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CE Basic Design

\[ \text{CPI} = \text{Diary} + \text{Quarterly Interview} \]
Parameters from the CNSTAT for recommendations

- Reduce measurement error
- Adapt to changing retail and technological landscape
- Provide respondents with more flexibility
- Think ‘out of the box,’ but ground recommendations in as much survey experience as possible
- Do not let budget constrain ideas too much
Causes of measurement error

• CE is very burdensome
  > Quarterly Interview averages 1 hour
  > Recall is difficult
  > Proxy reporting for other consumer unit (CU) members.
  > High burden leads to errors (e.g., “satisficing,” nonresponse; interviewer shortcuts)

• Retrospective recall is subject to error
  > Omissions, telescoping, estimation
  > Failure to encode (expense amounts)
Changing retail environment

- Transactions occur through multiple modes
  - Brick and mortar stores
  - Online expenditures
    - Bill payment
    - Online shopping
- Electronic records for most purchases
Which transactions leave an electronic record that could be used for CE data collection?

- Cash: 29%
- Debit Card: 29%
- Credit Card: 17%
- Check: 13%
- Online Bill Pay: 5%
- Prepaid Card: 1%
- Bank Account Payment: 5%
- Money Order: 1%

Total = 64.5 transactions per consumer per month, 2009
## Transactions with e-records/month/consumer, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% with e-records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill payments</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online payments</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail, service, person-to-person transactions</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All transactions</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With consolidation in retail industry, relatively few retail chains

- 20 largest grocery chains
  - Total Sales 61.6%

- Walgreens, CVS, Rite Aid
  - Total Pharmacy Sales 73.2%

- Sam’s Club, Costco
  - Warehouse Club Sales 89.5%

Cooperation from several chains = Data for a high proportion of CU expenditures
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Summary of key features of proposed design

Both Diary & Interview Surveys
Scan receipts or mail paper records; Download financial files
Increase monitoring
Enhance recall interview
Monetary & nonmonetary incentives
Vendor Survey
Summary of key features of proposed design

**Both Diary & Interview Surveys**
- Scan receipts or mail paper records;
- Download financial files;
- Increase monitoring;
- Enhance recall interview;
- Monetary & nonmonetary incentives;
- Vendor Survey.

**Diary Survey**
- Two 7-day collection periods;
- Estimates for food, alcohol & other frequent purchases.
Summary of key features of proposed design

Both Diary & Interview Surveys
- Scan receipts or mail paper records;
- Download financial files
- Increase monitoring
- Enhance recall interview
- Monetary & nonmonetary incentives
- Vendor Survey

Diary Survey
- Two 7-day collection periods
- Estimates for food, alcohol & other frequent purchases

Quarterly Interview Survey
- Two 3-month collection periods, 12 months apart
- Estimates for all other purchases
Proposed design: use of personal records

- Ask respondents to download electronic information from:
  - Credit card
  - Bank
  - Mortgage
  - Any other online source

- Emphasis on collecting receipts

- Create records using other methods
# Online Banking

**Account Activity**: Checking XXXX-XXXX-XXXX-3456

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
<th>Deposits</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2011</td>
<td>Check 245</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5463.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/2011</td>
<td>ACH Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350.45</td>
<td>$5588.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/2011</td>
<td>ATM Withdrawal</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5237.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/2011</td>
<td>ACH Payment</td>
<td>$24.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5437.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/08/2011</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$5462.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed design: use of personal records

• Ask respondents to download electronic information from
  > Credit card
  > Bank
  > Mortgage
  > Any other online source

• Emphasis on collecting receipts

• Create records using other methods
REMEMBER TO ASK FOR A RECEIPT!
Proposed design: use of personal records

• Ask respondents to download electronic information from
  > Credit card
  > Bank
  > Mortgage
  > Any other online source

• Emphasis on collecting receipts

• Create records using other methods
Potential problems with increased record use

• Reduced response rate
  > Countermeasure: accept self-reports too.
  Avoid extremes.
  > Empirical question on effect on total survey error.
  Measurement error vs. non-response bias

• How many respondents will comply?
Proposed design: survey of vendors

- Ask vendors to provide purchases made by respondents
- Use information to substitute directly for data
- Use information to improve data quality
  - Fill in data missing from respondents’ reports
  - Obtain a measure of accuracy, completeness of respondents’ reports
Potential problems with vendor surveys

• Timing of collection may not coincide with publication schedule

• Increased cost (assuming sample size is fixed)
  > Possible offset by efficiency gains
  > Empirical question on interaction between costs and TSE
Proposed design: develop enhanced recall interview

• Recall interview for all respondents
  > Respondent burden mitigated with record use

• Cues to store data about expenditures (e.g., type; amount of expenditure; retail outlet).
  > Consider use of Event History Calendar
  > Refer to any records or receipts.

• CARI for monitoring question performance and interviewer behavior
Enhanced recall interview: Pros and Cons

• PRO
  > Reduce error due to omission and telescoping
  > Data for those with no records or receipts

• CON
  > Potentially increased interview length
Proposed design: monetary & nonmonetary incentives

- $50 – $70 for main respondent
  $10 – $20 secondary
- Reports of expenditures
- Charts showing how household expenditures compare with others
Bundle.com compares spending of users and others with similar demographic characteristics.
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Proposed design: multiple diary keepers

- All individuals 14+ fill out a diary
- Main diary keeper instructs others in CU
- Edgar et al (2006) show increases in mean expenditures with multiple diaries/CU
Multiple diary keepers: pros and cons

• PRO
  > Improved measurement
  > Reduced burden on main CU respondent

• CON
  > Increase in cost
  > Reduction in response rate
  • How do cost and error balance?
Redesigned Diary survey schedule

• Start: Initial in-person interview
• 2-3 days: Telephone call
• 7 days: Telephone or in-person interview
• 10 days: Telephone call
• 14 days: Telephone or in-person interview
Respondent data reporting alternatives

- **Electronic**
  - Download financial data files
  - Scan receipts, paper forms
  - Use respondents’ smartphones

- **Paper**
  - Mail-in receipts, monthly statements
  - Keep diary, as now
Respondents download financial data from Web sites of financial institutions

- Credit card accounts
- Checking accounts
- Bank accounts for debit card or electronic payments
- Software for downloading
  - Financial software packages like Mint
  - New software using Yodlee Software Development Kit
Creating a Record

• Types of records
  > Receipts from vendor
  > On-line receipts
  > Information entered into smartphone
  > Short paper form describing purchase

• Transmitting receipts
  > Scan
  > Mail
Repository system

- Software automatically transfers to central repository
  - Scanned receipts
  - Downloaded financial data files
- Converts to text using optical character recognition (OCR) software
- Extracts individual purchases from text
  - Expert system reads text
  - Finds description, cost of purchase (shirt, $20)
  - Ignores irrelevant text
Acme Clothing

PURCHASE

GLOVES 0088377056874 20.00
SHIRT 0088377048965 25.00
*MANAGER'S SPECIAL -5.00
YOUR PRICE 20.00
SHOES 0088377036952 125.00
*BONUS CARD SAVINGS -20%
YOUR PRICE 100.00

Sub Total 120.00
5.000 RGLR Tax 8.00
Total 128.00

Credit Card
08830Z XXX
xxxxxxxxxxxx1234

CUSTOMER COPY
Acme Clothing

PURCHASE

GLOVES  20.00
0088377056874  614/61

SHIRT  25.00
0088377048945  822/41
*MANAGER'S SPECIAL -5.00
YOUR PRICE  20.00

SHOES  125.00
0088377036952  773/61
*BONUS CARD SAVINGS -20%
YOUR PRICE  100.00

Sub Total  120.00
5.000 RGLR Tax  8.00
Total  128.00

Credit Card
088307 XXX
xxxxxxxxxxxxx1234

CUSTOMER COPY
Repository matches purchases, generates Web survey

- Compares
  - Purchases documented in receipts
  - Purchases documented in financial data files
- Matches by total cost, date
- Generates Web survey
  - CE-relevant questions for each purchase
On October 26, 2011, you bought a shirt for $20.00. Was this for a male or a female?

- Male
- Female
Example #1

- Repository finds
  - Expenditure for $20.25 in credit card data file
  - Receipt for $20.25 which lists
    - Hammer $15.00
    - Nails $3.00
    - Tax $2.25
  - Match data file with receipt
Example #1

- Repository finds
  - Expenditure for $20.25 in credit card data file
  - Receipt for $20.25 which lists
    - Hammer $15.00
    - Nails $3.00
    - Tax $2.25
  - Match data file with receipt

On July 25, you purchased a HAMMER for $15.
Was this purchase for someone in your household list?

- Yes
- No
Example #2

• Repository finds
  > Expenditure for $34 in checking account data file
    ▪ Check cashed July 30, 2011
  > No corresponding receipt for $34.00 near July 30, 2011
  > No receipt was scanned
Example #2

• Repository finds
  > Expenditure for $34 in checking account data file
    • Check cashed July 30, 2011
  > No corresponding receipt for $34.00 near July 30, 2011
  > No receipt was scanned

You made a purchase by check for $34. The check was cashed on July 30, 2011. Do you remember what you purchased?
Example #3

- Repository finds
  - Receipt for $5 from dry cleaner dated July 15, 2011
  - No corresponding check or credit card charge for $5 near July 15, 2011
  - Paid in cash
Example #3

• Repository finds
  > Receipt for $5 from dry cleaner
dated July 15, 2011
  > No corresponding check or credit card charge
     for $5 near July 15, 2011
  > Paid in cash

On July 15, 2011, you purchased
DRY CLEANING for $5.
Was this purchase for someone
in your household list?

☐ Yes ☐ No
Will many respondents cooperate and actually save receipts? Maybe yes.

- SIPP encouraged use of administrative records of income
  - Interviewers encouraged, instructed respondents
  - Telephoned respondents to remind them
  - Asked respondents to get missing records, including return visits
  - Achieved “astonishingly high” levels of compliance
    - Record use increased from 25 to 87 percent
Will many respondents cooperate and actually save receipts? Maybe no.

- MEPS respondents asked to keep receipts, calendar
  - 13.7 % used receipts to report data
  - 22.5 % used calendar
Administrative record survey for Diary

• Approach major retail chains
• Ask for purchasing histories
• Identify respondent households by loyalty card number
Uses of personal records and recall interviews for Diary

• Use receipts, financial data files as memory aids in recall interview
• Enter transaction dates on Event History Calendar
Diary survey data collection timeline

• Start: in-person interview
  > Sign consent for electronic information
  > Select paper or electronic data collection method
  > Provide envelopes/box for receipts
  > Provide scanner if electronic method used
  > Provide paper diary if that method used

• Interviewer monitors respondents' recordkeeping
  > Scans of receipts, mailed-in paper receipts
Initial followup

• 2-3 days: telephone call
  > Identify barriers, problems
  > Motivate

• 7 days: telephone/in-person
  > If respondent has been sending adequate records, by telephone
  > Otherwise, in-person recall interview

• 10 days: telephone call
  > Identify barriers, problems
  > Motivate
14 days: telephone/in-person

- If respondent meets criteria for recordkeeping, conduct interview by telephone; then close out
- Otherwise, in-person recall interview
Estimates of cost

• Costs estimated using:
  > CE Diary costs provided by CNSTAT
    ▪ For proposed design, anchored on total cost from current design
    ▪ Computed a “per complete” cost by dividing total cost by number of completes
  > Costs from Medical Provider Component of the MEPS, Energy Supplier Survey for RECS

• Many assumptions required
## Table of Diary costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current design</th>
<th>Proposed design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE Units</td>
<td>7,449</td>
<td>7,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview cost</td>
<td>$5.1M</td>
<td>$7.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative records cost</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$0.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Diary Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.1M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8.3 M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of the redesigned Diary survey on precision of estimates

• Sample design unchanged, changes in precision are a function of cost

• If only one respondent is interviewed, Diary cost would not increase

• For fixed budget, new design with >1 respondent could collect approximately 60% as much data
  > This would increase standard errors by about 29%
  > If no administrative data are collected, the increase would be about 21%
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New interviewing schedule for CE quarterly interview survey

- Two recall interviews, spaced 12 months apart
- Collect details on purchases other than food and alcoholic beverages
- Vary the reference periods across expenditures
The interviewing structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Year 1 Quarters</th>
<th>Year 2 Quarters</th>
<th>Year 3 Quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quarterly interview reference periods for recall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Frequent purchases**: Over 12 month period
- **Majority of purchases**: Over 7 month period
- **Purchases that are easy to recall or estimate accurately**: Over 1 month period
Proposed structure: Pros and Cons

- **PRO**
  - Reduces number of CE interviews
  - Reduces design effects for annual estimates
  - Can ask reference periods >3months

- **CON**
  - Increased cost due to more interviews
  - No longitudinal data on quarterly change
  - No annual data for individual CUs
Redesigned Quarterly Interview schedule

• Wave 1
  > Start: initial in-person interview
  > 2 weeks, 1 month, and 2 months: telephone call
  > 3 months: In-person interview

• Wave 2, 12 months later
  > Start: telephone or in-person interview
  > 2 weeks, 1 month, and 2 months: telephone call
  > 3 months: in-person interview
Respondent data reporting alternatives

• Electronic
  > Download financial data files
  > Scan receipts, paper forms
  > Enter information using smartphone

• Paper
  > Mail-in receipts, monthly statements
  > Keep receipts and other records
Other survey design parameters

• One main person interviewed in the CU
  > Consider experimentation with using more than 1 person
  > Encourage main respondent to consult others in CU

• Incentive provided for each recall interview
Wave 1, initial in-person interview

- Sign consent for electronic information
- Select paper or electronic data collection method
- Provide envelopes/box for receipts
- Provide scanner if electronic method used
- Conduct bounding interview
Followup

- Telephone contacts at 2 weeks, 1 month, and 2 months
  - Interviewer monitors respondents’ recordkeeping
    - Scans of receipts
    - Mailed-in paper receipts
  - Identify barriers, problems
  - Motivate

- In-person interview at 3 months
  - Review records provided
  - Recall interview
Wave 2

• 12 months after initial contact
  > Mail instruction packet to CU
  > Followup telephone call to orient respondent and conduct bounding interview
  > If household has changed, use initial contact protocol

• Followup
  > Repeat wave 1 procedures
Administrative record survey

- Approach major retail chains, utility, mortgage companies
- Ask for purchasing histories and collect expenditures as they occur
Quarterly Interview survey cost caveats

- Same as for the Diary
- Plus: difficult to partition current costs by mode
# Table of quarterly interview costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current design</th>
<th>Proposed design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE Units</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews/CE Unit/quarter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview cost</td>
<td>$17.0 M</td>
<td>$24.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Records cost</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$10.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Interview Cost</td>
<td>$17.0 M</td>
<td>$34.9 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimates of precision for proposed design

- Estimates for expenditures that are currently based on the Quarterly Interview Survey
- Estimates of precision simulated using the 2009 public use file
Methodology for estimating precision

• Simulated effects on within-PSU sampling variance for 1-, 3-, and 12-month reference periods

• Assumed each 3-month interview was uncorrelated and computed variances

• For 12-month period used constant reduction based on length of reference period

• For 1-month period used most recent month of 3-month reference period
Percent reduction in sampling variance for a 3 month reference period
Percent reduction in sampling variance for a 3 month reference period

Median = 19%
Percent reduction in sampling variance for a 12 month reference period
Percent reduction in sampling variance for a 12 month reference period

MEDIAN = 39%
Percent reduction in sampling variance for a 1 month reference period
Percent reduction in sampling variance for a 1 month reference period

MEDIAN = -36%
Combining costs and precision

• The additional costs of the new design are partially offset by reductions in variance
• Cutting 4 waves to 2 waves increases costs by 40%
  > A 20% reduction in sample achieves equal or better precision on the annual estimates for most expenditures
  > Shifting to a 12-month reference period for some items would reduce variances further.
• The administrative record component adds to the cost
Percent reduction in sampling variance with a 20% sample cut and a 3 month reference period
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Methods to improve measurement & reduce burden

• Increase use of records
  > Personal
  > Administrative
• Reduce number of quarterly interviews
• Use of multiple diary keepers
• Enhanced recall interview
• Use of incentives
Design is flexible

• Provides respondents with several different ways to report
  > Need to make this a positive feature of the survey
  > Avoid making it more complicated to respond

• Is adaptable as new technologies and consumption methods evolve

• If records become principal mode, permits two surveys to merge
Oh No! The cost is twice as much!!
## Additional costs of proposed design relative to current design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method to Reduce Burden and Measurement Error</th>
<th>Diary</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of personal records</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative records</td>
<td>.8 M</td>
<td>10.2 M</td>
<td>11.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in CE interviews</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7.6 M</td>
<td>7.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple diary keepers</td>
<td>2.4 M</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced recall interview</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.2 M</td>
<td>17.8 M</td>
<td>21.0 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= not a significant cost factor  
NA = not applicable
But...

• New design can cut sample by at least 20% and maintain or exceed current precision
  > Efficiencies with selective use of a 12 month reference period

• Modifications to administrative data collection are possible, e.g.
  > Restrict to utility companies. This would reduce the cost from $10 million to $3 million
  > Subsample retailers to fit resources
Design priorities in managing costs

• First priority
  > Personal records and technology
  > Multiple diary keepers
  > Incentive

• Second priority
  > Administrative data collection

• Third priority
  > New panel design
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Administrative data

• Will retail, utility, mortgage companies provide data?
• What are the barriers?
• What procedures elicit cooperation?
Outcome measures for evaluation

- Level of expenditures
- Match reported expenditures = administrative data
- Proportion of expenditures reported with records
- Cost of data collection
- Nonresponse
- Perceived level of burden, satisfaction
- Proportion of respondents requiring recall interview
Diary survey field test

- Single respondent vs. multiple respondents
- Low incentive vs. high incentive
- Respondent chooses data collection method vs. interviewer chooses
Quarterly Interview field test

- Single respondent vs. multiple respondents
- Low incentive vs. high incentive
- All 3-month reference period vs. 1, 3, or 12-month reference periods
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