F* at the end of the “clump” question series

D/R - Goto *CHECK ITEM F* at the end of the “clump” question series

Q5.[clump]

Can you tell me who that was, please?

- i. **(That is, the other people who lived here with you and [READ NAMES] for a month or more during 2006?)**
- ii. **(That is, the other people who lived with you and [READ NAMES], either here or at a previous address, for a month or more during 2006?)**

READ IF NECESSARY: We don't need full names – first name and last initial is fine. I only need a name so you and I can be clear about who we're talking about.

READ IF NECESSARY: This survey is about people's economic situation during calendar year 2006. The picture would be incomplete if we didn't get a little information about people you used to live with.

MARK THE "DEC" (DECEASED) BOX IF THE RESPONDENT VOLUNTEERS THAT THE PERSON HAS DIED.

IF R DOES NOT PROVIDE NAME, ENTER "PERSON A," "PERSON B," ETC.

TYPE-2 LIST FOR <u>HH respondent and other(s)</u>			
	FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	DEC?
T2-1			
T2-2			
T2-3			
T2-4			
T2-5			

IF ALL 5 ROWS ARE FILLED -> Continue with Q6

OTHERWISE -> Goto Q7

Q6.[clump]

That's five other people who lived with you last year, which is all this questionnaire has room for. How many more were there?

- None; no more (there were exactly 5)

- enter the number of additional people, beyond the 5 already reported

- D/R

Q7.[clump]

IN THE TABLE BELOW, CIRCLE THE PERSON NUMBER FOR EACH PERSON CIRCLED ON THE HOUSEHOLD ROSTER.

REFER TO THE TYPE-2 LIST (Q5). STARTING WITH THE FIRST TYPE-2 PERSON, ASK RELATIONSHIP WITH THE HH RESPONDENT AND WITH ALL OTHER CIRCLED NAMES ON THE HH ROSTER.

How was [T2 NAME] related to you?

How about [NAME of next CIRCLED HH member]...?

(How was [T2 NAME] related to [him/her]?)

REPEAT FOR EACH TYPE-2 PERSON LISTED.

	<u>PERSON NUMBER ON THE HH ROSTER</u>								Relationship Codes
	Start with the first TYPE-2 person listed, and fill a relationship code for the HH respondent and all other circled people on the HH ROSTER								
	01 - HH Resp	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	
T2-1									1 - Husband-Wife
T2-2									2 - Unmarried Partners
T2-3									3 - Parent-Child
T2-4									4 - Grandparent-Grandchild
T2-5									5 - Siblings (e.g., brother-sister)
									6 - Other Relatives (e.g., aunt/uncle-niece/ nephew, cousins, parent-child-in-laws, etc.)
									7 - Foster Parent-Child
									8 - Friends, Roommates or Other Non-Relatives [D/R]

IF MORE THAN ONE RELATIONSHIP COULD BE MARKED, ENTER THE ONE THAT APPLIED FOR MOST OF THE TIME SPENT LIVING TOGETHER IN 2006.

IF THE EXACT RELATIONSHIP IS NOT KNOWN...

MARK (6) "OTHER RELATIVES" IF RELATED, OR

MARK (8) "FRIENDS...OTHER NON-RELATIVES" IF NOT RELATED.

Q8.[clump]

REFER TO THE TYPE-2 LIST (Q5). STARTING WITH THE FIRST TYPE-2 PERSON, ASK MONTHS OF CO-RESIDENCE. CONTINUE IN TOPIC-BASED FASHION FOR EACH TYPE-2 PERSON LISTED.

In what months of 2006 did you and [T2-1 NAME] live together?

How about [T2-2 NAME]...?

In what months of 2006 did you and [he/she] live together?

And [T2-3 NAME]...?

FOR EACH TYPE-2 PERSON, MARK ALL MONTHS IN WHICH HE/SHE AND THE HH RESPONDENT LIVED TOGETHER FOR AT LEAST HALF OF THE MONTH.

	MONTHS OF CO-RESIDENCE IN 2006												
	jan	feb	mar	apr	may	jun	jul	aug	sep	oct	nov	dec	D/R
T2-1													
T2-2													
T2-3													
T2-4													
T2-5													

CHECK ITEM C

How many names are on the TYPE-2 list?

[] One – Goto Q9

[] Two or more – Read INTRO, inserting the FIRST TYPE-2 person's name

INTRO

Next are a few questions about [T2 NAME] specifically. CONTINUE WITH Q9.

ASK Q9 - Q17 FOR THE FIRST TYPE-2 PERSON, THEN RETURN TO THIS INTRO AND REPEAT THE SERIES FOR THE SECOND TYPE-2 PERSON, ETC.

Q9[clump] What was [T2 NAME]'s age (at the beginning of 2006)?	
T2-1: _____	READ IF NECESSARY: Your best guess is fine. ENTER AGE (OR D/R) IN APPROPRIATE ROW. IF AGE IS REPORTED – Goto Q11 IF D/R – Continue with Q10
T2-2: _____	
T2-3: _____	
T2-4: _____	
T2-5: _____	

Q10[clump] Was he/she.....	
T2-1: []	[1] ... under 5?
T2-2: []	[2] ... 5 to 14?
T2-3: []	[3] ... 15 to 20?
T2-4: []	[4] ... 20 to 30?
T2-5: []	[5] ... 30 to 50?
	[6] ... 50 to 70?
	[7] ... or over 70
	[D/R]

Q11[clump] ASK IF NECESSARY. OTHERWISE MARK WITHOUT ASKING. Is [T2 NAME] male or female?	
T2-1: M F D/R	CIRCLE ANSWER IN APPROPRIATE ROW
T2-2: M F D/R	
T2-3: M F D/R	
T2-4: M F D/R	
T2-5: M F D/R	

CHECK ITEM D

How old is this TYPE-2 person?

14 or younger – Goto CHECK ITEM E

15 or older (or D/R) – Continue with Q12

Q12[clump]

What was the highest level of school [T2 NAME] completed, or the highest degree he/she received?

T2-1: []

T2-2: []

T2-3: []

T2-4: []

T2-5: []

[1] Did NOT graduate from high school

[2] Graduated from high school (high school diploma or GED)

[3] College graduate – bachelors degree or beyond

[D/R]

Q13[clump]

Did [T2 NAME] work for pay during the time you lived together in 2006?

T2-1: []

T2-2: []

T2-3: []

T2-4: []

T2-5: []

[1] Yes

[2] Yes, some of the time (volunteered)

[3] No

[D/R]

Q14[clump] Including all income sources, what would you guess was [T2 NAME]'s annual income?	
T2-1: \$ _____	READ IF NECESSARY: We don't expect an exact amount. Your best guess is fine. INCOME IS AS OF THE BEGINNING OF 2006 (IF R ASKS FOR A SPECIFIC TIME). IF A \$\$ AMT IS REPORTED – Goto <i>CHECK ITEM E</i> IF D/R – Continue with Q15
T2-2: \$ _____	
T2-3: \$ _____	
T2-4: \$ _____	
T2-5: \$ _____	

Q15[clump] Was it more than \$25,000?	
T2-1: []	INCOME IS AS OF THE BEGINNING OF 2006 (IF R ASKS FOR A SPECIFIC TIME). [1] Yes (more than 25K) – Continue with Q16 [2] No (25K or less) – Goto Q17 [D/R] – Goto <i>CHECK ITEM E</i>
T2-2: []	
T2-3: []	
T2-4: []	
T2-5: []	

Q16[clump] Was it more than \$50,000?	
T2-1: []	INCOME IS AS OF THE BEGINNING OF 2006 (IF R ASKS FOR A SPECIFIC TIME).

- [1] Yes, more
- [2] No
- [D/R]

ALL: Goto *CHECK ITEM E*

T2-2: []	
T2-3: []	
T2-4: []	
T2-5: []	

Q17[clump] Was it more than \$10,000?	
T2-1: []	INCOME IS AS OF THE BEGINNING OF 2006 (IF R ASKS FOR A SPECIFIC TIME). [1] Yes, more [2] No [D/R] ALL: Continue with <i>CHECK ITEM E</i>
T2-2: []	
T2-3: []	
T2-4: []	
T2-5: []	

CHECK ITEM E

Are there more TYPE-2 people listed who have not yet been asked Q9-Q17?

[] Yes – Return to the INTRO and repeat Q9-Q17 for the next TYPE-2 person

[] No – Continue with CHECK ITEM F

CHECK ITEM F

Are there any uncircled names on the household roster?

[] Yes - Starting with Q4a[individual], COMPLETE AN “INDIVIDUAL” QUESTION SERIES for each uncircled name.

[] No - END INTERVIEW

INDIVIDUAL QUESTION SERIES

Q4a.[individual]

REFER TO THE HH ROSTER. ENTER THE PERSON NUMBER OF THE NEXT UNCIRCLED NAME: _____

[.../Next let's talk about [NAME].] Did [you/NAME] move to this address before or after January 1st 2006?

BEFORE January 1, 2006 – *ASK Q4b-i*

AFTER January 1, 2006 – *ASK Q4b-ii*

[other answers] – *ASK Q4b-ii*

D/R – *ASK Q4b-ii*

Q4b.[individual]

[Other than the people [you/NAME] [live/lives] with now, was/Was] there anyone else who lived

i. here with [you/NAME] for one month or more during calendar year 2006?

ii. with [you/NAME] for one month or more during calendar year 2006, either here or at a previous address?

NOTE: “ONE MONTH OR MORE” MUST BE CONTINUOUS TIME.

READ IF NECESSARY: This survey is about people's economic situation during calendar year 2006. The picture would be incomplete if we didn't get a little information about people [you/NAME] used to live with.

Yes – Goto Q5 (*if necessary, read i or ii, as appropriate*)

No - Continue with *CHECK ITEM G*

D/R - Continue with *CHECK ITEM G*

CHECK ITEM G

Are there any more uncircled names on the household roster?

Yes - Go to a new “Individual” question series packet. Starting with Q4a [individual], COMPLETE AN “INDIVIDUAL” QUESTION SERIES for the next uncircled name.

No - END INTERVIEW

Q5.[individual]

Can you tell me who that was, please?

- i. (That is, the other people who lived here with [you/NAME] for a month or more during 2006?)**
- ii. (That is, the other people who lived with [you/NAME], either here or at a previous address, for a month or more during 2006?)**

READ IF NECESSARY: We don't need full names – first name and last initial is fine. I only need a name so you and I can be clear about who we're talking about.

READ IF NECESSARY: This survey is about people's economic situation during calendar year 2006. The picture would be incomplete if we didn't get a little information about people [you/NAME] used to live with.

MARK THE "DEC" (DECEASED) BOX IF THE RESPONDENT VOLUNTEERS THAT THE PERSON HAS DIED.

IF R DOES NOT PROVIDE NAME, ENTER "PERSON A," "PERSON B," ETC.

CONSIDER, FOR EACH TYPE-2 PERSON LISTED: IS THIS A DUPLICATE NAME? REVIEW THE TYPE-2 LISTS PROVIDED BY OTHER HH MEMBERS; PROBE IF YOU SUSPECT THAT A PERSON NAMED IN THE CURRENT LIST MIGHT ALSO HAVE BEEN LISTED BY A PRIOR RESPONDENT. MARK THE "DUP" (DUPLICATE) BOX IF THIS TYPE-2 PERSON HAS ALREADY BEEN LISTED BY SOMEONE ELSE.

TYPE-2 LIST FOR (enter person number from HH ROSTER): _____				
	DUP	FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	DEC?
T2-1				
T2-2				
T2-3				
T2-4				
T2-5				

IF ALL 5 ROWS ARE FILLED -> Continue with Q6
OTHERWISE -> Goto Q7

Q6.[individual]

That's five other people who lived with [you/NAME] last year, which is all this questionnaire has room for. How many more were there?

- None; no more (there were exactly 5)

 - enter the number of additional people, beyond the 5 already reported

- D/R

Q7.[individual]

REFER TO THE TYPE-2 LIST (Q5) FOR THIS PERSON. DETERMINE HIS/HER RELATIONSHIP WITH EACH TYPE-2 NAME.

How was [T2-1 NAME] related to [you/NAME]?

How about [T2-2 NAME]...?

(How was [T2-2 NAME] related to [you/NAME]?)

REPEAT FOR EACH TYPE-2 PERSON LISTED.

	Relationship Code
T2-1: <input type="checkbox"/>	1 - Husband-Wife
T2-2: <input type="checkbox"/>	2 - Unmarried Partners
T2-3: <input type="checkbox"/>	3 - Parent-Child
T2-4: <input type="checkbox"/>	4 - Grandparent-Grandchild
T2-5: <input type="checkbox"/>	5 - Siblings (e.g., brother-sister)
	6 - Other Relatives (e.g., aunt/uncle-niece/nephew, cousins, parent-child-in-laws, etc.)
	7 - Foster Parent-Child
	8 - Friends, Roommates or Other Non-Relatives
	[D/R]

IF MORE THAN ONE RELATIONSHIP COULD BE MARKED, ENTER THE ONE THAT APPLIED FOR MOST OF THE TIME SPENT LIVING TOGETHER IN 2006.

IF THE EXACT RELATIONSHIP IS NOT KNOWN...

MARK (6) "OTHER RELATIVES" IF RELATED, OR

MARK (8) "FRIENDS...OTHER NON-RELATIVES" IF NOT RELATED.

Q8.[individual]

REFER TO THE TYPE-2 LIST (Q5). STARTING WITH THE FIRST TYPE-2 PERSON, ASK MONTHS OF CO-RESIDENCE. CONTINUE IN TOPIC-BASED FASHION FOR EACH TYPE-2 PERSON LISTED.

In what months of 2006 did [you/NAME] and [T2-1 NAME] live together?

How about [you/NAME and [T2-2 NAME]...?

In what months of 2006 did [you/they] live together?

And [T2-3 NAME]...?

FOR EACH TYPE-2 PERSON, MARK ALL MONTHS IN WHICH HE/SHE AND THIS HOUSEHOLD MEMBER LIVED TOGETHER FOR AT LEAST HALF OF THE MONTH.

	MONTHS OF CO-RESIDENCE IN 2006												
	jan	feb	mar	apr	may	jun	jul	aug	sep	oct	nov	dec	D/R
T2-1													
T2-2													
T2-3													
T2-4													
T2-5													

CHECK ITEM H

How many names are on this household member's TYPE-2 list?

One – Continue with CHECK ITEM I

Two or more – Goto CHECK ITEM J

CHECK ITEM I

Is the "DUP" box (in Q5) marked for this TYPE-2 person? (That is, has another household member already reported this TYPE-2 person's characteristics?)

Yes – Goto CHECK ITEM L

No – Goto Q9

CHECK ITEM J

Review the TYPE-2 person list for this household member. Is there at least one name listed for which the “DUP” box (in Q5) is not marked?

[] Yes – Continue with INTRO, and then Q9 - Q17, for the first listed TYPE-2 person for whom the “DUP” box is not marked.

[] No, all names are “DUP’s” – Goto CHECK ITEM M at the end of the “individual” question series

INTRO[individual]

Next are a few questions about [T2 NAME] specifically. CONTINUE WITH Q9.

ASK Q9 - Q17 FOR THE FIRST NON-“DUP” TYPE-2 PERSON, THEN RETURN TO THIS INTRO AND REPEAT THE SERIES FOR THE SECOND, ETC.

Q9[individual] What was [T2 NAME]’s age (at the beginning of 2006)?	
T2-1: _____	READ IF NECESSARY: Your best guess is fine. ENTER AGE (OR D/R) IN APPROPRIATE ROW. IF AGE IS REPORTED – Goto Q11 IF D/R – Continue with Q10
T2-2: _____	
T2-3: _____	
T2-4: _____	
T2-5: _____	

Q10[individual] Was he/she.....	
T2-1: []	[1] ... under 5? [2] ... 5 to 14? [3] ... 15 to 20? [4] ... 20 to 30? [5] ... 30 to 50? [6] ... 50 to 70? [7] ... or over 70 [D/R]

T2-2: []	
T2-3: []	
T2-4: []	
T2-5: []	
Q11[individual] ASK IF NECESSARY. OTHERWISE MARK WITHOUT ASKING. Is [T2 NAME] male or female?	
T2-1: M F D/R	CIRCLE ANSWER IN APPROPRIATE ROW
T2-2: M F D/R	
T2-3: M F D/R	
T2-4: M F D/R	
T2-5: M F D/R	

CHECK ITEM K

How old is this TYPE-2 person?

[] 14 or younger – Goto CHECK ITEM L

[] 15 or older (or D/R) – Continue with Q12

Q12[individual] What was the highest level of school [T2 NAME] completed, or the highest degree he/she received?	
T2-1: []	[1] Did NOT graduate from high school [2] Graduated from high school (high school diploma or GED) [3] College graduate – bachelors degree or beyond [D/R]
T2-2: []	
T2-3: []	
T2-4: []	
T2-5: []	

Q13[individual] Did [T2 NAME] work for pay during the time [he/she] and [you/NAME] lived together in 2006?	
T2-1: []	[1] Yes [2] Yes, some of the time (volunteered) [3] No [D/R]
T2-2: []	
T2-3: []	
T2-4: []	
T2-5: []	

Q14[individual] Including all income sources, what would you guess was [T2- NAME]'s annual income?	
T2-1: \$ _____	READ IF NECESSARY: We don't expect an exact amount. Your best guess is fine. INCOME IS AS OF THE BEGINNING OF 2006 (IF R ASKS FOR A SPECIFIC TIME). IF A \$\$ AMT IS REPORTED – Goto <i>CHECK ITEM L</i> IF D/R – Continue with Q15
T2-2: \$ _____	
T2-3: \$ _____	
T2-4: \$ _____	
T2-5: \$ _____	

Q15[individual] Was it more than \$25,000?	
T2-1: []	INCOME IS AS OF THE BEGINNING OF 2006 (IF R ASKS FOR A SPECIFIC TIME). [1] Yes (more than 25K) – Continue with Q16 [2] No (25K or less) – Goto Q17 [D/R] – Goto <i>CHECK ITEM L</i>
T2-2: []	
T2-3: []	
T2-4: []	
T2-5: []	

Q16[individual] Was it more than \$50,000?	
T2-1: []	INCOME IS AS OF THE BEGINNING OF 2006 (IF R ASKS FOR A SPECIFIC TIME). [1] Yes, more [2] No [D/R] <u>ALL: Goto CHECK ITEM L</u>
T2-2: []	
T2-3: []	
T2-4: []	
T2-5: []	

Q17[individual] Was it more than \$10,000?	
T2-1: []	INCOME IS AS OF THE BEGINNING OF 2006 (IF R ASKS FOR A SPECIFIC TIME). [1] Yes, more [2] No [D/R] <u>ALL: Continue with CHECK ITEM L</u>
T2-2: []	
T2-3: []	
T2-4: []	
T2-5: []	

CHECK ITEM L

Are there more non-“DUP” TYPE-2 people listed who have not yet been asked Q9-Q17?

[] Yes – Return to the INTRO and repeat Q9-Q17 for the next non-DUP TYPE-2 person

[] No – Continue with CHECK ITEM M

CHECK ITEM M

Are there any uncircled names on the household roster?

[] Yes - Starting with Q4a[individual], COMPLETE AN “INDIVIDUAL” QUESTION SERIES for the next uncircled name.

[] No - END INTERVIEW
