

Final Evaluation of the Saving Gateway 2 Pilot: Technical Report

Research study conducted for
HM Treasury/Department for
Education and Skills



HM TREASURY

department for
education and skills

May 2007

Authors:

Paul Harvey, Nick Pettigrew, Richard Madden, and Trinh Tu (Ipsos MORI)

Carl Emmerson, Gemma Tetlow and Matthew Wakefield (Institute for Fiscal Studies).

MORI

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
2	Recruitment.....	7
2.1	Recruitment objectives.....	7
2.2	'Category 6' research.....	7
2.3	Recruitment methods.....	8
2.4	Take-up rates.....	11
2.5	Measures to boost conversion.....	13
2.6	Saving Gateway helpline.....	14
2.7	Recruitment fieldwork & timing.....	15
3	Evaluation.....	16
3.1	Scope of the quantitative research.....	16
3.2	Baseline survey.....	16
3.3	Wave 1 survey.....	16
3.4	Wave 2 survey.....	24
4	Qualitative research.....	31
4.1	Recruitment Research.....	31
4.2	Wave 1 Evaluation.....	31
4.3	Stakeholder Research.....	31
4.4	Wave 2 Evaluation.....	32
4.5	Wave 3 Evaluation.....	32
4.6	Recruitment & fieldwork.....	32
5	Weighting & Outputs.....	34
5.1	Weighting the quantitative analysis.....	34
5.2	Outputs.....	35

Appendices

1 Introduction

This technical report has been compiled by Ipsos MORI Social Research Institute (SRI) and contains the technical details for both the recruitment and the evaluation of Saving Gateway 2 (SG2). Both elements were conducted by Ipsos MORI in partnership with researchers at the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS). The findings from waves 1 and 2 evaluation are contained in two separate reports.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Saving Gateway 2 (SG2)

The Saving Gateway is a government initiative aimed at encouraging saving among lower income households and promoting engagement with mainstream financial services. Each pound placed into a Saving Gateway account is matched by the government at a certain rate up to a monthly contribution limit.¹

A key motivation for the Saving Gateway is ‘to increase rates of saving and asset-ownership’ among eligible (lower income) families.² In order to measure the effect of different match-rates, contribution limits and a bonus, on participation in the accounts and on boosting the number of savers and savings among lower income families the government piloted six different variants of the Saving Gateway in six areas across England between February 2005 and March 2007.³ A report containing the interim findings from this evaluation was published in July 2006.⁴ Since that report was published further data on the behaviour of account holders up until near the time of account maturity have been collected and this report contains final findings from the evaluation of the accounts. Data from almost the full duration of accounts allow for more final answers to evaluation questions, and also provide more opportunity to explore issues such as whether the account design has been successful in encouraging regular contributions, than was possible with the data available for the interim report.

An initial pilot of the Saving Gateway accounts – SG1 – was put into operation in five areas of England in August 2002.⁵ These accounts provided pound-for-

¹ Further details on the Saving Gateway policy can be found on the HM Treasury website at http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/documents/financial_services/savings/topics_savings_gateway.cfm and the Directgov website at http://www.direct.gov.uk/MoneyTaxAndBenefits/ManagingMoney/SavingsAndInvestments/SavingsAndInvestmentsArticles/fs/en?CONTENT_ID=10010450&chk=U09/4C

² Source: HM Treasury (2001), *Savings and Assets for All*, London: HM Treasury (www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/mediastore/otherfiles/36.pdf). More information on Saving Gateway design issues were provided subsequently in HM Treasury (2001), *Delivering Saving and Assets*, London: HM Treasury (www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/mediastore/otherfiles/delivering_savings.pdf).

³ These are Cambridgeshire, Cumbria and North Lancashire, East London, East Yorkshire, Manchester and South Yorkshire.

⁴ See http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/80D/D7/savingsgateway2_180706.pdf

⁵ Tower Hamlets in East London; Gorton in East Manchester; Cumbria; Cambridgeshire and Hull.

pound matching subject to a £25 monthly contribution limit and an overall cap of £375. The accounts lasted 18 months (although maximum match could have been achieved in 15 months) and were operated by the Halifax bank. Individuals aged between 16 and the State Pension Age were eligible to open a SG1 account if they were in work and had an income below a certain threshold, or if they were out-of-work and in receipt of certain benefits.⁶ The evaluation of SG1 examined the behaviour and attitudes of a group of account openers at the start, and towards the end, of the account period and compared these to the behaviour and attitudes of a comparison set of individuals. This evaluation found that just over half (56%) of those who built up funds in their Saving Gateway account previously had no formal savings, and that ‘the scheme also seems to have encouraged more people to save regularly’. The extent to which this represented new saving will depend on whether, in the absence of the policy, this saving would have taken place. Encouragingly, there was little evidence of people shifting existing assets into their SG1 account or borrowing to ‘save’. However, there was also little evidence of individuals reporting they had cut back on expenditure in order to save. Instead, the self reports indicated that ‘the great majority of participants found the money to save from their regular income’.⁷

In the December 2004 Pre-Budget Report, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced a second pilot of the Saving Gateway – SG2 – costing £15 million, to build on the lessons of the first pilot. The SG2 pilot was much larger in scale: there were nearly 22,000 SG2 accounts in operation compared with fewer than 1,500 accounts in the first pilot. The eligibility criteria were broadened on the second pilot to include individuals aged 16 to 65 with individual earnings up to £25,000 and family earnings below £50,000 *or* in receipt of a main out-of-work qualifying benefit (Income Support, Jobseekers’ Allowance, Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance). The SG2 pilot also had variation in how the accounts operated: while, like the first pilot, it ran for 18 months, it varied by area in terms of the match-rate offered (from 20p to £1 for each £1 contributed) and in terms of the monthly contribution limit (from £25 a month to £125 a month). One area also offered a £50 bonus once the first £50 of matchable contributions had been paid. Full details on account design are contained in the next section of this chapter.

Alongside the financial incentive to place funds in a SG2 account, the pilot also offered financial education. Account holders in all areas were offered national courses run by learndirect and additional financial education was available in five of the six pilot areas (for details, see section 1.2.3, below).

Therefore, the evaluation of SG2 built on the first pilot by exploring the role of different match-rates and contribution limits and also examining the impact on a

⁶ HM Treasury and Department for Education and Skills (2002), *Saving Gateway* [pamphlet], (www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/mediastore/otherfiles/ACF1F8F.pdf).

⁷ See p viii and section 5.2 of Kempson, E., McKay, S. and Collard, S. (2003), *Evaluation of the CFLI and Saving Gateway Pilot Projects Interim report on the Saving Gateway pilot project*, http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/D6A/C0/SG_report_Oct03_162.pdf, and sections 5.5 and 5.10 of Kempson, E., McKay, S. and Collard, S. (2005), *Incentives to save*:

Encouraging saving among low-income households: Final report on the Saving Gateway pilot project, London HM Treasury (http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/35D/E1/Incentives_to_save.pdf).

wider group of potentially eligible individuals. In addition, the larger sample size gives greater scope for quantitative examination of the effect of the accounts. A range of potential outcomes of interest are examined in this report, with a particular focus of the quantitative research on examining how much was paid into SG2 accounts, how this varied by background characteristics, and what evidence there is on whether contributions to Saving Gateway accounts represented new saving.

The qualitative element of the study adds to these findings, seeking to find out how account holders managed to save, and how far they engaged with mainstream financial services and the mechanics of savings.

1.1.2 Operation of Saving Gateway 2

The SG2 accounts are operated by the Halifax bank at branches in the pilot areas. The general principle of the SG2 accounts is that contributions made by individuals to their accounts are matched, at varying rates, by the government. There are limits to the amount of government match that an individual can receive in each calendar month and the funds in the account earn no interest. The accounts must be kept open for a period of 18 months in order to receive the government match.

The SG2 accounts are being piloted in six areas around England – East Yorkshire, South Yorkshire, Manchester, Cumbria, Cambridge and East London. Different match-rates and monthly contribution limits are offered in each area (see Table 1.1). The most generous match-rate is offered in Manchester, where the government contributes £1 for every £1 that an individual puts in their SG2 account. The least generous matches are offered in Cambridge and East London, where the government puts £0.20 into the account for every £1 contributed by the individual.

The monthly contribution limit (in other words, the maximum contribution that can attract a government match each month⁸) also varies across the pilot areas. The lowest contribution limits are in Manchester, East Yorkshire and South Yorkshire where the monthly contribution limit is £25. The highest monthly limit is in Cambridge, where net contributions of up to £125 a month can attract a government match.

The final variation is in East Yorkshire where account openers are given an additional £50 once they have saved at least £50 in their account.

The accounts have to remain open for 18 months but the maximum government match that an individual can receive is 16 months of full contributions. This is so that, if individuals need to withdraw money or take a month or two off from contributing, they will have two months in which to catch up before the end of the account.

⁸ A month refers to a calendar month.

Therefore, the maximum amount of government match that an individual can receive varies across the pilot areas. For example, in Manchester the maximum match at the end of 18 months will be 16 months of £25 contributions matched at a rate of £1 for every £1 contributed. This works out as a maximum total match of £400 (16 × 25 × 1). Similarly, in Cambridge, where the match-rate is £0.20 for every £1 contributed and the contribution limit is £125, the maximum match achievable is also £400 (16 × 125 × 0.2). Table 1.1 shows, for each area, the match-rate, contribution limit and maximum possible match available.

Table 1.1: Account features and match range achievable in each pilot area, ranked by contribution limit

	Match (per £1.00)	Contribution limit (£ per month)	Match range (total)
Cambridge	£0.20	£125	£0-£400
Cumbria	£0.50	£50	£0-£400
East London	£0.20	£50	£0-£160
Manchester	£1.00	£25	£0-£400
East Yorkshire	£0.50	£25	£0-£250*
South Yorkshire	£0.50	£25	£0-£200

* Account holders in East Yorkshire receive a £50 bonus once they have contributed £50 to the account. Therefore, provided they contribute at least £50 to the account, the minimum government match received will be £75, including both the £0.50:£1 match and the £50 bonus ((0.5*£50)+£50).

1.1.3 Eligibility for SG2

The eligibility criteria for SG2 are wider than those applied for SG1. In order to be eligible for SG2 (other than living in one of the pilot areas), individuals had to be aged 16 to 65 years old, with either individual earnings up to £25,000 and in a family with earnings below £50,000, or in receipt of a main out-of-work qualifying benefit (Income Support, Jobseekers Allowance, Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance).⁹

1.1.4 Financial Education

Improving financial information and awareness are important elements of the government policy, and opportunities for financial education were built into the design of the SG2 pilots. Alongside the SG2 account, account openers were offered various types of financial education which varied depending on the pilot area. The financial education available was detailed in the information leaflet sent to everyone offered an account. Much of the financial education on offer was also available to non-SG2 participants. In all areas, individuals had the opportunity to take part in courses run by learndirect (the learndirect Cash Crescent course was specifically promoted in East Yorkshire). In all areas apart

⁹ In addition, all those who had previously had SG1 accounts and individuals in South Yorkshire who had adult learning grants, were also allowed to open accounts – see section 1.3.1.

from Manchester and East Yorkshire, other financial education options were also promoted. The financial education available in each area is shown in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2: Financial education available, by area

	learndirect	Other
East Yorkshire	✓	Specifically promoted learndirect Cash Crescent
Cambridge	✓	Family learning courses
South Yorkshire	✓	Adult Learning Grant
East London	✓	Tower Hamlets College
Cumbria	✓	Financial Pursuits
Manchester	✓	None

2 Recruitment

2.1 Recruitment objectives

The recruitment element was designed to meet two key aims:

- Recruitment of eligible people who were offered the opportunity to open an SG2. We refer to this group as the **treatment group**¹⁰; and
- Recruitment of a **control group** who were not offered an SG2 account for the purpose of the evaluation.

To ensure that the control group matched the treatment group as closely as possible, they were recruited alongside each other using similar recruitment approaches. This is described in detail in section 2.3.

The target number of SG2 accounts was 20,000 with at least half being among benefit recipients. The number of accounts actually opened exceeded this target at 21,476.

The target number for the control group was 3,000. The interviews with the control group were also split evenly between benefit and non-benefit recipients.

2.2 'Category 6' research

The recruitment of the treatment group fell outside the remit of traditional market research (i.e. we were approaching individuals to offer them a SG2 account rather than to find out their views on a specific issue). As a result, the work could not be carried out under the Market Research Society Code of Conduct. This is known in the industry as “Category 6” research. The Market Research Society Code of Conduct describes this as: “All projects...where some or all of the data will be used by the client at a personal level for purposes **in addition to or instead** of those defined in the 1998 Act and the MRS Code as confidential research”.

One of the implications of this was that we had to take steps at each stage to ensure that the respondent was aware of the nature of the process, and was given the opportunity to opt-out before proceeding to the next stage. In addition, we had to exclude from the RDD recruitment telephone numbers that have registered with the Telephone Preference Service (TPS). This step is *not* normally taken in “conventional” market research. Furthermore, although DWP provided samples of people on benefits for the SG2 postal recruitment, these individuals could not be re-contacted if they *did not* open a SG2 account. However, if they

¹⁰ The treatment group comprises all those offered the chance to open an SG2 account (and are eligible for it), regardless of whether or not they actually took up the offer.

did open a SG2, they could be contacted for the evaluation unless they indicated otherwise.

2.3 Recruitment methods

The principal aim was to try and recruit as many individuals as possible using Random Digit Dialling (RDD). RDD is the only sampling method that can produce a representative and unbiased probability sample for *telephone* research (see section 2.3.2). Telephone recruitment is also the most time-efficient approach given the tight deadline for having c20,000 SG2 accounts opened.

However, there were two key issues that had to be taken into consideration:

- Firstly, there was no data to provide guidance on what the likely “success rate” of this approach would be – that is, what proportion of the people recruited will actually open an account. Recruitment for SG1 was targeted - much of it was done through local organisations rather than “cold calling” – and the approaches were, therefore, not directly comparable.
 - This “uncertainty” meant that other recruitment approaches – such as direct mailing – were also considered. In addition, it was felt desirable to test other recruitment approaches in the event that SG2 is rolled out nationally.
- Secondly, benefit recipients are relatively “rare” and were, therefore, time-consuming and costly to recruit using RDD alone. Thus a more targeted approach was required. This involved using DWP records to boost recruitment of benefit recipients to offer the SG2 account, as well as to be part of the control group.

Thus, the final recruitment comprised the following approaches:

- **RDD:** Individuals were contacted by telephone using RDD. This method was used to recruit both the treatment and control groups (the recruitment questionnaire is appended).
- **DWP records:** DWP provided two samples of benefit recipients. The *first* was used to recruit the control group. This was carried out by telephone. An advance letter was sent to all those in the sample, giving them details about the research and allowing them to opt-out by contacting Ipsos MORI. The *second* sample was used to recruit SG2 participants. As mentioned in section 2.2, because the recruitment could not be classified as “research”, DWP only permitted this sample to be contacted by post and those refusing the SG2 offer could not be re-contacted.

- **Postcode Address File (PAF):** Invitations to open an SG2 account were sent to samples of addresses drawn from the Postcode Address File (PAF).

In addition to these principal methods, some account holders came from two other sources. First, all those who had previously had a SG1 account were eligible to open a SG2 account. Second, everyone receiving the Adult Learning Grant in South Yorkshire was also given the opportunity to open a SG2 account.

Full detail of each method is described below and a breakdown of the outcome for each approach is contained in Tables 2.4a-e. All fieldwork materials relating to the recruitment are appended. Each SG pack contained the following:

- An invitation letter with a unique serial number allocated by Ipsos MORI. In addition to meeting the eligibility criteria, individuals could only open an SG2 on production of this letter to the Halifax along with the required documentations. The back of this letter contained the addresses of the Halifax branches that were administering SG2 applications;
- An SG2 booklet with information about the account. This booklet also contained the application form; and
- An account opening questionnaire to inform the evaluation – SG2 account openers were not required to complete this form although a large majority did – 79% (see section 3.2).

2.3.1 De-duping the sample

As the recruitment approaches were being conducted in parallel, the samples were all de-duped against each other prior to each DWP and PAF mail-out, in order to minimise incidences of duplication (although it was not possible to eradicate this completely as the RDD sample is based on telephone numbers at the point of selection, as opposed to actual addresses).

2.3.2 Random Digit Dialling (RDD)

Recruitment using RDD comprised the following stages:

- 1) Matching postcodes in the pilot areas to the telephone exchanges;
- 2) Generating a random sample of telephone numbers within the pilot areas;
- 3) Contacting these telephone numbers to establish eligibility (as described in section 1.1.3). In addition, among people not in receipt of one of the eligible benefits, the following quotas were imposed to ensure that the recruitment was not skewed towards high income individuals: 50% recruited in household income band of less than £20,000; 35% in band £20,000 - £30,000; and 15% in band £30,000 - £50,000.

- 4) Recruiting either to a treatment or control group. Selection to a control or treatment group was randomised:
 - **Treatment group:** once eligibility had been confirmed, these individuals were told about the SG2 account and asked whether they would like to open one. For those who said yes, we collected their contact details and arranged for an SG2 pack to be sent to them. This is done on a rolling basis. Those refusing an account were asked if they would be willing for Ipsos MORI to contact them for further research.
 - **Control group:** once eligibility had been confirmed, these individuals were asked to join a research panel. We also collected some additional baseline information about them for the evaluation.

In total, 4,029 account openers were recruited through this method (for details on the distribution of the RDD sample by area, see Table 2.4a).

2.3.3 DWP sample

The second principal recruitment method of individuals into the SG2 pilot was through contacting individuals from DWP benefit records. All these individuals were clients of DWP as a result of being in receipt of one or more of Income Support, Job Seeker's Allowance, Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance.

More letters were sent to benefit recipients in Cambridge and East London than the other areas because the match rate was less generous in these areas. In total, 4,990 people opened accounts as a result of being contacted through DWP records (see Table 2.4b).

As mentioned above, an additional group of control individuals was also drawn from the DWP records. These individuals were not offered the account but were asked to take part in research into individuals' saving behaviour.

2.3.4 Postcode Address File (PAF)

Addresses in each of the pilot areas were randomly sampled from the Postcode Address File (PAF). These addresses were then sent the information pack offering them the chance to open a SG2 account. However, it was not possible to assess whether anyone at these addresses was eligible before the letters were sent. The letters emphasised that only one account could be opened per household.

In total 11,948 people opened SG2 accounts as a result of receiving a letter through PAF. The majority of these accounts were opened in Cambridge and South Yorkshire – over 3,000 accounts were opened in each of these areas. Between 1,200 and 1,600 accounts were opened in each of the other areas as a result of people having been contacted through PAF – although it should be

noted that the number of letters sent also varied by area due to differential take-up (for further details see Table 2.4c).

2.3.5 SG1 participants

Everyone who opened a SG1 account as part of the first evaluation of the SG policy (1,382 individuals in total) was given the opportunity to open a second account as part of the SG2 evaluation. In total, 479 SG1 individuals opened an SG2 (see Table 2.4d).

2.3.6 Adult Learning Grant (ALG) recipients

In South Yorkshire, all those in receipt of the Adult Learning Grant were offered the chance to open a SG2 account (436 individuals in total). These people account for very few of the accounts that were opened (30 in total).

2.4 Take-up rates

Tables 2.4a-e below show the final take-up rate for the different recruitment approaches.

The take-up rate for the PAF sample is likely to a slight underestimation as there were still people wanting to apply for the accounts post-closure of the offer. Take-up rate for the other two approaches were not as affected because these recruitment methods were completed relatively earlier on.

Table 2.4a: SG2 packs sent and accounts opened: RDD sample

	<i>Packs sent</i>	<i>Accounts opened</i>	<i>Conversion rate</i>
Cambridge	3,898	400	10.3%
Cumbria	4,185	913	21.8%
East London	4,262	277	6.5%
East Yorkshire	4,062	928	22.8%
Manchester	4,262	841	19.7%
South Yorkshire	4,128	670	16.2%
<i>All</i>	<i>24,797</i>	<i>4,029</i>	<i>16.2%</i>

Table 2.4b: SG2 packs sent and accounts opened: DWP sample

	<i>Packs sent</i>	<i>Accounts opened</i>	<i>Conversion rate</i>
Cambridge	48,856	945	1.9%
Cumbria	18,904	1,045	5.8%
East London	36,938	583	1.6%
East Yorkshire	14,743	998	6.8%
Manchester	14,793	778	5.3%
South Yorkshire	14,841	641	4.3%
<i>All</i>	<i>149,075</i>	<i>4,990</i>	<i>3.3%</i>

Table 2.4c: SG2 packs sent and accounts opened: PAF sample

	<i>Packs sent</i>	<i>Accounts opened</i>	<i>Conversion rate</i>
Cambridge	63,706	3,458	5.4%
Cumbria	5,162	1,241	24.0%
East London	77,001	1,206	1.6%
East Yorkshire	12,255	1,563	12.8%
Manchester	10,208	1,338	13.1%
South Yorkshire	49,004	3,142	6.4%
<i>All</i>	<i>217,336</i>	<i>11,948</i>	<i>5.5%</i>

Table 2.4d: SG2 accounts opened amongst SG1 participants

	<i>Packs sent</i>	<i>Accounts opened</i>	<i>Conversion rate</i>
Cambridge	214	56	26.2%
Cumbria	267	97	36.3%
East London	311	51	16.4%
East Yorkshire	356	167	46.9%
Manchester	234	108	46.2%
South Yorkshire	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>All</i>	<i>1382</i>	<i>479</i>	<i>34.7%</i>

Note: South Yorkshire was not involved in the SG1 pilot.

Table 2.4e: SG2 accounts opened amongst ALG participants

	<i>Packs sent</i>	<i>Accounts opened</i>	<i>Conversion rate</i>
South Yorkshire	436	30	6.9%

Table 2.4f shows household income for account openers. This information is derived from the self-completion questionnaire which participants completed when they first opened their account (SG1 and ALG participants are excluded from this table). The questionnaires were completed by the vast majority of account openers recruited via RDD, DWP and PAF records – 97%.

Half (51%) of account openers who completed the questionnaire have household income of less than £15,000 per annum rising to 78% of those recruited using DWP records. Three in ten (31%) have household incomes of between £15,000 – below £26,000 and 16% have household income of between £26,000 – below £50,000. Less than one per cent had household income in excess of the threshold of £50,000.

As would be expected, those recruited using DWP records are less affluent than those recruited using PAF and RDD – the household income of these latter groups are broadly similar.

Table 2.4f: Accounts openers by household income

<i>Income</i>	<i>RDD</i>	<i>DWP</i>	<i>PAF</i>	<i>Total</i>
Less than £15000	1874	3719	4763	10356
£15000 – less than £21k	897	465	2197	3559
£21k – less than £26k	698	250	1653	2601
£26k – less than £50k	699	196	2338	3233
More than £50k	20	27	36	83
<i>All (N)</i>	<i>4239</i>	<i>4786</i>	<i>11227</i>	<i>20252</i>

Note: excludes SG1 and ALG participants

2.5 Measures to boost conversion

Take-up of the SG2 offer was slow during the first half of the recruitment after which it gathered momentum. In order to understand the reasons for the slow progress, Ipsos MORI re-contacted a sample of those who were offered the SG2 account during the early stages of recruitment. As a result of this investigation, the help of Toynbee Hall was sought to try and boost recruitment in East London, and a deadline for SG2 application was included in the SG2 packs. These measures are described below.

2.5.1 Telephone reminders

In total, 13,000 telephone reminders were conducted with RDD individuals who had not opened an account. The aim of this exercise was to ascertain the reasons why people had not opened a SG2 account, in order to inform the recruitment. A copy of the reminder questionnaire is appended (Appendix B).

Overall, inertia was one of the key reasons for not having opened the account - two-fifths of those contacted said they still intended to open the account (however, just nine per cent of those contacted actually went on to open an account, and it was unclear how much of this was the result of the reminder exercise). As a result of this finding, a deadline for account opening was included in the cover letter in the SG2 pack (see section 2.5.3).

A similar proportion - two-fifths - said they did not intend to an open account. The most commonly cited reason was that they could not afford it. Other reasons cited were: already had a savings account, too much hassle, too busy, the account opening questionnaire was too intrusive/personal, and the Halifax branches listed were too far away¹¹.

¹¹ The SG2 accounts could only be opened at selected branches of the Halifax or by post through a centralized processing system.

2.5.2 East London

Take-up in East London was lower than observed in the other five pilot areas, including Cambridge which had a similarly less generous match rate¹². Where the two areas differed significantly was in terms of deprivation and ethnic make-up of residents – East London is more deprived and a significant proportion of residents are from minority ethnic groups. Thus residents in East London were more likely to experience difficulties in accessing the offer due to language difficulties and/or low literacy. To address these potential barriers, the help of Toynbee Hall – a local charity – was sought. The SG2 pack for residents in East London was accompanied by a leaflet with details on how they could access free help and advice about SG2 from Toynbee Hall (Appendix C).

2.5.3 Deadline for SG2 applications

The initial letters that accompanied the SG2 packs asked people to open their account as quickly as possible as there was a limit on the number of accounts available. However, no dates or timescales were specified as it was felt that this may deter individuals from applying if they felt they had just missed the deadline. However, the telephone reminders highlighted that a key reason why people had not applied was because they had simply “not got round to it”. The decision was therefore taken to state in the cover letter a timescale within which individuals needed to apply.

The findings from the qualitative research indicated that it was a combination of this deadline and increasing “word-of-mouth” publicity about SG2 (as more people became aware of the initiative through the scale of the PAF and DWP mail-outs), that eventually accelerated take-up of SG2. If SG2 was to be rolled out nationally, it is likely that there would be greater publicity about it through different channels which should facilitate take-up.

Different versions of the letters that were sent are appended (Appendix E).

2.6 Saving Gateway helpline

A free phone helpline was set up and manned by Ipsos MORI staff from the start of recruitment and continued until a month after the account offer closed (March - September 2005). The Helpline operated 12 hours per day Monday – Friday and 8 hours per day Saturday – Sunday, excluding public holidays.

The helpline answered general queries about the SG2 process (i.e. what respondents needed to do if they wanted to open an account, who they could contact if they require more information about the account) and how individuals have been selected from RDD/PAF/DWP records. It did *not* provide financial advice and/or information. It also answered queries relating to the SG2 self-completion questionnaire which accompanied every SG2 packs (see section 3.2).

¹² The contribution limit was more generous in Cambridge, although this is unlikely to be the reason for differential conversion rate between these two areas.

In total, the helpline received c.7,500 calls during this period. The most common reasons for calling were to check eligibility and to verify that the agency involved was indeed Ipsos MORI. A breakdown of the nature of the calls received is shown in Table 2.6.

<i>Table 2.6: Nature of calls made to Helpline</i>	<i>%</i>
Checking eligibility	30
Verification that MORI is involved	20
Verifying invitation received – DWP & PAF samples	16
Requesting another SG2 pack	10
Checking whether pack had been sent	5
Questions relating to the account (these were referred to the Halifax)	4
Encountered problems opening the account (eg. Appointment dates too far in advance; branches too far away)	3
Wants to open account but hasn't been invited	3
Calls from Halifax staff	2
Questions about research from control group	1
Other	6

2.7 Recruitment fieldwork & timing

The recruitment was undertaken by Ipsos MORI Telephone using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). Ipsos MORI Telephone is a member of the Interviewer Quality Control Scheme (IQCS) which is recognised by the Market Research Society.

All interviewers were personally briefed by members of the Ipsos MORI research team prior to fieldwork. They were also given detailed interviewer briefing notes which are appended (Appendix D).

Recruitment took place between March - September 2005. However, recruitment of SG2 participants had to pause once the general election was announced and did not commence again until the day after the election was held. During this period, recruitment of the control sample continued but all mentions of government had to be removed (i.e. it could not be mentioned that the research was being conducted on behalf of HM Treasury or DfES). This had a significant adverse effect on response rate. However, response rate picked up again once purda was over and we were able to mention the commissioning departments.

3 Evaluation

3.1 Scope of the quantitative research

The evaluation of SG2 collected data from three groups of individuals - SG2 account openers; SG2 invitees who did not open an account; and a control group - at three points in time:

- On account opening in the form of a self-completion questionnaire – the baseline survey.
- Approximately 6 months after the account was opened through telephone and face-to-face interviewing – wave 1.
- Approximately 18 months after the account was opened which coincided with the account maturity – wave 2.

This chapter describes the design of the quantitative surveys (baseline, wave 1 and wave 2). Chapter 4 describes the qualitative strand of the research.

3.2 Baseline survey

All account openers were asked to fill in a paper questionnaire when they opened their account (Appendix F). The questionnaire collected details on personal and financial characteristics such as household composition, employment status, own and family income and asset holdings prior to opening a SG2 account. In addition, the questionnaire also asked about individuals' intended use of their SG2 accounts. In total, 79% of account holders completed this questionnaire.

3.3 Wave 1 survey

Ipsos MORI interviewed a total of 11,644 people across the six SG2 pilot areas. The majority of interviews (11,077) were conducted by CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing), while a further 567 interviews were conducted face-to-face, in-home, using CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing). The rationale for adopting this dual approach was to ensure that response rate was maximised and that no particular groups were precluded from taking part because they were unable to complete the survey by telephone (i.e. people with hearing or language difficulties etc). Thus respondents who could not be interviewed by telephone, including soft refusers (i.e. where someone else in the household had refused to take part in the survey on their behalf), had their contact details issued to the Ipsos MORI CAPI interviewing team for face-to-face follow-up.

As mentioned, there were three types of respondent:

1. *Account Openers*: All received a SG2 information pack and opened an account;
2. *Non Openers*: Invited to, but did not, open a SG2 account; and
3. *Control group*: Eligible for SG2 but were *not invited* to open an account.

Telephone fieldwork was conducted between 14 September - 5 December 2005, while the face-to-face fieldwork took place between 1 November - 18 December 2005.

3.3.1 Sample design

The sample design comprised a **main sample** which was selected to be representative of the three groups described above, and a **booster sample** of account openers only in order to facilitate more detailed analysis of this group.

Tables 3.3a-c summarise the target number of interviews for each of the three groups described above and the sampling strategy adopted. Table G1 in Appendix G gives a detailed breakdown of the total samples available, the samples drawn, and the target number of interviews. The samples were drawn on the assumption of an unadjusted response rate of 65% among account holders and control group and 50% for account non-openers.

<i>Table 3.3a: Main sample</i>	<i>Target interviews</i>	<i>Sampling strategy</i>
<i>Account openers not in receipt of benefits – RDD sample only</i>	2,000	Sampling proportionally by area. Stratified by income within area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 50% with household income of less than £20K ▪ 35% with household income £20-30K ▪ 15% with household income of £30-50K.
<i>Account openers in receipt of benefits – DWP sample</i>	1,000	Sampling proportionally by area. Within area, sample ranked by benefit type prior to random selection.
<i>Account non-openers (ie. invited to open an SG2 but did not, including refusers at point of recruitment, those who did not get round to open an account, etc.) – RDD sample only¹³</i>	3,000	Sampling proportionally by area. Stratified by benefit status although the sample was predominantly non-benefit recipients. Among non-benefits, ranked by household income prior to random selection.
<i>Total main sample</i>	<i>6,000</i>	

¹³ Recontact with DWP sample was not permitted. It was not possible to identify a sample of eligible non-openers from the PAF sample without prior screening to establish eligibility.

<i>Table 3.3b: Booster sample</i>	<i>Target interviews</i>	<i>Sampling strategy</i>
<i>Account openers– DWP sample</i>	1,000	Equal number of interviews across 6 pilot areas Within area, sample ranked by benefit type prior to random selection
<i>Account openers – PAF sample</i>	1,000	Equal number of interviews across 6 pilot areas Within area, sample ranked by postcode prior to random selection ¹⁴
<i>Total booster sample</i>	<i>2,000</i>	

<i>Table 3.3c: Control sample</i>	<i>Target interviews</i>	<i>Sampling strategy</i>
<i>Non-benefits recruited via RDD</i>	1,500	Equal number of interviews across 6 pilot areas Within area, sample ranked by household income prior to random selection
<i>Benefit recipients recruited via RDD and using DWP records</i>	1,500	Equal number of interviews across 6 pilot areas Within area, sample ranked by benefit type prior to random selection
<i>Total control sample</i>	<i>3,000</i>	

3.3.2 Questionnaire design

The questionnaire was designed by researchers at IFS and Ipsos MORI in close collaboration with HMRC, HM Treasury and DfES. A copy of the final questionnaire which was used for both CATI and CAPI fieldwork is appended (Appendix I).

The questionnaire covered the following areas:

- Regular Incomes;
- Attitudes to Saving and Borrowing;
- Current Accounts;
- Savings Accounts;
- Life Insurance, Pensions and Other Investments;
- Financial Commitments;
- Expenditure;
- Saving Gateway (This section was only asked of the treatment group);

¹⁴ We did not have data on whether PAF account holders were on benefit or not.

- Health.

3.3.3 Piloting

Ipsos MORI undertook an extensive pilot to test the questionnaire and methodologies. Telephone and face-to-face interviews were conducted in two areas with different match rates - East Yorkshire and Cambridge.

Pilot interviewers were personally briefed by the Ipsos MORI research team prior to undertaking the pilot. They were also provided with full written instructions. Prior to the pilot fieldwork, an advance letter was sent to all those in the pilot sample, giving them details about the research and a contact name at Ipsos MORI should they require further information and/or wish to opt-out of the research. Face-to-face debriefs were conducted with pilot interviewers and the feedback is summarised below.

Telephone Pilot

A total of 301 interviews were conducted by telephone between 27 - 31 July 2005. Interviews were conducted with 200 treatment and 101 control respondent: 150 in Cambridge and 151 in East Yorkshire. The treatment interviews were split as follow: 125 RDD, 50 DWP, and 25 PAF.

The overall unadjusted response rate (including ineligible and invalid leads) was 67%. The overall adjusted response rate was 76%. There was no significant variation between the two pilot areas.

Face-to-Face Pilot

A total of 16 interviews were conducted between 5 - 14 August 2005, which comprised 12 treatment and 4 control respondents: 8 in Cambridge and 8 in East Yorkshire. The treatment interviews comprised 7 RDD and 5 DWP respondents.

Pilot feedback

Interviewers were generally positive about the questionnaire and felt that respondents were keen to do the interview without much persuasion. The advance letter was thought to have played a big part in this. Having had contact with these people in various ways prior to the interview also helped.

There was great variation in the interview length. For those with no savings or investment, the interview could be as short as 20 minutes whilst for those with a partner/spouse and several forms of savings and investments, it could last up to 70 minutes.

Most respondents were happy to give actual figures rather than using the bands for financial questions. Some respondents were suspicious of the detailed nature of the financial questions but confidentiality reassurances, stressed throughout

the interview, helped to minimise this. The importance of this was stressed to interviewers in subsequent briefing sessions.

Overall, most questions worked well. Many of the suggested amendments were minor and involved tightening up of some question wordings, and greater clarification on what constituted savings versus investments. A small number of questions were removed to try and minimise the interview length for people with more extensive savings and investment portfolios.

3.3.4 Main fieldwork

Interviewer briefings

Face-to-face briefings were given to both CATI and CAPI interviewers. In total six sessions were conducted with CAPI interviewers (one per pilot area) and one session with CATI interviewers. The briefings covered, amongst other things, the aims of the survey, the policy background, contact procedures, and procedures for maximising response rates. Test interviews were also undertaken to highlight certain questions and specific routing in the questionnaire.

Interviewers were also given full written instructions on all aspects of the survey, as well as fact sheets for reference (Appendices K and L).

Advance mail-out

As with the pilot, every person in the sample was sent a letter in advance of the fieldwork. There were separate letters for those in the treatment and control groups (Appendix H). These letters gave respondents information about the research as well as a contact name at Ipsos MORI should they require additional information. Respondents were given two weeks to opt-out of the research by contacting the Ipsos MORI team - a dedicated free phone and email helpline were set up for this purpose.

In total, 18,303 advanced letters were sent to respondents (13,693 treatment and 4,610 control) of which 315 refused prior to fieldwork (two per cent). Therefore 17,988 leads were released to the telephone interview team, of which 13,426 were treatment and 4,562 control.

Telephone fieldwork

All telephone fieldwork was carried out by Ipsos MORI Telephone.

Sample leads were supplied, at random, to interviewers through a computerised sample management system (SMS). The SMS allowed the status of each lead to be monitored, and for appointments with willing participants to be made and kept systematically.

All telephone numbers were tried a minimum of ten times at different times of the day, and on different days, to maximise successful contact rate. In many

cases, more than 10 calls were made. As fieldwork took place over several months, leads that were tried up to 10 times were re-released for further attempts among subgroups with lower than average response rate.

Face-to-face fieldwork

Respondents who could not be interviewed by telephone had their contact details issued to the Ipsos MORI CAPI team for face-to-face follow-up. This group included soft-refusers (ie. where other members of the household refused on behalf of the respondent), respondents who were still un-contactable after at least 10 telephone attempts, respondents whose telephone numbers were out of service/dead during the fieldwork period and respondents who were unavailable during the CATI fieldwork period.

Interviewers in the six areas were issued with paper contact sheets, to record their attempts at making contact with respondents in the sample. There were three types of contact sheet, one for the control group, one for RDD treatment and one for DWP and PAF treatment respondents. The reason for this was that we required different information from these three groups. The DWP and PAF contact sheets included a small screening section which checked the respondent's age and whether they were in full-time education (we did not have this information because only the RDD sample was asked these questions to establish their eligibility for SG2). We also needed separate contact sheets for the treatment and control groups to ensure that the interviewers did not inadvertently mention Saving Gateway to respondents in the control group. The three contact sheets were printed on different colour paper to make them easily identifiable (Appendix J).

CAPI interviewers were instructed to make at least four attempts per address to secure an interview. At least one of these calls must be in the evening and one at the weekend.

Reserve sample

Fieldwork progress was monitored carefully to ensure the target number of interviews was achieved in each area. In mid-October 2005 it was agreed that a reserve sample would be required for some subgroups such as East London treatment and control. In total 3,122 advance letters (2,126 treatment, 996 control) were sent to respondents in areas that were likely to fall below the target number of interviews. As fieldwork progressed, it became clear that not all of these leads would need to be released, so the decision was made to only release sufficient leads so as not to have a negative impact on the overall response rate. Therefore, only 1,421 of the 3,122 leads were released to MTS (570 treatment, 851 control).

3.3.5 Response rates

The following tables show the unadjusted and adjusted response rates for the telephone fieldwork – including the main and reserve sample (Table 3.3d), face-to-face fieldwork (Table 3.3e) and a combined response rate (Table 3.3f). As can

be seen, the face-to-face follow-up increased the overall adjusted response rate from 65% to 72%. There was scope to increase the response rate further as 817 of the leads issued to CAPI interviewers were not used (as the target number of CAPI interviews had been met and fieldwork could not be extended due to reporting commitments).

Table 3.3d: Telephone outcomes

	Total
Total sample issued	19,409
Achieved interviews	11,077
Unadjusted response rate	57%
Adjusted response rate	65%
Eligible sample:	
Achieved interviews	11,077
Respondent refusal	3,223
Other refusal	1,917
No response	475
Interview terminated	358
Total eligible sample	17,050
Ineligible sample:	
Incorrect telephone number	707
Number out of service	427
Moved	318
Not available during fieldwork	36
Screened out	62
Other ineligible	147
Total ineligible sample	1,697
Not needed – target achieved	662

Source: Ipsos MORI

Table 3.3e: Face-to-face outcomes

	Total
Total sample issued	1,953
Achieved interviews	567
Unadjusted response rate	29%
Adjusted response rate	55%
Eligible sample:	
Achieved interviews	567
Respondent refusal	291
Other refusal	17
No response	151
Total eligible sample	1,026
Ineligible sample:	
Property not found	16
Property vacant/ non-residential	15
Moved	34
Not available during fieldwork	15
Other ineligible	30
Total ineligible sample	110
Not needed – target achieved	817

Source: Ipsos MORI

Table 3.3f: Combined telephone and face-to-face outcomes¹⁵

	Total
Total sample issued	19,409
Achieved interviews	11,644
Unadjusted response rate	60%
Adjusted response rate	72%
Total eligible sample	16,140
Total ineligible sample	1,790
Not needed – target achieved	1,479

¹⁵ Face-to-face leads were derived from the telephone sample and as such are a sub-set of the main sample and not independent. The combined response rate is therefore not calculated as an aggregate of the two outcomes as this would represent some respondents twice.

3.4 Wave 2 survey

Ipsos MORI interviewed a total of 11,123 across the six SG2 pilot areas. All interviews were conducted by CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing). Due to a stricter timetable than wave 1 as well as the high response rate achieved, CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing) was not found to be necessary for this stage of the evaluation.

3.4.1 Sample design

The aim was to ensure that the sample size and composition for wave 2 mirrored what was achieved in wave 1. Thus the sample for wave 2 comprised:

- **A longitudinal sample:** all wave 1 respondents who have agreed to be re-contacted (88% of the wave 1 sample agreed to be re-contacted).
- **A top-up sample:** a “new” sample of people who were not interviewed at wave 1. A top-up sample was necessary because it was not possible to re-interview all wave 1 respondents due to sample attrition (eg. refusals, out-of-date contact details etc.). The top-up sample was sourced in a number of ways depending on the sample type (Table 3.4a). Estimates on the number of top-up interviews required were based on response rates achieved in wave 1.

Table 3.4a: Sample sources for wave 2

<i>Sample type</i>	<i>Top-up sample source</i>
Account openers	Account openers from all three recruitment methods: RDD, DWP and PAF.
Account refusers	Account refusers from RDD recruitment.
Control sample	<p>The top-up sample for this group was constructed using three sources:</p> <p><i>Control respondents who were not interviewed in wave 1</i> (ie. not all of the control sample recruited were interviewed in wave 1). However, the number of leads available was insufficient to make up the shortfall. Thus other means were needed to top-up the wave 2 control sample – using DWP benefit records and RDD.</p> <p><i>People who were in receipt of one or more of Income Support, Job Seeker’s Allowance, Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance</i> – this sample was provided by DWP.</p> <p>RDD for recruiting respondents who were not in receipt of benefits.</p> <p>Both the RDD and DWP top-up samples underwent a series of screening questions to check their eligibility to be recruited as a member of the control group (as was the case in the initial recruitment – see section 2). (Appendix O).</p>

Table 3.4b summarises the target and achieved number of interviews for each of the groups described above.

<i>Table 3.4b: Longitudinal leads</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achieved</i>
Treatment	4,134	4,535
Control	1,320	1,680
<i>Total longitudinal</i>	<i>5,454</i>	<i>6,215</i>
<i>Top-up sample using leads from initial recruitment</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achieved</i>
Top-up Treatment	3,870	3,534
Top-up Control	839	476
<i>Total booster sample</i>	<i>4,709</i>	<i>4,010</i>
<i>Booster sample – Control free-find leads</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achieved</i>
Control DWP	429	335
Control RDD	412	563
<i>Total control free-find sample</i>	<i>841</i>	<i>898</i>

3.4.2 Questionnaire design

The questionnaire was based on the wave 1 evaluation to allow tracking of core questions for longitudinal leads – it covered identical issues to those listed in section 3.3.2. However, wave 2 also included some additional questions on the SG account for account holders. A copy of the final questionnaire is appended (Appendix O).

3.4.3 Piloting

Ipsos MORI undertook a pilot to test the questionnaire and methodologies (particularly the control free-find element).

Pilot interviewers were personally briefed by the Ipsos MORI research team prior to undertaking the pilot. They were also provided with full written instructions. Prior to the pilot fieldwork, an advance letter was sent to all those in the pilot sample, giving them details about the research and a contact name at Ipsos MORI should they require further information and/or wish to opt-out of the research.

Telephone pilot

A total of 100 interviews were conducted by telephone between 10 – 31 July 2006. Interviews were conducted with 48 treatment and 52 control respondents. The interviews were split as follow:

- *31 Account Openers:*
 - 9 RDD (6 longitudinal, 3 top-up)
 - 11 DWP (6 longitudinal, 5 top-up)
 - 11 PAF (5 longitudinal, 6 top-up)
- *17 Refusers* (12 longitudinal, 5 top-up)
- *52 Control* (27 longitudinal, 25 free-find top-up).

For the named sample, the overall unadjusted response rate (including ineligible and invalid leads) was 59%. The overall adjusted response rate was 74%. Response rates were in line with our assumptions with the exception of the top-up RDD account openers and top-up refusers which were lower.

Pilot feedback

Similarly to the wave 1 evaluation, interviewers were generally positive about the questionnaire and felt that respondents were keen to do the interview without much persuasion. The advance letter, again, played a big part in this.

Concerns raised were similar to those discussed at Wave 1:

- Respondents were wary about providing partner's financial information
- Respondents sometimes found it difficult to combine figures if they are receiving benefits at different intervals i.e. weekly, monthly etc.
- Some felt that questions which focus on the last calendar month etc. did not provide an accurate reflection of their general behaviour.

A new issue which was raised related to the expenditure questions – a small number of respondents felt that these questions were excessive and some unemployed respondents occasionally felt that the focus on finances and expenditure was insensitive.

Other observations were:

- References to HM Treasury in the telephone introduction appeared to encourage participation among the control free-find sample.
- Refusals to participate were largely due to not wanting to give personal information, not being bothered and not wanting to be involved – similar to the reasons cited at Wave 1.

3.4.4 Main fieldwork

Interviewer briefing

Face-to-face briefings were given to CATI interviewers. The briefing covered, amongst other things, the aims of the survey, the policy background, contact procedures, and procedures for maximising response rates. Test interviews were also undertaken to highlight certain questions and specific routing in the questionnaire.

Interviewers were also given full written instructions on all aspects of the survey, as well as fact sheets for reference (Appendices P and Q).

Advance mail-out

As with the pilot, every person in the sample (excluding new control free-find leads to be sourced via RDD) was sent a letter in advance of the fieldwork. There were separate letters for those in the longitudinal treatment; top-up treatment; existing control and free-find DWP groups (Appendix N). These letters gave respondents information about the research as well as a contact name at Ipsos MORI should they require additional information. Respondents were given two weeks to opt-out of the research by contacting the Ipsos MORI team - either by telephoning a member of the SG project team or via a dedicated SG email address set up for this purpose.

In total, 24,803 advance letters were sent to respondents (7,417 longitudinal treatment; 10,852 top-up treatment; 4,594 existing control and 1,940 control DWP free-find) of which 243 refused before fieldwork started (one per cent). Therefore 24,560 leads were released to the telephone interviewing team, of which 18,130 were treatment and 6,430 were control.

Telephone fieldwork

All telephone fieldwork was carried out by Ipsos MORI Telephone – see section 3.3.4 for further details.

3.4.5 Response rates

The following tables show the unadjusted and adjusted response rates for the telephone fieldwork conducted with named leads – that is, excluding the control free-find responses through RDD (Tables 3.4c-3.4e).

Table 3.4c: Telephone outcomes for named sample: Longitudinal leads

	Total
Total sample used	8,437
Achieved interviews	6,215
Unadjusted response rate	74%
Adjusted response rate	90%
Eligible sample:	
Achieved interviews	6,215
Respondent refusal	717
Other refusal	6
No response	4
Interview terminated	0
Total eligible sample	6,942
Ineligible sample:	
Incorrect telephone number	658
Number out of service	574
Moved	150
Not available during fieldwork	63
Screened out	0
Other ineligible	39
Total ineligible sample	1,484
Not needed – target achieved	11

Source: Ipsos MORI

Table 3.4d: Telephone outcomes for named sample: Top-up leads

	Total
Total sample used	10,584
Achieved interviews	4,345
Unadjusted response rate	41%
Adjusted response rate	69%
Eligible sample:	
Achieved interviews	4,345
Respondent refusal	1,912
Other refusal	14
No response	3
Interview terminated	0
Total eligible sample	6,274
Ineligible sample:	
Incorrect telephone number	1,907
Number out of service	1,540
Moved	484
Not available during fieldwork	92
Screened out	93
Other ineligible	172
Total ineligible sample	4,288
Not needed – target achieved	22

Source: Ipsos MORI

Table 3.4e: Telephone outcomes for named sample: combined¹⁶

	Total
Total sample used	19,019
Achieved interviews	10,560
Unadjusted response rate	56%
Adjusted response rate	80%
Eligible sample:	
Achieved interviews	10,560
Respondent refusal	2,629
Other refusal	20
No response	7
Interview terminated	0
Total eligible sample	13,215
Ineligible sample:	
Incorrect telephone number	2,565
Number out of service	2,114
Moved	634
Not available during fieldwork	155
Screened out	93
Other ineligible	211
Total ineligible sample	5,772
Not needed – target achieved	32

Source: Ipsos MORI

¹⁶ 5,541 of the original 24,560 leads were suspended from use during fieldwork either to be transferred to the Qualitative Research sample or because targets were achieved within pilot areas/sample types.

4 Qualitative research

4.1 Recruitment Research

Twelve face-to-face interviews were conducted with Halifax Saving Gateway champions in April 2005 as recruitment of account holders was in progress. Two members of Halifax staff were recruited to participate from each pilot area. The aim of this research was to gain an overview of the process of opening accounts.

4.2 Wave 1 Evaluation

Two tranches of qualitative research were conducted between September and December 2005.

The first tranche of qualitative research were with SG1 participants. In total, 30 depth interviews were conducted, face-to-face, across the five SG1 pilot areas. Half of the interviews were with SG1 participants who had subsequently opened a SG2 account.

The second tranche of qualitative research comprised 78 depth interviews, conducted face-to-face, with SG2 account openers, SG2 account refusers and members of the control group. In addition, in South Yorkshire, six respondents were interviewed (four account openers and two account refusers) who were holders of the Adult Learning Grant (ALG). Fieldwork for this second tranche took place during December 2005. Table 4.1 below summaries the interviews conducted.

Table 4.1: Qualitative interviews – wave 1, second tranche

<i>Pilot area</i>	<i>Openers</i>	<i>Refusers</i>	<i>Control group</i>
East Yorkshire	7	3	2
Cambridge	7	3	2
South Yorkshire	8 (4 ALG)	5 (2 ALG)	2
East London	7	3	2
Cumbria	7	3	2
Manchester	10	3	2
<i>Total</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>

4.3 Stakeholder Research

In April 2006, depth interviews were conducted with Halifax staff and Learning Providers. All interviews were conducted by telephone, twelve with Halifax staff and nine with learning providers.

4.4 Wave 2 Evaluation

Qualitative research was conducted between October - November 2006.

This second wave of qualitative research comprised 91 depth interviews conducted face-to-face with SG2 account openers; members of the control group; training providers and Halifax staff. Table 4.4 below summaries the interviews conducted.

Table 4.4: Qualitative interviews – wave 2

<i>Pilot area</i>	<i>Control</i>	<i>Account Holders</i>	<i>Learning Providers</i>	<i>Halifax staff</i>	<i>Total</i>
Cumbria	2	10	1	2	15
Cambridge	2	10	2	2	16
E Yorkshire	2	10	2	2	16
E London	2	10	3	2	17
Manchester	2	10	0	2	14
S Yorkshire	2	8	1	2	13
<i>Total</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>91</i>

4.5 Wave 3 Evaluation

A third wave of qualitative interviews were conducted between February – March 2007.

Interviews were conducted with 70 account holders whose accounts had already matured. Interviews within each group were evenly split to include account holders maturing pre and post December 31 2006. Table 4.5 below summaries the interviews conducted.

Table 4.5: Qualitative interviews – wave 3

<i>Pilot area</i>	<i>SG2 Account Holders</i>			<i>Total</i>
	<i>Account Holders</i>	<i>SG1 & SG2</i>	<i>Recipients of SG Financial Learning</i>	
Cumbria	6	2	3	11
Cambridge	7	2	3	12
E Yorkshire	6	2	3	11
E London	7	2	3	12
Manchester	7	2	3	12
S Yorkshire	7	2	3	12
<i>Total</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>70</i>

4.6 Recruitment & fieldwork

Participants for all waves were recruited, by telephone, by trained Ipsos MORI recruiters. Prior to recruitment, an advance letter was sent to all those selected,

providing them with details about the research and the interview. Each participant was offered a £20 High Street voucher as a thank you.

Halifax staff and learning providers were also recruited by telephone by trained Ipsos MORI recruiters.

The depth interviews were conducted by Ipsos MORI researchers, using topic guides agreed with HMRC, HM Treasury and DfES (Appendices R-T).

5 Weighting & Outputs

5.1 Weighting the quantitative analysis

5.1.1 Wave 1 interim report

Due to differential response rates and differences in sampling of certain groups, the quantitative data was weighted for some parts of the analysis in order that the sample was representative.

The Halifax transactions data was not weighted as this was the complete set of transactions carried out using SG2 accounts.

Some account holders did not return their *account opening questionnaires* so this sample of account openers may not be representative. However, given that we do not know anything about the characteristics of the non-responders, the account opening questionnaire data was not been weighted to take account of non-response.

The telephone data was weighted for the analysis presented in Chapter 7 of the interim report and some of the analysis presented in Chapter 3. The weights used for the RDD data controlled for two factors:

- First, the weights controlled for the fact that RDD account openers (a self selected sample who, on average, had higher incomes and more wealth than other individuals in the RDD sample – see Chapter 3 of the interim report) were over represented in the telephone interviews.
- Second, the weights controlled for the fact that, whilst account openers were sampled across areas in proportion to the conversion rate in each area (i.e. more account openers were sampled in areas where the conversion rate was higher), RDD control individuals were sampled roughly equally in each area.
- In addition, where analysis was presented in Chapter 3 for all account openers, the account openers sampled were also weighted to take account of the fact that RDD, DWP and PAF account openers were not sampled proportionately to their share of the overall number of accounts in each area.

Where weighted data was used, this was stated in the notes to the relevant tables and figures in the interim and final reports.

5.1.2 Wave 2 final report

The weighting for the second wave followed the same principles as the weighting for the first wave explained above. This was again to control for particular sampling factors.

5.2 Outputs

The findings contained in the *interim* report were based on data from four main sources:

- *Halifax transaction data for all SG2 accounts:* We had information on every deposit and withdrawal for 21,476 SG2 accounts which had been opened between one and 10 months by 31st December 2005. The information available on each transaction included the amount that was deposited or withdrawn, the date of the transaction, the branch where the transaction took place and the method of payment (e.g. cash, cheque, standing order).
- *Baseline self completion questionnaire* for 79% of SG2 account holders.
- *Wave 1 telephone and face-to-face survey data* for 11,644 individuals.
- *Findings from two tranches of qualitative research* conducted in September-December 2005 with: SG1 participants; SG2 account openers and refusers; and members of the control group.

The findings contained in the wave 2 evaluation report were based on the above data sources plus the following:

- *Halifax transaction data*
- *Wave 2 telephone survey data* for 11,123 individuals.
- *Qualitative research findings* from interviews conducted during October - November 2006 with: SG2 account opener; members of the control group; training providers and Halifax staff.
- *Qualitative research findings* from interviews conducted during February – March 2007 with: SG2 account openers whose accounts have matured (including SG1 account holders and receivers of SG financial learning).

Ipsos MORI/J24346/J25503/J28117

Checked & Approved:

Trinh Tu, Nick Pettigrew

Checked & Approved:

Juliet Brown, Rachel Vines, Jane Daragh

Appendices

Recruitment

- Appendix A: RDD Recruitment Questionnaire
- Appendix B: RDD Reminder Questionnaire
- Appendix C: Toynbee Hall Flyer
- Appendix D: Recruitment Interviewer Instructions
- Appendix E: Invitation Letters
- Appendix F: Baseline Questionnaire

Wave 1 Quantitative Evaluation

- Appendix G: Sample Design
- Appendix H: Advance Letters
- Appendix I: Questionnaire
- Appendix J: CAPI Contact Sheets
- Appendix K: Interviewer Instructions
- Appendix L: Interviewer Factsheet

Wave 2 Quantitative Evaluation

- Appendix M: Sample Design
- Appendix N: Advance Letters
- Appendix O: Questionnaire
- Appendix P: Interviewer Instructions
- Appendix Q: Interviewer Factsheet

Qualitative Evaluation

- Appendix R: Wave 1 Topic Guides
- Appendix S: Wave 2 Topic Guides
- Appendix T: Wave 3 Topic Guide