PATH Through Life Project – 20+ - Wave 3
Response rates and notes on data
(June 2008)

Because some participants were interviewED at Wave 3 but had not been interviewed at wave 2, it is not possible to express the response rate simply from wave 2 to 3. I have provided a couple of options but we will need to decide on the best way to express this so that there will be consistency in reporting.

b_intervr interview status_w2 * c_intervr interview status_w3 Crosstabulation

		c_intervr interview status_w3				
		0 not contacted W3 (refused /dead/not found)	1 interviewed	2 refused	3 not found	Total
b_intervr interview status_w2	1 interviewed	4	1917	196	22	2139
	2 refused + medical 'refusals'	91	41	57	1	190
	3 dead between waves	7	0	0	0	7
	4 not found	1	20	19	28	68
Total		103	1978	272	51	2404

Status	N	% of W2	% of W1
Interviewed W1,W3,W3	1917	89.6	
Interviewed W1, W3	61		2.5
Total interviews W3	1978	92.5	82.3
Refusal	196/ 272	9.2	11.1
Not found	22/51	1.0	2.1
Not contacted at W3 (previous withdrawal or death)	4/103	0.2	4.3
Total (interviewed W 2)	2139		
Total (interviewed W 1)	2404		

	Interviewed at W1 N=2404	Interviewed at W2 N=2139	Not interviewed at w2 n=265
Interviewed at W3	1978	1917	61
Not interviewed at W3	426	222	204
Attrition rate	17.7%	10.4%	77%

Wave 2 response can also now be expressed in terms of temporary attrition ie those who were not interviewed at Wave 2 but were at w3:

$$= 61 / 2404 = 2.5\%,$$

and permanent attrition ie those who were not interviewed at either w2 or w3:
$$= 204 / 2404 = 8.5\%.$$

Note that at Wave 4 no attempt will be made to contact those not found or who refused at both w2 and w3.

'Status' variables
The first 3 variables (after respid2) in the Wave 3 data file (PATH_20+_w3_3-6-2008.sav) describe the response status at both wave 2 and 3. *If you want to select only those who completed an interview at Wave 3 select 'c_intervr=1').*

Method of interview (variable = 'c_int_method'):
  Face-to-face interview: 1877
  Mailed or emailed questionnaire: 91
  Questionnaire on paper but testing also completed: 10

Missing data:
This was treated similarly to Wave 2. No interviews were lost in this round of interviewing.

Some general points
A number of the questions ask about events '*since your last interview*'. For those who had not completed a Wave 2 interview these questions were asked about the last 4 years.
Where the final score on testing eg. SDMT, pegboard, trails, is collected at the time of interview the scores I have previously left these scores in the original order with the raw data. For the current data I have moved these scores to be groups with the other final (computed) cognitive scores.

New scales
At Wave 3 the following new scales were introduced:
  The Lubben 6-item social network scale
  The Dyadic Adjustment scale
  The O'Connor Davidson Resilience scale (RISC)
  The brief COPE
Scales have been developed for these according to the information provided in the references. (See path_w3 scales_30-5-08.sps)

Total years of education
Years of education is more complicated this time because it was only asked of those who had completed a qualification since w2. I have calculated secondary and tertiary education for all w3 participants by using w2 values if no extra education completed since w2. Because respondents were asked about 'the highest tertiary qualification completed *since the last interview*,' the level of tertiary qualification reported is not necessarily the highest level achieved as they may have completed something higher before w2.
I have then calculated years of secondary and years of tertiary education only for those who had completed qualifications since w2. I then computed total years of education using w2 values (or w1 where no w2 interview) where no new qualifications.

I then created a new 'total years of education' (c_compeduc) in which I used the highest number of years calculated over the waves. (Note that wave 2 was asked so that 'years of education' was higher or the same as wave 1).
I have also computed a variable the includes current studying (c_yeareduc).

Problems with Wave 3 20+ data

For Wave 3 it was decided that the most efficient way of developing the computer-based questionnaire would be to have SPSS , who own the Dimensions software to script the interview rather than having someone here learn how to do it. Because of this it has proved much more difficult to check the scripting as it was developed and a number of errors got through in the 20's program.

1. For the **BISBAS**, questions 10 and 20 of this scale did not appear on the computer version of the questionnaire. (They were, however, completed by the 101 people who did the paper/email version of the questionnaire.) This means that 2 of the 4 questions for BASfun were missing.
Tim Windor examined these data, comparing with Wave 1 and 2 data (see w3_funseek_check_3-6-08.doc) and suggested that we compile a new scale using the 2 available items for the BAS fun scale and call it 'impulsivity'. (See also the articles Smillie06.pdf, PAID3810_biscontrol.pdf). *The impulsivity scale has been computed for Wave 1 and wave 2 data as well as Wave 3.*

2. For the **COPE**, questions 10 and 20 of this scale did not appear on the computer version of the questionnaire. (They were, however, completed by the 101 people who did the paper/email version of the questionnaire.). For this measure, which comprises 14 2–item scales, one item was missing for the 'COPE-Religion' scale and the 'COPE-denial' scale. Peter Butterworth examined these data (see COPE _problem_w3 20s_3-6-08.doc) and concluded that the single items for the 'denial' and 'religion' scales would be good proxies for these scales.

3. At Wave 3 the 'hostility' scale from the **PANAS** was dropped. In the process of doing that I dropped 2 items from the NAS ('irritable' and 'hostile'). Tim Windsor has examined these data (w3_NAS_check_3-6-08.doc) and concluded that an 8-item NAS scale would be appropriate. *The 8-item NAS scale has been computed for Wave 1 and 2 as well as for Wave 3.*

4. At wave 3 '**life-time trauma'** were asked in reference to 'since the last interview' only. In looking at the descriptions of trauma provided it is obvious that participants included many examples of trauma before the last interview and which were included at wave 2. It is impossible to distinguish in the majority of cases the time frame within which participants have answered the questions. So, in consultation with Kaarin, I have not computed a 'trauma' scale. This data may be looked at in more detail later.

5. Two of the '**alcohol consumption**' questions were changed at wave 3. 'Audit1'(frequency of drinking) has more categories and 'audit3 (binge drinking) has been changed from '6 or more drinks' to '5 or more' asked of females and '7 or more' asked of males. To develop an 'AUDIT' score I have collapsed the categories in 'audit1' so that they are the same as used in waves 1 and 2 and computed a single

'audit3' score in which males and females will be referring to different number of drinks.

Because of the new questions for assessing binge drinking (c_audits_f and c_audit3_m) it is not possible to compute the same classification variable that includes binging at Wave 3. Therefore a new classification variable has been computed which defines harmful/hazardous etc but does not include binging (c_audit_class). *This new variable has been computed for Wave 1 and 2 as well as for Wave 3.*

6. **Education:** If currently studying for a trade, a technical certificate, a degree, a d\post graduate diploma or a higher degree, participants were not asked if they were studying full or part time, except for the 101 who completed the interview on paper or by email.

7. **Amphetamines:** If answered that had taken ecstasy and amphetamines but had not taken ecstasy in the last year, participants were not asked if they had used amphetamines in the last year, except for the 101 who completed the interview on paper or by email.