Research into uptake of Section 18(3): Annex

Methodological note, additional findings and analysis, and questionnaire

Published 7 November 2024

This research was commissioned under the previous administration (11 May 2010 to 5 July 2024) and therefore does not reflect the policies of the current government. The views expressed are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the government.

Contents

A. Methodological note

Introduction

This section supplements the information about methods contained in the methodology chapter of the main report about the update of Section 18(3) (S.18(3)). This Annex is intended to supplement that document and should be read with reference to the main report.

Target audience for the research: eligibility

The research used Ipsos' KnowledgePanel sample. Only those aged 30 and over living in England were eligible for the research and the module included screening questions to determine whether participants would be eligible to take part in the module on S.18(3). The questions or existing data used for screening for eligibility were age, own tenure, own level of assets, own care needs, caring or support responsibilities for an adult aged 65+ and that person's tenure. The intention was to include people aged 30 and over who would be responsible for offering support in decisions about care to a potential self-funder aged 65+, or who are themselves a potential self-under aged 65+. Being a potential self-funder was defined as having assets of £100,000 as this is the most likely level for the upper capital threshold when adult social care funding reform is implemented. To avoid being intrusive tenure was used as a proxy for being a potential self-funder, with an additional question about assets of £100,000 for those aged 65 and over who are not homeowners. For those with no care needs or intense care needs preference was given to asking them questions about care decisions for others if they had this responsibility, otherwise they were asked about care decisions for themselves. The full questionnaire is shown in section C with routing.

Table 1 shows the three main eligibility groups and how this determined the type of questions participants received in the questionnaire.

Table 1. Eligibility and questions asking in survey

Eligibility group	General questions	Discrete choice experiment
People aged 65 or older, with assets of £100,000 or more (i.e. self-funder under new expected capital limit rules) and either has care needs (without intense formal care); or has no care needs or intense needs and does not care for or support anyone who is a self-funder aged 65 or older.	Questions about needing to access a care home for themselves.	Questions about needing to access a care home for themselves: Scenarios 1 or 2
People aged 65 or older who care for or may support a self-funder aged 65 or older and who themselves has assets under £100,000 (i.e. not a self-funder) or with assets of £100,000 or more and no care needs or with intense needs. People meeting these criteria would be asked to answer	Questions about needing to access a care home for a family member or relative.	Questions about needing to access a care home for a family member or relative: Scenarios 3 or 4
People aged 30 to 64 who care for or may support a self-funder aged 65 or older.	Questions about needing to access a care home for a family member or relative.	Questions about needing to access a care home for a family member or relative: Scenarios 3 or 4

Achieved sample

The sample was drawn from Ipsos' UK KnowledgePanel. The UK KnowledgePanel is a random probability online panel. It provides an accessible random probability alternative to face to face and telephone based methods, and offers a high quality and efficient means of obtaining survey results using a single data collection method. The KnowledgePanel does not use a quota approach when conducting surveys. Instead invited samples are stratified when conducting waves to account for any profile skews within the panel. The sample was stratified by education and only sample in England was included.

Fieldwork outcome

A total of 4,170 KnowledgePanel panellists aged 30 and over were in the issued sample. In total, 2,474 panellists started the survey and were asked the screening questions. Fieldwork outcomes and response rates were monitored throughout the fieldwork. Table 1. below shows the breakdown of the fieldwork outcome.

Table 2. Fieldwork outcome

Outcome	Number of respondents	% Issued	% of completed (screened in or out)
In sample	4,170	100%	
Started the survey	2,474	59.3%	
Abandoned before determining screening outcome	47	1.1%	
Abandoned during screening out	2	0.0%	
Abandoned after screening in*	89	2.1%	
Completes including screen outs	2,336	56.0%	
Completes screened out	1,022	24.5%	43.8%
Completes: screened in but removed because of inconsistent data on eligibility	4	0.1%	0.2%
Completes: screened in but removed because completed module too fast (<5 minutes)	20	0.5%	0.9%
Completes: screened in and completed an interview	1,290	30.9%	55.2%

*Partial data not included in analysis

A small number of participants (20) were excluded from the analysis as a result of quality control processes. Four were removed because of inconsistent information on their eligibility and 20 were excluded because they completed the survey in less than 5 minutes. This cut off was decided after exploring response timings, taking into consideration the median length of the module (16 minutes) and the amount of information which participants were given to read and the number of questions, balanced with the aim of not excluding those who had responded to the survey properly but faster than others (we found that younger people tended to respond faster than older people which may relate to their ability to navigate online and process information more quickly). After discussion a cut off of 5 minutes was agreed.

Achieved sample by questionnaire route and wording

Depending on their characteristics participants could be asked questions about themselves or about someone they care for or support or may support with financial decisions in the future. The eligibility routing of respondents who completed the full survey is set out in Table 3.

Table 3. Eligibility route

Eligibility	Total unweighted	% unweighted	Total weighted	% weighted
65+ Ask about self (if is self-funder and has care needs (without intense formal care) or is self-funder and has no care needs or has intense needs and does not care for or support anyone who is a self-funder aged 65+)	496	39%	426	39%
65+ ask about supporting someone else (if is not a self-funder or is a self-funder but does not have care needs or has intense needs and cares for or may support a self-funder aged 65+)	224	11%	123	11%
30-64 about supporting someone else (cares for or may support a self-funder aged 65+)	570	50%	557	50%
TOTAL	1,290	100%	1,106	100%

The survey included a Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) designed to explore the decisions made in different situations. Each participant was shown one of four scenarios. A breakdown of the number of respondents that were shown each scenario in the DCE is presented in Table 4. below.

Table 4. Number of respondents by scenario shown (unweighted)

Scenario	Total unweighted	%
Scenario 1: Hospital entry point for self	248	19%
Scenario 2: Community entry point for self	248	19%
Scenario 3: Hospital entry point for relative	397	31%
Scenario 4: Community entry point for relative	397	31%
TOTAL	1,290	100%

A breakdown of the eligibility routing by scenario is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Eligibility routing by scenario (unweighted)

Eligibility route	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	TOTAL
65+ Ask about self (if is self-funder and has care needs (without intense formal care) or is self-funder and has no care needs or has intense needs and does not care for or support anyone who is a self-funder aged 65+)	248	248	0	0	496
65+ ask about supporting someone else (if is not a self-funder or is a self-funder but does not have care needs or has intense needs and cares for or may support a self-funder aged 65+)	0	0	115	109	224
30-64 about supporting someone else (cares for or may support a self-funder aged 65+)	0	0	282	288	570
TOTAL	248	248	397	397	1,290

Weighting

A summary of the approach to weighting is described in the main report in section 2.7. Here we describe the weighting in more detail.

In order to ensure the survey results are as representative of the target population as possible, a weighting specification was applied to the data in line with the target population profile (see Table 6.). Weighting was applied to all cases who completed the screening module and were screened out or who were screened in and completed the survey, after excluding 24 cases for quality control reasons (inconsistent routing through questionnaire and speeding through questions resulting in completing the survey in less than 5 minutes). In total 2,312 cases were weighted. These cases were weighted to result in an overall weighted sample of 2,312. The weighting was applied to the screened sample because we do not have data suitable for weighting on the socio-demographic profile of the eligible population for the survey. The result of weighting in this way is that the weighted sample of cases which completed the whole module is 1,106, when the unweighted number who completed the whole module is 1,290.

Two members per household are allowed to register on the KnowledgePanel. Therefore, we employed a design weight to correct for unequal probabilities of selection of household members.

Calibration weights have also been applied using the latest population statistics relevant to the surveyed population to correct for imbalances in the achieved sample. The variables for weighting were selected based on KnowledgePanel standard practice as well as additional variables requested by DHSC (sexual orientation) or importance because of the subject matter of the survey. The data were weighted by highest educational qualification and NS-SEC to account for socio-economic differences in financial decision making.

The weights were adjusted and trimmed. The final weighting efficiency is 44%. This results from the relatively large number of variables used for weighting, to ensure the achieved sample for analysis is as representative as possible.

Table 6. shows the target profile for the weights and the achieved profile after trimming which also shows the characteristics used for weighting.

The following information was used for weighting:

- Census 2021: Age, age and gender interlocked, region, ethnicity, sexual orientation (using 16+ profile), NS-SEC (social grade)
- Census 2011: education, household composition interlocked with age (because for education and household composition data was not yet available for age 30+ using 2021 census data)

Table 6. Weighting profile (target and achieved)

Group	Category	Target profile	Target profile	Target profile	Target profile	Achieved profile
		Age 30 to 49	Age 50 to 64	Age 65 and over	Total 30+	Weighted % 30+
Age	Age 30 to 39				21.30%	18.37%
Age	Age 40 to 49				19.69%	20.26%
Age	Age 50 to 59				21.22%	22.79%
Age	Age 59 to 64				9.02%	9.83%
Age	Age 65 to 69				7.63%	7.94%
Age	Age 70 to 79				13.40%	14.61%
Age	Age 80+				7.74%	6.19%
Age	Total				100.00%	0.00%
Gender	Male	19.84%	14.76%	13.11%	47.71%	46.01%
Gender	Female	20.85%	15.26%	15.52%	51.64%	53.19%
Gender	Missing	0.30%	0.22%	0.13%	0.65%	0.80%
Gender	Total	41.00%	30.24%	28.76%	100.00%	100.00%
Region	North East				4.77%	5.07%
Region	North West				13.08%	13.54%
Region	Yorkshire and The Humber				9.65%	9.96%
Region	West Midlands				8.70%	8.75%
Region	East Midlands				10.41%	10.57%
Region	East				11.43%	12.11%
Region	London				14.69%	12.02%
Region	South East				16.74%	16.93%
Region	South West				10.53%	11.05%
Region	Total				100.00%	0.00%
Ethnicity	White				83.61%	86.29%
Ethnicity	Mixed / multiple ethnic groups				1.43%	1.53%
Ethnicity	Asian / Asian British				8.10%	5.17%
Ethnicity	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British				3.47%	3.39%
Ethnicity	Other ethnic group				1.88%	1.81%
Ethnicity	Missing				1.51%	1.81%
Ethnicity	Total				100.00%	100.00%

Table 6. Weighting profile (target and achieved) continued

Group	Category	Target profile	Target profile	Target profile	Target profile	Achieved profile
		Age 30 to 49	Age 50 to 64	Age 65 and over	Total 30+	Weighted % 30+
Education	No qualifications, level 1, other qualifications				46.06%	34.35%
Education	Level 2, level 3 qualifications and apprenticeship				25.87%	31.80%
Education	Level 4 qualifications and above				26.99%	32.52%
Education	Missing				1.08%	1.33%
Education	Total				100.00%	100.00%
Household	One person household	5.09%	4.23%	12.16%	21.47%	18.25%
Household	One family and other h/h types	35.91%	26.01%	16.60%	78.53%	81.75%
Household	Total	41.00%	30.24%	28.76%	100.00%	100.00%
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual or straight				89.37%	92.28%
Sexual orientation	Gay or lesbian				1.54%	1.71%
Sexual orientation	Bisexual or other				1.63%	1.97%
Sexual orientation	Don't know or refuse				7.46%	4.04%
Sexual orientation	Total				100.00%	100.00%
Group	Category	Age 30 to 49	Age 50 to 64	Age 65 and over	Total 30+	Weighted % 30+
NS-SEC	1- Managerial, administrative and professional occupations				32.86%	38.47%
NS-SEC	2/3- Intermediate occupations, small employers and own account workers				21.81%	23.16%
NS-SEC	4/5/6/7- Lower supervisory, technical occupations, semi and routine, unemployed				44.38%	37.20%
NS-SEC	Missing				0.95%	1.17%
NS-SEC	Total				100.00%	100.00%

Questionnaire

The median questionnaire length was 16.08 minutes. The full questionnaire documentation is shown in section C.

In addition to the questions included in the module about S.18(3), data are available from the KnowledgePanel registration and post registration surveys. These variables were used for questionnaire routing, weighting and cross breaks in the analysis.

Data outputs

Following the fieldwork of the study, the following outputs were delivered:

Data tables – these showed the results for each question, broken down by a number of demographic and attitudinal cross-tabulations. The tables also included significance testing at the 95% confidence level, using letters to show where any differences between sub-groups are statistically significant. The data tables were provided in Excel format.

SPSS dataset – to allow further analysis and linking with existing datasets, an individual level datafile was provided in SPSS format, including weighting variables.

Discrete Choice Experiment design and analysis

A DCE is an analytical tool for understanding which features of a proposition or service consumers really value. It offers advantages over direct questioning techniques by teasing out which features really matter, rather than taking what participants state as being important at face value. The method works by splitting a product (for example taking up the offer of S.18(3) with a LA) into its component parts, known as attributes, and within each of these attributes we can test different options, known as levels.

Participants are subjected to a small number of possible combinations of these levels. Using Bayesian analytical techniques we can determine the impact of preference for any combination of attribute levels. The analysis of the choice data was conducted using a Hierarchal Bayes (HB) algorithm. The HB technique fits a Multinomial Logit Model (MNL) to each individual respondent using an iterative approach that maximises the posterior likelihood. In other words, HB finds the optimum set of utility parameters given the observed respondent data and given the knowledge about the rest of the sample.

For each of the concepts, ‘utility’ score or desirability of each concept was derived from the main DCE analysis. This included their preference data which indicated in a binary way whether they would take up S.18(3), with a choice between 'Yes I would accept the offer and ask the local authority to arrange the care' and 'No I would look for other care options myself'). Regression analysis was then carried out, at the participant level, to identify a relationship between the utility of a concept and the likely uptake intent.

Analysis of DCEs often involves calibration modelling based on the uptake intent from the five fixed combinations (concepts) presented to all participants which allow them to choose a response on a scale with very likely, fairly likely, fairly unlikely, very unlikely and using weights to down weight preference shares. The inclusion of these fixed variables, which provide greater detail on the strength of their preference and consistent data across all participants, can be an important part of the modelling to avoid over-estimating uptake of a product. This approach is commonly taken in consumer market research DCEs, to reflect elasticity of demand for products when switching between products or introducing a new product or service. Within consumer market research without this calibration the preference expressed for a product would be higher and would overestimate the likely take up.

For this analysis, a decision was made not to calibrate the results. There are several reasons for this. The assumptions typically used in setting calibration weights are based on evidence from consumer market research on take up of new products in practice which may not be applicable in demand for S.18(3). There is no suitable equivalent evidence from demand for services like that provided by S.18(3) and so any calibration would be based on consumer market research where the weights are too ‘aggressive’ or would be new weights based on untested assumptions. In consumer research the biggest risk is over-estimating future demand. However, for this research under-estimating future demand for

S.18(3) is a greater risk because of the implications for planning and local authority planning and therefore weighting down preferences is not desirable. Decisions about whether to take up local authority support in arranging a care home place are usually made in a time of crisis with limited options and so demand for S.18(3) may not be as elastic as demand for a consumer product. Previous social research DCEs carried out by Ipsos and the academic behavioural expert commissioned by DHSC to support the study have involved uncalibrated analysis.

The outcome of the analysis was fed into a dynamic excel-based simulation tool (DCE simulator) that provides an understanding of what features make S.18(3) desirable to participants and how adjustments to the LA offer influence levels of uptake. The DCE simulator enabled the calculation of the utility of the product and from the regression modelling it was possible to determine the potential uptake intent for the concept. It should be noted that these preference shares are based on reported intent when presented with a range of scenarios. Uptake in practice will depend on a range of factors including the context, individual characteristics (and the balance of those in the population) and the offer made to people. The findings present a guide to which factors may influence uptake and which scenarios and circumstances may see the highest uptake. Preference shares should not be taken as a definitive indication of the percentage of people needing a care home place taking up S.18(3).

This DCE simulator also offers a multitude of analysis options to gain valuable insights. For example, comparing a simulation across filters (such as age, gender, financial status and likelihood to take up S.18(3) when asked a general question) to identify key filters or characteristics affecting preference, attributing sensitivity to identify which levels have the largest impact on preference, and profiling to understand the composition of participants (demographically). The research team used the tool to conduct analysis of the DCE data. The findings from this analysis are presented in section 4 of the main report.

22-067126-01 | Version 3 | Internal Use Only | This work was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the international quality standard for Market Research, ISO 20252. © Ipsos 2023

Our standards and accreditations

Ipsos' standards and accreditations provide our clients with the peace of mind that they can always depend on us to deliver reliable, sustainable findings. Our focus on quality and continuous improvement means we have embedded a "right first time" approach throughout our organisation.

ISO 20252

This is the international market research specific standard that supersedes BS 7911/MRQSA and incorporates IQCS (Interviewer Quality Control Scheme). It covers the five stages of a Market Research project. Ipsos was the first company in the world to gain this accreditation.

Market Research Society (MRS) Company Partnership

By being an MRS Company Partner, Ipsos endorses and supports the core MRS brand values of professionalism, research excellence and business effectiveness, and commits to comply with the MRS Code of Conduct throughout the organisation. We were the first company to sign up to the requirements and self-regulation of the MRS Code. More than 350 companies have followed our lead.

ISO 9001

This is the international general company standard with a focus on continual improvement through quality management systems. In 1994, we became one of the early adopters of the ISO 9001 business standard.

ISO 27001

This is the international standard for information security, designed to ensure the selection of adequate and proportionate security controls. Ipsos was the first research company in the UK to be awarded this in August 2008.

The UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the UK Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018

Ipsos is required to comply with the UK GDPR and the UK DPA. It covers the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy.

HMG Cyber Essentials

This is a government-backed scheme and a key deliverable of the UK's National Cyber Security Programme. Ipsos was assessment-validated for Cyber Essentials certification in 2016. Cyber Essentials defines a set of controls which, when properly implemented, provide organisations with basic protection from the most prevalent forms of threat coming from the internet.

Fair Data

Ipsos is signed up as a "Fair Data" company, agreeing to adhere to 10 core principles. The principles support and complement other standards such as ISOs, and the requirements of Data Protection legislation.

For more information

3 Thomas More Square
London
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

www.ipsos.com/en-uk
http://twitter.com/IpsosUK

About Ipsos Public Affairs

Ipsos Public Affairs works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.200 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. Combined with our methods and communications expertise, this helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.