



CREATIVITY IN THE UK

**ANNEX 9: CONTINGENT VALUATION
SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

APPENDIX 1: TREATMENT OF ECONOMIC IMPACT DATA

Economic Impact - Data Review and Cleaning

The approach utilised for calculating Willingness to Pay was Contingent Valuation, with the survey questions proposed by an independent research agency and reviewed and confirmed by representatives from the main evaluators, UNBOXED and DCMS.

Questionnaire development

Questions were developed initially by an independent research agency and then reviewed in concert with representatives from the independent evaluation team, DCMS and UNBOXED. UNBOXED: Creativity in the UK is a unique programme and thus no comparable set of data valuing the effect of cultural impact across so many different activation types was available as a 'model'.

Questions were thus initially developed utilising learnings from the DCMS / Simetrica-Jacobs Culture and Heritage Capital Evidence Bank, which was published as part of the DCMS Rapid Evidence Assessment: Culture and Heritage Valuation Studies - Technical Report (REA). Specifically, the design was informed by the by the Quality Grading Criteria.

A contingent valuation approach was decided upon as it was felt that whilst, as with all approaches, some biases may be introduced these could be adequately addressed through the survey implements and analysis. In addition, given the events had been attended (e.g. the events themselves were not hypothetical) the scenario to be presented was felt by the steering group to be one about which participants could answer accurately.

The initial draft of the survey implement included a double-bounded dichotomous choice approach to elicit value to be paid. During early discussions between the steering group it was suggested and agreed that this would be altered to utilising a payment card based on the experience of the DCMS team.

Other considerations and methods implement to minimise bias or inaccuracy in the survey were:

- The use of ‘cheap talk’ which entails reading a script that explicitly highlights the potential for bias to participants before they provide any answers. The following phrase was read out to all completing this section of the survey:

Sometimes people can over-estimate or under-estimate the amount they might pay for a ticket, so please take in to account your own financial situation and priorities when answering.

- The way in which the potential for payment being needed in future was framed, in the context of events being free in the UNBOXED year. It was decided to be upfront about this funding but to ask participants to consider a scenario where the same event was delivered in a self-funded way, and an entry fee was charged.
- Whether participants were asked to value how much they would pay for ‘UNBOXED’ or whether they should be asked about their specific experience at the Commission event in question. There were also concerns about whether participants would be aware of UNBOXED more generally and thus whether this would introduce an inaccuracy in to the results. It was agreed that participants would be able to give a much more accurate assessment of the specific event attended and thus they should be asked about this.
- Whether it was clear and explicit what participants were being asked to provide a value for – e.g. was the event well defined. It was agreed that in order to allow for consistent wording across the wide range of events and activations taking place that participants should be asked about their a ‘similar innovative cultural event’ (QWTP1) and to attend for ‘one day’ at ‘similar event’ (QWTP2).
- The need for a compulsory payment mechanism was required, to overcome the potential for individuals thinking others would pay for it and they would experience an event for free. This was achieved using a hypothetical charged entry fee.
- The need to understand the motivations of individuals saying they would or would not pay an entry fee to understand and be able to discount protest responses. Outcomes of this element are discussed in more detail below.

The questions used for Willingness to Pay are included as an Appendix.

Data preparation

Data for relevant surveys within each commission (either the Attendee or Participant strand, dependent on the commission in question) was reviewed line by line at the individual respondent level.

Where relevant:

- Those who said they 'Would not pay' for an event were re-coded to give a figure of Zero (£0) within the economic impact data set.
- Those who gave responses classed as misleading ("I don't believe I would really have to pay") or as protest responses were removed from the analysis. Examples of protest responses include but were not limited to:
 - Giving a price but suggesting in the comments that they would be willing to pay more in reality but provided a lower price so as to keep events accessible.
 - Giving a value of £0 and giving a reason that UNBOXED events should be free for all, or that they don't agree with charging for admission on principle.
- Those who gave willingness to pay figures significantly above or below the average response were deemed outliers and were removed from the analysis.
- Those who **only** gave a reason for their willingness to pay as being to support the wider sector were removed, as they were deemed to not have been specifically answering in relation to the attended event.
 - Those who gave this as one of number of otherwise qualifying responses were included in the analysis

Below, the actions taken for each commission at each specific question are outlined:

Dandelion (Attendee)

- QWPT1 = 3 (No) – 13 cases recoded to QWTP2 = £0
- QWPT4 = “I don’t believe that I would really have to pay” – 2 cases removed
- QWPT4 = “My willingness-to-pay is not just for this event, but also an expression of my support for the sector more broadly” and no other codes selected – 4 cases removed
- QWPT5 = No valid codes selected (including open) – 4 cases removed

Dreamachine (Attendee)

- QWPT1 = 3 (No) – 31 cases recoded to QWTP2 = £0
- QWPT4 = “I don’t believe that I would really have to pay” – 4 cases removed
- QWPT4 = “My willingness-to-pay is not just for this event, but also an expression of my support for the sector more broadly” and no other codes selected – 19 cases removed
- QWPT5 = No valid codes selected (including open) – 9 cases removed

GALWAD Live Event (Attendee)

- QWPT1 = 3 (No) – 2 cases recoded to QWTP2 = £0
- QWPT4 = “I don’t believe that I would really have to pay” – 1 case removed
- QWPT4 = “My willingness-to-pay is not just for this event, but also an expression of my support for the sector more broadly” and no other codes selected – 2 cases removed
- QWPT5 = No valid codes selected (including open) – 1 case removed

Green Space Dark Skies (Participant)

- QWPT1 = 3 (No) – 41 cases recoded to QWTP2 = £0
- QWPT4 = “I don’t believe that I would really have to pay” – 4 cases removed
- QWPT4 = “My willingness-to-pay is not just for this event, but also an expression of my support for the sector more broadly” and no other codes selected – 17 cases removed
- QWPT5 = No valid codes selected (including open) – 18 cases removed

Our Place in Space (Attendee)

- QWPT1 = 3 (No) – 45 cases recoded to QWTP2 = £0
- QWPT4 = “I don’t believe that I would really have to pay” – 12 cases removed
- QWPT4 = “My willingness-to-pay is not just for this event, but also an expression of my support for the sector more broadly” and no other codes selected – 9 cases removed
- QPT4 OTHER = “Protest” – 1 case removed
- QWPT5 = No valid codes selected (including open) – 12 cases removed

PoliNations (Attendee)

- QWPT1 = 3 (No) – 42 cases recoded to QWTP2 = £0
- QWPT4 = “I don’t believe that I would really have to pay” – 3 cases removed
- QWPT4 = “My willingness-to-pay is not just for this event, but also an expression of my support for the sector more broadly” and no other codes selected – 6 cases removed
- QWPT4 = “My willingness-to-pay is not just for this event, but also an expression of my support for the sector more broadly” and QPT4 OTHER = “Protest” – 1 case removed
- QPT4 OTHER = “Protest” – 2 cases removed

QWPT5 = No valid codes selected (including open) – 24 cases removed

SEE MONSTER (Attendee)

- QWPT1 = 3 (No) – 12 cases recoded to QWTP2 = £0
- QWPT4 = “I don’t believe that I would really have to pay” – 5 cases removed
- QWPT4 = “My willingness-to-pay is not just for this event, but also an expression of my support for the sector more broadly” and no other codes selected – 1 case removed
- QPT4 OTHER = “Protest” – 1 case removed
- QWPT2 = Outlier – 3 cases removed
- QWPT5 = No valid codes selected (including open) – 7 cases removed

StoryTrails (Attendee)

- QWPT4 = “I don’t believe that I would really have to pay” – 1 case removed
- QWPT4 = “My willingness-to-pay is not just for this event, but also an expression of my support for the sector more broadly” and no other codes selected – 4 cases removed
- QWPT2 = Outlier – 5 cases removed
- QWPT5 = No valid codes selected (including open) – 2 cases removed

ECONOMIC IMPACT - WEIGHTING

Following cleaning of the data, valid economic data was weighted to be representative of audiences.

Economic impact data was collected alongside the main audience survey, via the use of an optional additional element in the face-to-face surveys. This means that data collected for the Economic Impact survey elements did not exactly reflect the profile of respondents gathered.

This necessitated the weighting of the Economic Impact element of the survey to match the profile of all surveys undertaken, which is more reflective of the actual audience and thus better reflects the audiences economic considerations around the event including spend and willingness to pay.

This was achieved in two steps.

Step 1 – Weighting economic impact data to the profile of the full dataset

All commissions were weighted by Age, Gender, Family group and Locality, except for Dreamachine and Green Space Dark Skies. These were weighted by Age, Gender, and Locality only, as we were unable to determine the family group from the data collected.

Where a response was missing in a particular cell, the percentages we used for weighting were rebased to exclude that cell. Where this was the case, we have highlighted this for each commission below.

Step 2 – Weighting up full survey data (including economic impact data) to attendance figures provided by UNBOXED

The weighted percentages remained the same as those resulting from step 1, counts changed to reflect the increased weighted base.

The results of weighting for each individual commission are provided below.

About Us (Attendee)

Locality – Empty cells for prefer not to say (5 cases), weighting based on 1538 cases (1543).

Weighted base – 754

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 496

Weighted to attendance figure – 116,208

Dandelion (Attendee)

Age – Empty cells for 75 to 84 (5 cases) and prefer not to say (4 cases), weighting based on 446 cases (455).

Gender – Empty cells for prefer not to say (4 cases), weighting based on 451 cases (455).

Locality – Empty cells for prefer not to say (2 cases) , weighting based on 453 cases (455).

Weighted base – 107

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 97

Weighted to attendance figure – 322,722

Dreamachine (Attendee)

Not weighted by family group. Weighting based on 625 cases.

Weighted base – 474

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 470

Weighted to attendance figure – 38,567

GALWAD Live Event (Attendee)

Weighted base – 32

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 23

Weighted to attendance figure – 525

Green Space Dark Skies (Participant)

Not weighted by family group. Weighting based on 304 cases.

Weighted base – 253

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 252

Weighted to attendance figure – 6,381

Our Place in Space (Attendee)

Age – Empty cells for 85 or older (1 case) and prefer not to say (13 cases), weighting based on 917 cases (931).

Gender – Empty cells for prefer not to say (16 cases), weighting based on 915 cases (931).

Weighted base – 380

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 358

Weighted to attendance figure – 1,198,325

PoliNations (Attendee)

Gender – Empty cells for non-binary (3 cases), weighting based on 591 cases (594 cases).

Weighted base – 214

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 199

Weighted to attendance figure – 148,929

SEE MONSTER (Attendee)

Age – Empty cells for 85 or older (1 case) and prefer not to say (3 cases), weighting based on 692 (696).

Weighted base – 209

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 194

Weighted to attendance figure – 342,804

Tour de Moon (Attendee)

Age – Empty cells for 75 to 84 (1 case) and prefer not to say (2 cases), weighting based on 342 cases (345).

Gender – Empty cells for prefer not to say (6 cases), weighting based on 339 cases (345).

Weighted base – 70

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 59

Weighted to attendance figure – 60,990

StoryTrails (Attendee)

Weighting based on 257 cases.

Weighted base – 149

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 141

Weighted to attendance figure – 47,520

The ten data sets used in the merged Economic Impact tabulations were all weighted individually at Commission level before being combined, and no further weighting was carried out once the data was combined. This provides the following at an overall level.

Economic Impact Merged Dataset (all commissions combined)

Weighted base – 2642

Effective Weighted Sample Size – 1735

Weighted to attendance figure – 2,282,971