Online Appendix

An increase matters, not the actual value: early bird incentives in longitudinal surveys

Pablo Cabrera-Álvarez[†], Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex
Peter Lynn, Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex

[†]Corresponding author: pcabre@essex.ac.uk

Online Appendix A. Cumulative Response Rates at *Understanding Society* Wave 12

The analysis presented in the article corresponds to a subpopulation of *Understanding Society*: panel members eligible for an individual interview at wave 12 who were part of the web-first or CAPI-only group in the previous wave. In addition, the analysis sample is restricted to the April to September 2020 monthly samples[1], where the higher early bird incentive experiment was embedded. The response rates are detailed in the Data and Methods section of the article. In this appendix, we provide some contextual information about the cross-sectional and longitudinal response rates of *Understanding Society* wave 12.

We provide two response rates. First, we present a cross-sectional individual response rate for wave 12 based on the panel members eligible for an adult interview (aged 16 or over) issued to the field at wave 12. Second, we present the cumulative response rate for the different samples that form *Understanding Society*, which were recruited at different time points. The cumulative response rate combines the household response probability at the initial wave, the individual response rate at wave 1, and the probability of being eligible and responding to wave 12. Below, we describe the calculation and present the different response rates.

The individual cross-sectional response rate is based on the RR6 AAPOR (AAPOR 2023), including specific outcomes from a household longitudinal study:

[1] The fieldwork of each wave of *Understanding Society* expands over two years and a half. The different samples that form *Understanding Society* are split into 24 random monthly samples. Each month, a new monthly sample is issued, and the fieldwork lasts 19 weeks (Carpenter 2021).

$$RR_{w12} = \frac{(I+P)}{(I+P) \; + \; (\mathrm{Pr} + IR + HR + NC + O + U)}$$

(A1)

where I are the web interviews and P the partials, Pr refers to the proxy interviews where another household member responded to a shorter version of the questionnaire on behalf of the panel member, IR are individual refusals, HR are household refusals, NC is non-contacted households, O are other non-interviews, and U untraced households. The definition of partials refers to individual questionnaires completed up to the household finance module.

Table A1. Cross-sectional individual response rate at wave 12

Interviews & Partials (***I*** & ***P***)	**Proxy Interviews** (***Pr***)	**Individual Refusals** (***IR***)	**Household Refusals** (*HR*)	**Household Non-contact** (***NC***)	**Other Non-interview** (***O***)	**Household Untraced** (***U***)	**Response Rate**
29,070	21	2,569	3,323	3,132	3,210	527	69.5

The estimated cumulative response rate at wave 11 has three components:

$$CRR_{w12} = \widehat{P_1} \; x \; \widehat{P_2} \; x \; \widehat{P_3}$$

(A2)

where $\widehat{P_1}$ refers to the estimated proportion of sample individuals from households that participated in the recruitment wave, $\widehat{P_2}$ corresponds to the estimated proportion of individuals from responding households who completed the individual interview at the initial wave, and $\widehat{P_3}$ is the estimated proportion of sample members responding at the recruitment wave who were interviewed at wave 12.

Understanding Society is formed by several samples covering the general household population of Great Britain (BHPS original sample, 1991; General Population Sample, 2009), Northern Ireland

(Northern Ireland HPS, 2001; GPS Northern Ireland, 2009), Wales (Welsh BHPS boost sample, 1999) or Scotland (Scottish BHPS boost sample, 1999). Moreover, the study includes two ethnic minority boost samples: the ethnic minority boost sample (EMB), recruited in wave one (2009), and the immigration and ethnic minority boost (IEMB), incorporated in wave six (2014). These samples cover different subpopulations, their designs depart from each other to some extent and were recruited at different times. Therefore, we calculated the response rates for each one individually.

First, we estimate $\widehat{P_1} = \frac{m_1}{\hat{n}}$, where m_1 is the number of individuals living in the responding households at the initial wave[2], and $\hat{n}$ is the estimated number of individuals living in the sampled households. The calculation of $\hat{n}$ poses some challenges. The Postal Address File used as a sample frame contains a list of postal addresses, but there is no information about the number of individuals living in each address. This information is only available for the households where someone responded to the survey at the initial wave. Hence, the number of individuals in the non-responding households must be estimated. To estimate this figure, we rely on the Censuses of Population from 1991, 2001 and 2011 for the general population samples and survey estimates for the ethnic minority boost samples.

Regarding the general population samples, we use data from the Census of Population to estimate the total number of persons in the sampled households. The expected number of individuals in the sample is estimated as $\hat{n} = \hat{a} \sum_{i=1} i\, \pi_i$, where π_i is the proportion of households in the Census that contain i individuals and a is the number of addresses with at least one household. To estimate

[2] For the ethnic minority and immigration boost samples, m_1 is restricted to the eligible sample members in the sampled households, who are persons with an ethnic minority background and, in the case of the IEMB, people born outside the United Kingdom.

$\hat{a} = a_e + a_{ue}(a_e/(a_e + a_{ne})$, where a_e is the number of addresses known to be eligible, $a_{ue}$is the number of addresses of unknown eligibility, and a_{ne} refers to the non-eligible addresses. For the ethnic minority and immigration samples, we rely on survey data from *Understanding Society* to estimate the number of eligible sample members in each household.

Second, $\widehat{P_2}$ refers to the probability of responding to the adult interview at the initial wave conditional on the household participation. Persons aged 16 are eligible for the adult interview. Therefore, $\widehat{P_2} = \frac{m_3}{m_2}$ where m_2 is the number of individuals aged 16 or over from responding households and m_3 is the number of complete individual interviews.

Finally, $\widehat{P_3}$ is the proportion of initial wave respondents who responded to the wave 11 adult interview. $\widehat{P_3} = \frac{m_5}{\widehat{m_4}}$, where m_5 is the number of respondents to the initial wave who also responded to wave 12. The calculation of $\widehat{m_4}$, the initial wave respondents still eligible for an adult interview at wave 12, involves subtracting from m_3 the panel members that became ineligible between waves 1 and 12. Panel members may become ineligible for two reasons: dying and moving out of the country. This change in the eligibility status is known for some panel members; however, some participants become uneligible from one wave to another, and it is not possible to disentangle a genuine nonresponse from a change in the eligibility status. Therefore, to estimate $\widehat{m_4}$ we, first, remove all the ineligible cases identified by the fieldwork force between waves 1 and 11 using the outcome codes. Second, we remove the cases known to have deceased before wave 11 from the mortality registers and during data collection. Third, we implement a propensity adjustment to correct the sample for undetected mortality (Kamisnka 2021). Thus, $\widehat{m_4} = m_3 * \pi_m - (\hat{d} + \hat{l})$, where π_m is the mortality propensity adjustment, $\hat{d}$ is the estimated number of deceased panel

members from outcome codes and official registers, and $\hat{l}$ are the panel members who moved out of scope.

Estimates of the different components for all the *Understanding Society* samples is shown in Table A2.

Table A2. Wave 12 cumulative response rate for the samples that form *Understanding Society*

	$\hat{n}$	m_1	$\widehat{P_1} = \frac{m_1}{\hat{n}}$	m_2	m_3	$\widehat{P_2} = \frac{m_3}{m_2}$	π_m	$\hat{d}$	$\hat{l}$	$\widehat{m_4}$	m_5	$\widehat{P_3} = \frac{m_5}{\widehat{m_4}}$	$CRR_{w12} = \widehat{P_1} \, x \, \widehat{P_2} \, x \, \widehat{P_3}$
General Population Sample (GB)	100,076	60,596	0.61	47,614	39,049	0.82	0.98	2,625	1,031	34,681	13,087	0.38	18.7
General Population Sample (NI)	5,272	3,351	0.64	2,584	1,997	0.77	0.98	146	55	1,765	608	0.34	16.9
Ethnic Minority Boost	22,718	12,267	0.54	8,375	6,019	0.72	1.00	159	292	5,544	1,251	0.23	8.8
Immigration and Ethnic Minority Boost	16,400	7,922	0.48	5,746	4,123	0.72	1.00	73	232	3,818	1,023	0.27	9.3
British Household Panel Survey original sample (GB)	18,478	13,840	0.75	10,745	9,912	0.92	0.94	2,148	626	6,553	1,979	0.30	20.9
British Household Panel Boost (Scotland)	5,444	3,395	0.62	2,671	2,405	0.90	0.95	335	192	1,763	470	0.27	15.0
British Household Panel Boost (Wales)	5,180	3,577	0.69	2,770	2,430	0.88	0.94	376	192	1,724	544	0.32	19.1
Northern Ireland Household Panel	7,761	5,188	0.67	3,897	3,258	0.84	0.97	352	217	2,598	632	0.24	13.6
Total	181,329	110,136	0.61	84,402	69,193	0.82				58,447	19,594	0.34	16.7

The Great Britain and Northern Ireland General Population Samples and the Ethnic Minority Boost were recruited in 2009 at the initial wave of *Understanding Society*. The Immigration and Ethnic Minority Boost was recruited in wave six (2014-16). The BHPS original sample was selected in 1991; the BHPS Scottish and Welsh boost samples were recruited in 1999, and the Northern Ireland Household Panel was first interviewed in 2001. The BHPS and NHIS samples were added to *Understanding Society* in wave 2 (2010-12).

Online Appendix B. Technical Details of the Study and the Analysis

This appendix uses a PRICSSA item checklist to report the main characteristics of the study, *Understanding Society*, and the analysis of the early bird experiment (Seidenberg et al. 2023). We also provide a table with a description and descriptive statistics of the variables used in the analysis.

Table A3. PRICSSA item checklist for *Understanding Society*

PRICSSA item	Description
1.1 Data collection dates	The data collection of *Understanding Society* Wave 12 started in January 2020 and continued until April 2023. The fieldwork of the monthly samples where the higher early bird experiment was embedded started in April 2020 and was finalised in January 2021.
1.2 Data collection mode(s)	From January 2020 until March 2020, three fieldwork protocols coexisted in *Understanding Society*: • Web-first protocol (70% of households with high web propensity). Sequential mixed-mode design combining web, CAPI and CATI for a few remaining cases. • CAPI-first protocol (10% of the households with low web propensity). CAPI-first with web as an option. • CAPI-only protocol (20% random sample of the households). Only CAPI with occasional CATI mop-up at the end of the fieldwork. From April 2020 onwards, due to the Covid-19 and the suspension of face-to-face fieldwork: • All households moved to a protocol sequentially combining web and CATI (see Burton et al. 2020).
1.3 Target population	Individuals living in private households in the United Kingdom.
1.4 Sample design	*Understanding Society* is formed by several samples: • The General Population Sample (GPS) recruited in 2009 is based upon a two-stage stratified random sample of residential postal addresses in Great Britain (GB) plus a single-stage random sample of addresses in Northern Ireland. In GB, at the first stage, 2,640 postal sectors (geographical areas containing an average of around 2,500 households) were selected with probability proportional to size as PSUs and at the second stage, 18 addresses were selected from each PSU. In Northern Ireland, 2,400 addresses were selected (see Lynn 2009). • The Ethnic Minority Boost (EMB) sample was recruited at wave 1, in 2009, and the Immigration and Ethnic Minority Boost (IEMB), was recruited at wave 6 (2014). These samples targeted the main ethnic minority groups in the population (Bangladeshi, Caribbean, Indian,

Pakistani, and African) and, in the case of IEMB, also immigrants. In order to target these cases, a sample was selected among the postcode sector where the ethnic minority concentration was greater than 5%. For the EMB sample, a total of 3,145 postcode sectors were selected that covered between 82% and 93% of the population of these groups. The 42,865 addresses were screened and only invited to participate if at least one person met the inclusion criteria. The IEMB sample targeted immigrants (people born outside the UK) as well as persons who considered themselves or their ancestors to belong to the ethnic minority groups mentioned above. The sample was stratified by the prevalence of persons with an ethnic minority background or immigrants, and a clustered sample of 19,937 addresses was selected. A screening was carried out by interviewers to identify the eligible households (see Berthoud et al. 2009; Lynn 2009; Lynn et al. 2018).

- The former British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) was included in *Understanding Society* in wave two. The BHPS was formed by four samples. The BHPS original sample (1991): was a clustered and stratified sample covering the residential population of England, Scotland and Wales. A total of 250 postcode sectors were selected, and 33 addresses within each sector. The BHPS Scottish and Welsh boost samples (1999).were stratified and clustered, selecting 75 postcode sectors in each country and 33 addresses in each sector. The Northern Ireland Household Panel (2001) was based on a random sample of 2,000 addresses (see Marcia Freed et al. 2018).

1.5 Survey response rate(s)

Understanding Society is a longitudinal survey that follows original participants and their descendants.

First, we present the wave 12 individual cross-sectional response rate for the whole sample of *Understanding Society*. This response rate was calculated using an adaptation of the AAPOR RR6 (AAPOR 2023) (see Online Appendix A). The cross-sectional wave 12 response rate is 69.5%.

Second, we provide the individual cumulative response rate at wave 12 for the samples that form *Understanding Society*. This cumulative response rate takes into account the initial wave household response rate, the individual response at wave one, and the probability of being issued and responding to wave 12 adult interview. The estimated cumulative response rate is different for each sample (see Online Appendix A).

2.1 Missingness rates

In the subsample used for most of the analysis (see 2.2), which corresponds to adult panel members in the previously web-first protocol (n = 5,111), the following moderators presented some missingness:

- Sex (n = 2, .1%);
- Education (n = 213, 4.2%);
- Ethnic background (n = 100, 2.0%);
- Individual net income (quartiles) (n = 180, 3.5%);
- Internet daily (n = 277, 5.4%).

	We used the information from previous waves to minimise the level of missingness in the moderators. Regarding the ex-CAPI-only subsample (n = 1,073), there was no missingness in the variables employed in the analysis.
2.2 Observation deletion	The analysis used two subgroups of the sample: the ex-web-first and ex-CAPI-only subgroups. Starting from the wave 12 individual sample file (l_indsamp), the following observations were excluded from the analysis: • Individuals not eligible for an adult interview at wave 12 (became ineligible or were under 16 years old); • Panel members from monthly samples different to those covered in the experiment; • Panel members from households that were part of the CAPI-first group at the previous wave and those from CAPI-only protocol with lower response propensity in the web mode. • Panel members from households that did not participate in the experiment (experimental flag is missing; n = 171).
2.3 Sample sizes	Unweighted sample sizes are presented in Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4.
2.4 Confidence intervals/standards errors	The result tables include the point estimates alongside the standard errors.
2.5 Weighting	All analyses are weighted with a tailored weight that adjusts the sample for unequal selection probabilities at the initial wave, household and individual nonresponse up to wave 2, and selection into the monthly samples used for the experiment. The weights can be generated using the code replication files (Individual: l_psnexpub_xd; Household: l_hhexpub_xd).
2.6 Variance estimation	PSU (psu) and Stratum (stratata) variables were applied, and Taylor Series Linearization was used to produce design-adjusted standard errors. The strata variable was recoded in groups to minimise the impact of a single PSU.
2.7 Subpopulation analysis	We used the subpop() option in the svy: commands to stratify the analysis.
2.8 Supression rules	No suppression rule was applied.
2.9 Software code	All analyses used Stata 18 svy: command (in Stata MP, Version 18). The code to replicate the analysis can be found in the Supplementary Materials.
2.10 Singleton problem	Stata's single unit "scaled" option was used in order to handle the singleton PSU. This option uses the average of the variances from the strata with multiple sampling units for the stratum with just one PSU.
2.11 Public/restricted data	Wave 1 to 12 data are available from the UK Data Archive: University of Essex, Institute for Social and Economic Research. (2023). Understanding Society. [data series]. 9th Release. UK Data Service. SN: 2000053, DOI: http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-Series-2000053.

Table A4. Description of the independent variables included in the analysis

Variable	Description	Distribution (unweighted)
Individual-level analysis (RQ1, RQ2, RQ3)		
Web-only response	The web response variable was calculated based on the AAPOR RR6 (AAPOR 2023). The variable takes 1 for those completing the individual questionnaire online (interviews and partials) during the first five weeks of web-only fieldwork and 0 for the proxy interviews, individual refusals, household refusals, non-contacted households, others and untraced.	**Previous wave web-first**: (0) Non-response (n = 1,996; 39.1%) (1) Response (n = 3,115; 60.9%) **Previous wave CAPI-only**: (0) Non-response (n = 431; 40.2%) (1) Response (n = 642; 59.8%)
Final response (Web + CATI)	The web response variable was calculated based on the AAPOR RR6 (AAPOR 2023). The variable takes 1 for those completing the individual questionnaire (interviews and partials) and 0 for the proxy interviews, individual refusals, household refusals, non-contacted households, others and untraced.	**Previous wave web-first**: (0) Non-response (n = 1,201; 23.5%) (1) Response (n = 3,910; 76.5%) **Previous wave CAPI-only**: (0) Non-response (n = 244; 22.7%) (1) Response (n = 829; 77.2%)
Gender	The gender variable was derived from the household grid questionnaire, which is asked at the beginning of the annual interview.	(0) Male (n = 2,390, 46.8%) (1) Female (n = 2,719, 53.2%) (99) Missing (n = 2, 0.0%)
Age groups	Age in four groups was derived from the age information collected in the household grid.	(0) 16-29 (n = 1,040; 20.4%) (1) 30-44 (n = 1,037; 20.3%) (2) 45-64 (n = 1,776; 34.8%) (3) 65+ (n = 1,258; 24.6%)
Education	The education variable was derived from the highest qualification reported by respondents. The most recent valid response was imputed for those not responding at wave 12.	(0) No degree (n = 3,578; 70.0%) (1) Degree (n = 1,320; 25.8%) (99) Missing (n = 213; 4.2%)
Ethnic background	Ethnic background derived from multiple sources (self-reported as an adult, self-reported as a youth, reported by a household member, ethnic group of biological parents), with priority given to self-reported information.	(0) Ethnic minority (n = 847; 16.5%) (1) White British (n = 4,164; 81.5%)
Uses Internet daily	Frequency of Internet use (subjective). Derived from the answer to the individual questionnaire question about frequency of Internet use. Question text: How often do you use the internet for your personal use? Response categories: Almost all the time; Several times a day; Once or twice a daya;Several times a week; Several times a month; Once a month; Less than once a month; Never use; No access at home, at work or elsewhere. The original variable was recoded so those who use the Internet almost all of the time, several times a day or once or twice a day are considered daily users.	(0) Soft-users and non-users (n = 713; 14.0%) (1) Daily users (n = 4,121; 80.6%) (99) Missing (n = 277; 5.4%)
Individual net income (Quartiles)	Individual income in quartiles derived from the individual gross income variable (see Main Survey User Guide).	(0) Q1 (Bottom) (n = 1,263; 24.7%) (1) Q2 (n = 1,255; 24.6%) (2) Q3 (n = 1,235; 24.2%)

		(3) Q4 (Top) (n = 1,178; 23.1%) (99) Missing (n = 180; 3.5%)
Response pattern	This variable was derived using the outcome code for the adult interviews in which the panel members had been invited to participate up to wave 11. First, we calculated the ratio of adult interviews the panel member completed to the waves they were issued to the field. Then, we identified regular respondents as those who completed at least 2-in-3 interviews and irregular respondents who participated less than 66% of the time.	(0) Irregular respondent (n = 885, 17.3%) (1) Regular respondent (n = 4,226, 82.7%)
Last wave response	Last wave response to the individual questionnaire.	(0) Respondent (n = 4,098; 80.2%) (1) Non-respondent (responding household) (n = 522; 10.2%) (2) Non-respondent (non-responding household) (n = 491; 9.6%)
Household-level analysis (RQ4)		
Full household response (web-only phase)	The full household web response rate (FHWRR) is based on the AAPOR RR5 (AAPOR 2023), where the partials are not considered as respondents. We consider partial households where one or more adults did not complete the individual interview. This variable takes 1 for the households where all adults completed the individual interviews during the web-only phase of the fieldwork and 0 for the partials, refusals, non-contacted, others and untraced.	(0) Non-response (n = 1,236; 47.0%) (1) Response (n = 1,394; 53.0%)
Individual-level analysis (Wave 12 respondents) (RQ5)		
Gender	The gender variable was derived from the household grid questionnaire, which is asked at the beginning of the annual interview.	(0) Male (n = 1,763, 45.1%) (1) Female (n = 2,145, 54.9%) (99) Missing (n = 2, 0.1%)
Age	Age in four groups was derived from the age information collected in the household grid.	(0) 16-29 (n = 670; 17.1%) (1) 30-44 (n = 776; 19.9%) (2) 45-64 (n = 1,426; 36.5%) (3) 65+ (n = 1,038; 26.6%)
Ethnic background	Ethnic background derived from multiple sources (self-reported as an adult, self-reported as a youth, reported by a household member, ethnic group of biological parents), with priority given to self-reported information.	(0) White British (n = 3,311; 84.7%) (1) Black (n = 85; 2.2%) (2) Asian (n = 256; 6.6%) (3) Other and mixed (n = 258; 6.6%)
Urban or rural area	Binary indicator classifying the address as falling into an (0) urban or (1) rural area. This is derived from the Office for National Statistics Rural and Urban Classification of Output Areas 2001 (UKDS Study Number 7454).	(0) Urban (n = 2,893; 74.0%) (1) Rural (n = 1,016; 26.0%) (99) Missing (n = 1; .0%)
Marital status	Marital status uses the current legal marital status from wave 12. This variable uses information from the confirmation of previous interview marital status and the reported changes.	(0) Single (n = 1,036; 26.5%) (1) Married or Civil Partnership (n = 2,163; 55.3%) (2) Separated or divorced (n = 399; 10.2%) (3) Widowed (n = 206; 5.3%) (99) Missing (n = 106; 2.7%)
Education	The education variable was derived from the highest qualification reported by respondents. The most recent	(0) Degree (n = 1,115; 28.5%)

	valid response was imputed for those not responding at wave 12.	(1) Other higher degree (n = 535; 13.7%) (2) A-levels (n = 873; 22.3%) (3) GCSE (n = 793; 20.3%) (4) Other qualification (n = 306; 7.8%) (5) No qualification (n = 267; 6.8%) (99) Missing (n = 21; .5%)
Children in household	Variable derived from the household grid questionnaire, which is asked at the beginning of the annual interview.	(0) Yes (n = 3,070; 78.5%) (1) No (n = 840; 21.5%)
Benefits recipient	Variable takes 1 if the person has received disability, sickness, universal credit, income support, job seeker's allowance, child benefit, universal credit or other benefits and 0 otherwise.	(0) Yes (n = 1,195; 30.6%) (1) No (n = 2,674; 68.4%) (99) Missing (n = 41; 1.0%)
General health	Variable measuring the subjective health status from the individual web questionnaire. Question text: In general, would you say your health is...?	(0) Excellent (n = 374; 9.6%) (1) Very good (n = 1,337; 34.2%) (2) Good (n = 1,370; 35.0%) (3) Fair (n = 616; 15.8%) (4) Poor (n = 199; 5.1%) (99) Missing (n = 14; .4%)
Long standing illness or disability	Variable measuring whether the person has a long-standing illness or dissability from the individual web questionnaire. Question text: Do you have any long-standing physical or mental impairment, illness or disability? By 'long-standing' I mean anything that has troubled you over a period of at least 12 months or that is likely to trouble you over a period of at least 12 months.	(0) Yes (n = 1,352; 34.6%) (1) No (n = 2,547; 65.1%) (99) Missing (n = 11; .3%)

Online Appendix C. Sample Profile of the Web-first and CAPI-only Subgroups

In this appendix, we compare the profiles of the CAPI-only and web-first subsamples. The objective is to evaluate the comparability of both groups using a set of demographic variables. The results show that the CAPI-only subsample is slightly older and contains more respondents with university degrees. Due to these differences, as a robustness check, we reproduced Table 3 using two logistic regression models (i.e., individual web response and final individual response) that include sex, age, education, ethnic background, individual net income and internet use as controls and the interaction of each moderator with the wave 11 fieldwork protocol indicator and the experimental allocation flag. The predicted probabilities from the models were used to test the differences between the treatment and control conditions (see Table A7). The multivariate models (see column MV) show results similar to simple models without controls.

Table A5. Sample profile of the compliant and non-compliant subsamples

		CAPI-only	Web-first
Gender			
	Male	47.8 (1.1)	47.3 (0.6)
	Female	52.2 (1.1)	52.7 (0.6)
	Total	100.0	100.0
Age*			
	16-29	13.2 (1.2)	17.1 (0.6)
	30-44	15.1 (1.4)	16.2 (0.7)
	45-64	36.4 (1.8)	37.3 (0.8)
	65+	35.3 (2.1)	29.4 (0.9)
	Total	100.0	100.0
Education**			
	Degree	32.5 (2.0)	26.9 (0.9)
	Other higher degree	10.8 (1.1)	13.5 (0.6)
	A-level etc	19.5 (1.4)	21.4 (0.6)
	GCSE etc	18.7 (1.4)	21.5 (0.7)
	Other qualification	10.6 (1.1)	8.8 (0.5)
	No qualification	7.9 (1.0)	8.0 (0.5)
	Total	100.0	100.0
Ethnic background			
	White British	89.5 (1.5)	87.6 (0.8)
	Black	1.8 (0.7)	1.8 (0.2)
	Asian	4.5 (1.0)	4.8 (0.6)
	Other white, mixed, and others	4.2 (0.9)	5.8 (0.5)
	Total	100.0	100.0
Individual net income (Quartiles)			
	Q1 (Bottom)	24.6 (1.5)	24.4 (0.7)
	Q2	25.3 (1.6)	25.8 (0.7)
	Q3	23.7 (1.5)	24.7 (0.7)
	Q4 (Top)	26.4 (1.7)	25.0 (0.7)
	Total	100.0	100.0
Uses Internet daily			
	No	14.6 (1.4)	15.6 (0.7)
	Yes	85.4 (1.4)	84.4 (0.7)
	Total	100.0	100.0
n		1,073	5,111

Weighted estimates.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Online Appendix D. Logistic Regression Models and Test of the Differences in Predicted Probabilities

In this appendix, we present the logistic regression models and the tests of the differences between the control and treatment groups. The logistic regression models were used to predict the average probability of response for each group defined by the moderators, and these probabilities were used to test the differences between the control and treatment groups (Mize 2019).

Table A6 to A12 models and differences in predicted probabilities underpin the contrasts presented in tables 3, 4 and 5 of the article.

Table A6. Logistic regression models coefficients and standard errors for web and final response

	M1.1	**M1.2**	**M2.1**	**M2.2**
	Web repsonse (Web-only phase)		**Final response (Web + CATI)**	
	Simple	**Multiv.**	**Simple**	**Multiv.**
	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)
Higher EBI (ref. Control)	0.03	2.33	0.18	2.21
	(0.18)	(1.39)	(0.23)	(1.28)
Web-first (ref. CAPI-only)	0.02	1.55	0.04	1.11
	(0.14)	(1.14)	(0.17)	(1.06)
Higher EBI # (1)	0.18	-1.35	-0.05	-1.08
	(0.21)	(1.44)	(0.25)	(1.41)
Constant	0.41**	-3.89***	1.17***	-2.50*
	(0.13)	(1.11)	(0.16)	(1.00)
Observations	6184	5832	6184	5832
Design DF	1129	1128	1129	1128
F	2.29	13.40	0.67	16.92
P-value	0.077	0.000	0.573	0.000

Dependent variable: Web response at the end of the web-only period of the fieldwork, (0) Nonresponse, (1) Response; Final response (web+CATI), (0) Nonresponse, (1) Response. Control predictors in the multivariate model (MV): sex, age, ethnic background, personal net income (in quartiles), university degree, internet use, interaction terms of each predictor with experimental allocation flag and previous wave fieldwork protocol (i.e., web-first or CAPI-only). For simplicity, we only present the relevant coefficients of the MV models.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table A7. Probability of responding to the web survey at the end of the web-only period by moderators: marginal effect difference by experimental group

	Web response (Web-only phase)		Final response (Web + CATI)	
	Simple	**Multiv.**	**Simple**	**Multiv.**
Previous wave CAPI-only: Higher EBI - Control	0.007	-0.010	0.030	0.015
	(0.044)	(0.037)	(0.039)	(0.029)
Previous wave web-first: Higher EBI - Control	0.049**	0.055**	0.021	0.023
	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.014)

Probabilities of responding to the survey predicted using the models in Table A6.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table A8. Logistic regression models coefficients and standard errors for web and final response (Web+CATI) including all moderators

	M1.3 Web Response Web-only phase b / (SE)	**M2.3 Final Response (Web + CATI)** b / (SE)
Higher EBI (ref. Control)	0.98*	1.14
	(0.48)	(0.61)
Female (ref. Male)	0.15	0.06
	(0.09)	(0.13)
Higher EBI # Female	-0.08	0.14
	(0.15)	(0.20)
30-44 (ref. 16-29)	0.08	-0.22
	(0.19)	(0.26)
45-64 (ref. 16-29)	0.57**	0.17
	(0.17)	(0.24)
65+ (ref. 16-29)	0.52**	0.22
	(0.20)	(0.25)
Higher EBI # 30-44	-0.08	-0.02
	(0.30)	(0.41)
Higher EBI # 45-64	-0.46	-0.31
	(0.25)	(0.34)
Higher EBI # 65+	-0.25	-0.07
	(0.30)	(0.37)
Degree (ref. No degree)	0.17	0.30
	(0.15)	(0.19)
Higher EBI # Degree	0.13	0.15
	(0.21)	(0.27)
White British (ref. Ethnic minority)	0.64***	0.62**
	(0.19)	(0.23)
Higher EBI # White British	-0.27	-0.75
	(0.28)	(0.39)
Q2 (ref. Q1 Bottom)	-0.11	0.16
	(0.16)	(0.18)
Q3 (ref. Q1 Bottom)	0.15	0.13
	(0.16)	(0.19)
Q4 (Top) (ref. Q1 Bottom)	0.04	0.22
	(0.17)	(0.22)
Higher EBI # Q2	-0.25	-0.36
	(0.23)	(0.28)

Higher EBI # Q3	-0.61*	-0.20
	(0.25)	(0.31)
Higher EBI # Q4 (Top)	-0.45	-0.05
	(0.26)	(0.32)
Regular respondent (ref. Irregular respondent)	1.05***	1.71***
	(0.19)	(0.19)
Higher EBI # Regular respondent	0.09	0.06
	(0.27)	(0.28)
Non-respondent (responding hh) (ref. Respondent)	-1.78***	-2.04***
	(0.25)	(0.24)
Non-respondent (nonresponding hh) (ref. Respondent)	-1.93***	-2.15***
	(0.29)	(0.24)
Higher EBI # Non-respondent (responding hh)	0.27	0.21
	(0.33)	(0.33)
Higher EBI # Non-respondent (nonresponding hh)	-0.19	-0.38
	(0.39)	(0.37)
Daily user	1.36***	1.18***
	(0.17)	(0.20)
Higher EBI # Daily user	0.10	-0.15
	(0.25)	(0.29)
Constant	-2.34***	-1.39***
	(0.33)	(0.39)
Observations	4806	4806
Design DF	1117	1117
F	22.23	28.28
P-value	0.000	0.000

Dependent variable: Web response at the end of the web-only period of the fieldwork, (0) Nonresponse, (1) Response; Final response (web+CATI), (0) Nonresponse, (1) Response.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table A9. Logistic regression models coefficients and standard errors: web response at the end of the web-only period of the fieldwork

	M1.4	M1.5	M1.6	M1.7	M1.8	M1.9	M1.10	M1.11
	Sex	Age	Education	Ethnic background	Individual income	Uses internet daily	Response pattern	Last wave response
	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)
Higher EBI (ref. Control)	0.30**	0.42*	0.22*	0.47*	0.44**	0.18	0.25*	0.09
	(0.11)	(0.17)	(0.10)	(0.23)	(0.16)	(0.20)	(0.10)	(0.19)
(1)	0.31***	0.42**	0.37**	0.66***	0.05	2.16***	-2.66***	1.03***
	(0.08)	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.17)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.20)	(0.14)
(2)		0.92***			0.37**		-2.45***	
		(0.14)			(0.13)		(0.29)	
(3)		0.75***			0.36**		0.38	
		(0.15)			(0.13)		(0.27)	
Higher EBI # (1)	-0.18	-0.04	0.03	-0.30	-0.13	0.05	-0.24	0.19
	(0.11)	(0.22)	(0.17)	(0.24)	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.37)	(0.21)
Higher EBI # (2)		-0.36			-0.51*			
		(0.19)			(0.20)			
Higher EBI # (3)		-0.26			-0.27			
		(0.22)			(0.21)			
Constant	0.28***	-0.18	0.41***	-0.11	0.31**	-1.40***	0.86***	-0.32*
	(0.07)	(0.12)	(0.07)	(0.16)	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.06)	(0.13)
Observations	5109	5111	4898	5011	4931	5111	5111	4834
Design DF	1118	1118	1118	1118	1118	1118	1118	1117
F	7.53	10.49	7.58	8.38	3.10	134.29	110.10	51.56
P-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000

Dependent variable: Web response at the end of the web-only period of the fieldwork, (0) Nonresponse, (1) Response. Independent variables: Sex, (0) Male (ref.), (1) Female; Age, (0) 16-29 (ref.), (1) 30-44, (2) 45-64, (3) 65+; Ethnic background, (0) Ethnic minority (ref.), (1) White British; Education, (0) No degree (ref.), (1) University degree; Individual income, (0) Q1 (Bottom) (ref.), (1) Q2, (2) Q3, (4) Q4 (Top); Internet Use, (0) Less often than Daily (ref.), (1) Daily; Previous Response Behaviour, (0) Irregular respondent (ref.), (1) Regular respondent; Last wave response, (0) Respondent (ref.), (1) Non-respondent (Responding household), (2) Non-respondent (Non-responding household).
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table A10. Probability of responding to the web survey at the end of the web-only period by moderators: marginal effect difference by experimental group

	Sex	Age	Education	Ethnic background	Individual income	Uses internet daily	Response pattern	Last wave response
Bivariate LR models								
(0): Higher EBI - Control	0.072**	0.104**	0.051*	0.116*	0.102**	0.030	0.049**	0.023
	(0.025)	(0.042)	(0.024)	(0.056)	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.019)	(0.048)
(1): Higher EBI - Control	0.028	0.089**	0.051	0.038*	0.072*	0.048**	0.095**	0.059**
	(0.023)	(0.038)	(0.031)	(0.021)	(0.036)	(0.020)	(0.041)	(0.021)
(2): Higher EBI - Control		0.012			-0.016		0.001	
		(0.030)			(0.034)		(0.051)	
(3): Higher EBI - Control		0.036			0.036			
		(0.033)			(0.034)			
Multivariate LR models								
(0): Higher EBI - Control	0.057**	0.132***	0.053**	0.117*	0.117***	0.060	0.053**	0.040
	(0.023)	(0.041)	(0.021)	(0.050)	(0.032)	(0.040)	(0.018)	(0.043)
(1): Higher EBI - Control	0.053**	0.085**	0.060*	0.046**	0.065*	0.054**	0.119*	0.058***
	(0.020)	(0.035)	(0.028)	(0.018)	(0.030)	(0.018)	(0.052)	(0.018)
(2): Higher EBI - Control		0.018			0.003		0.019	
		(0.026)			(0.030)		(0.056)	
(3): Higher EBI - Control		0.045			0.035			
		(0.029)			(0.030)			

Probabilities of responding to the survey during the web-only period predicted using the models in Table A8 and Table A9. Independent variables: Sex, (0) Male (ref.), (1) Female; Age, (0) 16-29 (ref.), (1) 30-44, (2) 45-64, (3) 65+; Ethnic background, (0) Ethnic minority (ref.), (1) White British; Education, (0) No degree (ref.), (1) University degree; Individual income, (0) Q1 (Bottom) (ref.), (1) Q2, (2) Q3, (4) Q4 (Top); Internet Use, (0) Less often than Daily (ref.), (1) Daily; Previous Response Behaviour, (0) Irregular respondent (ref.), (1) Regular respondent; Last wave response, (0) Respondent (ref.), (1) Non-respondent (Responding household), (2) Non-respondent (Non-responding household). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table A11. Logistic regression models coefficients and standard errors: web response at the end of the fieldwork

	M2.4	M2.5	M2.6	M2.7	M2.8	M2.9	M2.10	M2.11
	Sex	Age	Education	Ethnic background	Individual income	Uses internet daily	Response pattern	Last wave response
	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)	b / (SE)
Higher EBI (ref. Control)	0.19	0.13	0.12	0.59*	0.19	0.06	0.20	0.12
	(0.13)	(0.18)	(0.12)	(0.25)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.14)	(0.21)
(1)	0.37***	0.39*	0.46**	0.71***	0.21	2.83***	-3.12***	0.80***
	(0.10)	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.19)	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.18)	(0.17)
(2)		0.89***			0.32*		-2.83***	
		(0.15)			(0.15)		(0.23)	
(1)		0.91***			0.44**		0.23	
		(0.17)			(0.15)		(0.26)	
Higher EBI # (1)	-0.14	0.14	0.09	-0.55*	-0.11	0.09	-0.38	0.03
	(0.14)	(0.25)	(0.21)	(0.27)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.34)	(0.23)
Higher EBI # (2)		-0.14			-0.23			
		(0.21)			(0.22)			
Higher EBI # (3)		0.04			0.08			
		(0.25)			(0.24)			
Constant	1.02***	0.58***	1.22***	0.65***	1.09***	-1.02***	1.96***	0.76***
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.18)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.15)
Observations	5109	5111	4898	5011	4931	5111	5111	4834
Design DF	1118	1118	1118	1118	1118	1118	1118	1117
F	7.07	11.31	7.77	5.29	2.80	244.26	177.77	17.39
P-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.007	0.000	0.000	0

Dependent variable: Web response at the end of the fieldwork (Web + CATI), (0) Nonresponse, (1) Response. Independent variables: Sex, (0) Male (ref.), (1) Female; Age, (0) 16-29 (ref.), (1) 30-44, (2) 45-64, (3) 65+; Ethnic background, (0) Ethnic minority (ref.), (1) White British; Education, (0) No degree (ref.), (1) University degree; Individual income, (0) Q1 (Bottom) (ref.), (1) Q2, (2) Q3, (4) Q4 (Top); Internet Use, (0) Less often than Daily (ref.), (1) Daily; Previous Response Behaviour, (0) Irregular respondent (ref.), (1) Regular respondent; Last wave response, (0) Respondent (ref.), (1) Non-respondent (Responding household), (2) Non-respondent (Non-responding household). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table A12. Probability of responding to the web survey at the end of the web-only period by moderators: marginal effect difference by experimental group

	Sex	Age	Education	Ethnic background	Individual income	Uses internet daily	Response pattern	Last wave response
Bivariate LR models								
(0): Higher EBI - Control	0.036	0.029	0.020	0.119**	0.035	0.012	0.020	0.027
	(0.023)	(0.041)	(0.020)	(0.050)	(0.031)	(0.038)	(0.014)	(0.045)
(1): Higher EBI - Control	0.008	0.050	0.025	0.006	0.014	0.017	0.087*	0.021
	(0.019)	(0.036)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.029)	(0.015)	(0.048)	(0.017)
(2): Higher EBI - Control		-0.001			-0.007		-0.036	
		(0.024)			(0.029)		(0.063)	
(3): Higher EBI - Control		0.024			0.037			
		(0.026)			(0.027)			
Multivariate LR models								
(0): Higher EBI - Control	0.017	0.044	0.020	0.106**	0.051*	0.037	0.021	0.044
	(0.019)	(0.035)	(0.016)	(0.040)	(0.025)	(0.042)	(0.013)	(0.038)
(1): Higher EBI - Control	0.029*	0.039	0.032	0.012	0.000	0.021	0.097*	0.019
	(0.015)	(0.029)	(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.014)	(0.057)	(0.014)
(2): Higher EBI - Control		0.005			0.016		-0.021	
		(0.019)			(0.024)		(0.064)	
(3): Higher EBI - Control		0.026			0.027			
		(0.022)			(0.022)			

Probabilities of responding to the survey on the web at the end of the fieldwork derived from the models in Table A8 and Table A11. Independent variables: Sex, (0) Male (ref.), (1) Female; Age, (0) 16-29 (ref.), (1) 30-44, (2) 45-64, (3) 65+; Ethnic background, (0) Ethnic minority (ref.), (1) White British; Education, (0) No degree (ref.), (1) University degree; Individual income, (0) Q1 (Bottom) (ref.), (1) Q2, (2) Q3, (4) Q4 (Top); Internet Use, (0) Less often than Daily (ref.), (1) Daily; Previous Response Behaviour, (0) Irregular respondent (ref.), (1) Regular respondent; Last wave response, (0) Respondent (ref.), (1) Non-respondent (Responding household), (2) Non-respondent (Non-responding household).
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Online Appendix E. Sample profile of respondents by experimental group

Table A 13. Sample profile of respondents by experimental group

		All respondents		Control (£10)		Higher EBI (£20)	
Gender							
	Male	45.6	(0.7)	44.8	(1.0)	46.4	(0.9)
	Female	54.3	(0.7)	55.1	(1.0)	53.6	(0.9)
	Missing	0.1	(0.0)	0.1	(0.1)	0.0	(0.0)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
Age							
	16-29	14.4	(0.6)	14.6	(0.9)	14.2	(0.9)
	30-44	15.6	(0.8)	15.0	(1.0)	16.2	(1.1)
	45-64	38.8	(0.9)	38.6	(1.4)	39.0	(1.3)
	65+	31.2	(1.1)	31.8	(1.5)	30.7	(1.4)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
Ethnic background							
	White British	88.8	(0.8)	89.3	(1.0)	88.2	(1.2)
	Black	1.5	(0.2)	1.2	(0.3)	1.8	(0.4)
	Asian	4.3	(0.6)	4.4	(0.7)	4.2	(0.8)
	Other and mixed	5.4	(0.5)	5.1	(0.7)	5.7	(0.8)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
Urban or rural area							
	Urban	76.0	(1.3)	76.2	(1.6)	75.8	(1.6)
	Rural	24.0	(1.3)	23.8	(1.6)	24.2	(1.6)
	Missing	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
Marital status							
	Single	24.6	(0.8)	24.8	(1.1)	24.4	(1.1)
	Married or Civil Partnership	55.9	(1.1)	55.9	(1.5)	55.8	(1.4)
	Separated or divorced	11.2	(0.6)	10.8	(0.9)	11.5	(0.8)
	Widowed	6.2	(0.5)	6.3	(0.7)	6.1	(0.6)
	Missing	2.2	(0.3)	2.2	(0.4)	2.3	(0.3)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
Education							
	Degree	28.5	(1.0)	29.0	(1.3)	28.0	(1.3)
	Other higher degree	14.1	(0.7)	13.8	(0.9)	14.5	(0.9)
	A-levels	21.1	(0.7)	21.5	(1.0)	20.6	(1.0)
	GCSE	20.7	(0.8)	20.5	(1.1)	20.8	(1.1)

	Other qualification	8.4	(0.6)	8.1	(0.8)	8.7	(0.8)
	No qualification	6.7	(0.5)	6.6	(0.7)	6.8	(0.6)
	Missing	0.5	(0.1)	0.4	(0.2)	0.5	(0.2)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
Children in household							
	No child	84.4	(0.8)	83.6	(1.1)	85.2	(1.0)
	Children	15.6	(0.8)	16.4	(1.1)	14.8	(1.0)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
Benefits recipient							
	Yes	27.7	(0.9)	26.7	(1.3)	28.7	(1.3)
	No	71.4	(0.9)	72.1	(1.3)	70.8	(1.3)
	Missing	0.9	(0.2)	1.2	(0.3)	0.5	(0.2)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
General health							
	Excellent	9.1	(0.6)	8.1	(0.7)	10.1	(0.9)
	Very good	34.0	(0.9)	36.4	(1.3)	31.7	(1.2)
	Good	35.2	(0.9)	35.1	(1.3)	35.3	(1.2)
	Fair	16.1	(0.7)	14.7	(0.9)	17.5	(1.0)
	Poor	5.3	(0.4)	5.4	(0.6)	5.2	(0.6)
	Missing	0.3	(0.1)	0.4	(0.1)	0.3	(0.1)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
Long-standing illness or disability							
	Yes	37.2	(1.0)	36.0	(1.3)	38.4	(1.3)
	No	62.5	(1.0)	63.7	(1.3)	61.4	(1.3)
	Missing	0.2	(0.1)	0.3	(0.1)	0.2	(0.1)
	Total	100.0		100.0		100.0	
n		4,196		2,073		2,123	

Analysis is restricted to the ex-web-first subsample.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

References

AAPOR (2023), *Standard Definitions. Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*, American Association for Public Opinion Research, p. 90.

Berthoud, R., Fumagalli, L., Lynn, P., and Platt, L. (2009), "Design of the Understanding Society Ethnic Minority Boost Sample," *Understanding Society Working Papers*.

Burton, J., Lynn, P., and Benzeval, M. (2020), "How Understanding Society: The UK Household Longitudinal Study adapted to the COVID-19 pandemic," *Survey Research Methods*, Survey Research Methods, 235-239 Pages. https://doi.org/10.18148/SRM/2020.V14I2.7746.

Carpenter, H. (2021), *UK Household Longitudinal Study. Wave 11 technical report.*, Technical report, London: Kantar Public, p. 44.

Kamisnka, O. (2021), "Weighting for mortality in a longitudinal study," ESRA Conference 2021, Online.

Lynn, P. (2009), "Sample Design for Understanding Society," *Understanding Society Working Papers*.

Lynn, P., Nandi, A., Parutis, V., and Platt, L. (2018), "Design and implementation of a high-quality probability sample of immigrants and ethnic minorities: Lessons learnt," *Demographic Research*, 38, 513–548. https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2018.38.21.

Marcia Freed, T., Brice, J., Buck, N., and Prentice-Lane, E. (eds.) (2018), *British Household Panel Survey User Manual Volume A: Introduction, Technical Report and Appendices.*, Colchester: University of Essex.

Mize, T. (2019), "Best Practices for Estimating, Interpreting, and Presenting Nonlinear Interaction Effects," *Sociological Science*, 6, 81–117. https://doi.org/10.15195/v6.a4.

Seidenberg, A. B., Moser, R. P., and West, B. T. (2023), “Preferred Reporting Items for Complex Sample Survey Analysis (PRICSSA),” *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*, 11, 743–757. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smac040.