

**EXAMPLES OF SURVEY METHODOLOGICAL REPORTING
THAT ARE CONSISTENT WITH AAPOR
TRANSPARENCY INITIATIVE STANDARDS**



Transparency Initiative Coordination Committee
American Association for Public Opinion Research
Revised August 1, 2015

INTRODUCTION

Participation in AAPOR's Transparency Initiative involves willingness to provide the items listed below in any reports of survey research results that are publicly released, or to make them publicly available, preferably on the organization's web site, immediately upon release of that report. These items correspond to the first part of Section III.A of AAPOR's Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, which was revised in May 2015. This document provides several annotated examples of methodological reporting that includes each of these elements:

Item 1: Who sponsored the research study and who conducted it. If different from the sponsor, the original sources of funding will also be disclosed.

Item 2: The exact wording and presentation of questions and response options whose results are reported. This includes preceding interviewer or respondent instructions and any preceding questions that might reasonably be expected to influence responses to the reported results.

Item 3: A definition of the population under study and its geographic location.

Item 4: Dates of data collection.

Item 5: A description of the sampling frame(s) and its coverage of the target population, including mention of any segment of the target population that is not covered by the design. This may include, for example, exclusion of Alaska and Hawaii in U.S. surveys; exclusion of specific provinces or rural areas in international surveys; and exclusion of non-panel members in panel surveys. If possible the estimated size of non-covered segments will be provided. If a size estimate cannot be provided, this will be explained. If no frame or list was utilized, this will be indicated.

Item 6: The name of the sample supplier, if the sampling frame and/or the sample itself was provided by a third party.

Item 7: The methods used to recruit the panel or participants, if the sample was drawn from a pre-recruited panel or pool of respondents.

Item 8: A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected, recruited, intercepted or otherwise contacted or encountered, along with any eligibility requirements and/or oversampling. If quotas were used, the variables defining the quotas will be reported. If a within-household selection procedure was used, this will be described. The description of the sampling frame and sample design will include sufficient detail to determine whether the respondents were selected using probability or non-probability methods.

Item 9: Method(s) and mode(s) used to administer the survey (e.g., CATI, CAPI, ACASI, IVR, mail survey, web survey) and the language(s) offered.

Item 10: Sample sizes (by sampling frame if more than one was used) and a discussion of the precision of the findings. For probability samples, the estimates of sampling error will be reported, and the discussion will state whether or not the reported margins of sampling error or statistical analyses have been adjusted for the design effect due to weighting, clustering, or other factors. Disclosure requirements for non-probability samples are different because the precision of estimates from such samples is a model-based measure (rather than the average deviation from the population value over all possible samples). Reports of non-probability samples will only provide measures of precision if they are accompanied by a detailed description of how the underlying model was specified, its assumptions validated and the measure(s) calculated. To avoid confusion, it is best to avoid using the term “margin of error” or “margin of sampling error” in conjunction with non-probability samples.

Item 11: A description of how the weights were calculated, including the variables used and the sources of weighting parameters, if weighted estimates are reported.

Item 12: Contact for obtaining more information about the study.

Section III.D of the AAPOR Code is also applicable:

Item 13: If the results reported are based on multiple samples of multiple modes, the preceding items will be disclosed for each.

In addition, other items included in the second part of Section III.A of the AAPOR Code are to be released within 30 days of any request for those materials, and Sections III.E-F are also to be observed.

Finally, the revised AAPOR Code also includes disclosure standards for qualitative research and for content analysis, in Sections III.B and III.C, respectively. These are considered in separate documents.

The examples provided below are intended to emphasize the fact that an infinite variety of formats can be employed to successfully report these disclosure elements and comply with Transparency Initiative requirements.

- Example 1: Dual Frame Landline/Cell Phone Sample Design
- Example 2: Dual Frame Landline/Cell Phone Sample Design
- Example 3: Dual Frame Landline/Cell Phone Sample Design
- Example 4: Mixed Mode Survey for a Dual Frame Address Based Sample Combined with a Landline RDD Sample
- Example 5: Web Survey
- Example 6: Area Probability Face-to-Face Survey

EXAMPLE 1

DUAL FRAME LANDLINE/CELL PHONE SAMPLE DESIGN

ABOUT THE SURVEY

The analysis in this report is based on telephone interviews [9] conducted (INCLUSIVE DATES) [4] among a national sample of adults, 18 years of age or older, living in all 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia [3] (NNNN respondents were interviewed on a landline telephone, and NNNN were interviewed on a cell phone, including NN who had no landline telephone) [10]. The survey was conducted by interviewers at (ORGANIZATION NAME) [1]. Interviews were conducted in English and Spanish [9]. The questionnaire used in this survey is available at: 222.xxxxx.com/qs. [2]

A combination of landline and cell phone random digit dial samples were used [5]. As the proportion of Americans who rely solely or mostly on cell phones for their telephone service continues to grow, sampling both landline and cell phone numbers helps to ensure that our surveys represent all adults who have access to either (only about 2% of households in the U.S. do not have access to any phone). Both the landline and cell phone samples were provided by (NAME OF VENDOR) [6].

The design of the landline sample ensures representation of both listed and unlisted numbers (including those not yet listed) by using random digit dialing [8]. This method uses random generation of the last two digits of telephone numbers selected on the basis of the area code, telephone exchange, and bank number. A bank is defined as 100 contiguous telephone numbers, for example 800-555-1200 to 800-555-1299. The telephone exchanges are selected to be proportionally stratified by county and by telephone exchange within the county. Only banks of telephone numbers containing three or more listed residential numbers are selected.

The cell phone sample is drawn through systematic sampling from dedicated wireless banks of 100 contiguous numbers and shared service banks with no directory-listed landline numbers (to ensure that the cell phone sample does not include banks that are also included in the landline sample). The sample is designed to be representative both geographically and by large and small wireless carriers.

Both the landline and cell samples are released for interviewing in replicates, which are small random samples of each larger sample. Using replicates to control the release of telephone numbers ensures that the complete call procedures are followed for all numbers dialed. The use of replicates also improves the overall representativeness of the survey by helping to ensure that the regional distribution of numbers called is appropriate.

Respondents in the landline sample were selected by asking at random for the youngest adult male or female who is now at home. If there is no eligible person of the requested gender at home, interviewers ask to speak with the youngest adult of the opposite gender, who is now at home. Interviews in the cell sample were conducted with the person who answered the phone, if that person was an adult 18 years of age or older [8].

At least 7 attempts were made to complete an interview at every sampled telephone number. The calls were staggered over times of day and days of the week (including at least one daytime call) to maximize the chances of making contact with a potential respondent. Interviewing was also spread as evenly as possible across the field period. An effort was made to recontact most interview breakoffs and refusals to attempt to convert them to completed interviews.

The response rate for this survey was (RR) in the landline sample and (RR) in the cell sample, as computed using the American Association for Public Opinion Research’s Response Rate 3. The response rate is the percentage of known or assumed residential households for which a completed interview was obtained. Survey participation tends to vary for different subgroups of the population, and these subgroups are likely to also vary on questions of substantive interest. To compensate for these known biases, the sample data are weighted for analysis.

The sample is first weighted by household size for those with landline phones to account for the fact that people in larger households have a lower probability of being selected. In addition, the combined landline and cell phone sample is weighted to account for the fact that respondents with both a landline and cell phone have a greater probability of being included in the sample.

The sample is then weighted using population parameters from the U.S. Census Bureau (ACS, 2014) for adults 18 years of age or older. The population parameters used for weighting are: gender by age, gender by education, age by education, region, race and Hispanic origin that includes a break for Hispanics based on whether they were born in the U.S. or not, population density and among non-Hispanic whites – age, education and region [11]. The parameters for the demographic variables are from the Census Bureau’s 2011 American Community Survey (for all adults excluding those in institutionalized group quarters). The parameter for population density is from the 2010 Census. These population parameters are compared with the sample characteristics to construct the weights. In addition to the demographic parameters, the sample is also weighted to match current patterns of telephone status and relative usage of landline and cell phones (for those with both), based on extrapolations from the 2012 National Health Interview Survey. The final weights are derived using an iterative technique that simultaneously balances the distributions of all weighting parameters.

Sampling errors and statistical tests of significance take into account the design effect due to weighting [10]. The following table shows the sample sizes and the error attributable to sampling that would be expected at the 95% level of confidence for different groups examined in the survey:

Group	Sample Size	Plus or minus ...
Total sample	(NNNN)	(percentage points)
Republicans	(NNN)	(percentage points)
Democrats	(NNN)	(percentage points)
Independents	(NNN)	(percentage points)

In addition to sampling error, one should bear in mind that question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of opinion polls.

The survey’s sponsor and funder was (ORGANIZATION NAME) [1]. For more information, contact XXXXX at EMAIL.[12]

Endnotes of Checklist Items

1. Who sponsored and conducted the research study (and sources of funding if different from sponsor).
2. The exact wording and presentation of questions and response options whose results are reported (and any preceding instructions or questions that might reasonably be expected to influence results).
3. A definition of the population under study and its geographic location.
4. Dates of data collection.
5. A description of the sampling frame(s) and its coverage of the target population, including mention of any segment of the target population that is not covered by the design.
6. The name of the sample supplier, if the sampling frame and/or the sample itself was provided by a third party.
7. [If applicable]: The methods used to recruit the panel or participants, if the sample was drawn from a pre-recruited panel or pool of respondents.
8. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected, recruited, intercepted or otherwise contacted or encountered, along with any eligibility requirements and/or oversampling. If quotas were used, the variables defining the quotas will be reported. If a within-household selection procedure was used, this will be described. The description of the sampling frame and sample design will include sufficient detail to determine whether the respondents were selected using probability or non-probability methods.
9. Method(s) and mode(s) used to administer the survey (e.g., CATI, CAPI, ACASI, IVR, mail survey, web survey) and the language(s) offered.
10. Sample sizes (by sampling frame if more than one was used) and a discussion of the precision of the findings. For probability samples, the estimates of sampling error will be reported, and the discussion will state whether or not the reported margins of sampling error or statistical analyses have been adjusted for the design effect due to weighting, clustering, or other factors. Reports of non-probability samples will only provide measures of precision if they are accompanied by a detailed description of how the underlying model was specified, its assumptions validated and the measure(s) calculated. To avoid confusion, it is best to avoid using the term “margin of error” or “margin of sampling error” in conjunction with non-probability samples.
11. A description of how the weights were calculated, including the variables used and the sources of weighting parameters, if weighted estimates are reported.
12. Contact for obtaining more information about the study.

EXAMPLE 2

DUAL FRAME LANDLINE/CELL PHONE SAMPLE DESIGN

Study Methodology

This survey was sponsored and funded [1] by (client organization name) and conducted by (survey organization name) [1]. The survey was conducted from (DATE) through (DATE) [4].

This nationally representative survey was conducted via telephone [9] with (N) adults age 18 or older living in the continental United States (excluding Alaska and Hawaii) [3]. This group of adults included (N) respondents randomly selected on landlines and [N] respondents randomly [10] selected on cellular telephones. The telephone samples were obtained from (organization) [6]. The at-home respondent having the most recent birthday was selected to be interviewed within each sampled household [8]. Cellular telephone respondents were offered a small monetary incentive for participating, as compensation for telephone usage charges. Interviews were conducted in both English and Spanish [9], depending on respondent preference. All interviews were completed by professional interviewers who were carefully trained on the specific survey for this study.

A total of (XXXX) interviews were completed. The final response rate was (XX) percent, based on AAPOR response rate formula 3. The overall margin of sampling error, adjusted for sample design effects, was +/- (XX) percentage points [10].

Sampling weights were calculated to adjust for sample design aspects and for nonresponse bias arising from differential response rates across various demographic groups. The base weighting adjusted for the probability of selection in each frame and the number of adults in the household for landline sample cases. The landline and cell samples were combined using compositing. Poststratification variables included age, sex, race, region, education, and landline/cellular telephone use. Weighting variables were obtained from the 2013 American Community Survey and the 2013 National Health Interview Survey. The weighted data, which thus reflect the U.S. general population, were used for all analyses [11].

All analyses were conducted using STATA (version 12), which allows for adjustment of standard errors for complex sample designs [10]. All differences reported between subgroups of the U.S. population are at the 95 percent level of statistical significance, meaning that there is only a 5 percent (or less) probability that the observed differences could be attributed to chance variation in sampling. Additionally, bivariate differences between subgroups are only reported when they also remain robust in a multivariate model controlling for other demographic, political, and socioeconomic covariates. A comprehensive listing of all study questions complete with tabulations of top-level results for each question and subgroup sample sizes is available on the (ORGANIZATION) website: www.xxxx.org [2].

For more information, contact XXXXX at EMAIL.[12]

Endnotes of Checklist Items

1. Who sponsored and conducted the research study (and sources of funding if different from sponsor).
2. The exact wording and presentation of questions and response options whose results are reported (and any preceding instructions or questions that might reasonably be expected to influence results).
3. A definition of the population under study and its geographic location.
4. Dates of data collection.
5. A description of the sampling frame(s) and its coverage of the target population, including mention of any segment of the target population that is not covered by the design.
6. The name of the sample supplier, if the sampling frame and/or the sample itself was provided by a third party.
7. [If applicable]: The methods used to recruit the panel or participants, if the sample was drawn from a pre-recruited panel or pool of respondents.
8. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected, recruited, intercepted or otherwise contacted or encountered, along with any eligibility requirements and/or oversampling. If quotas were used, the variables defining the quotas will be reported. If a within-household selection procedure was used, this will be described. The description of the sampling frame and sample design will include sufficient detail to determine whether the respondents were selected using probability or non-probability methods.
9. Method(s) and mode(s) used to administer the survey (e.g., CATI, CAPI, ACASI, IVR, mail survey, web survey) and the language(s) offered.
10. Sample sizes (by sampling frame if more than one was used) and a discussion of the precision of the findings. For probability samples, the estimates of sampling error will be reported, and the discussion will state whether or not the reported margins of sampling error or statistical analyses have been adjusted for the design effect due to weighting, clustering, or other factors. Reports of non-probability samples will only provide measures of precision if they are accompanied by a detailed description of how the underlying model was specified, its assumptions validated and the measure(s) calculated. To avoid confusion, it is best to avoid using the term “margin of error” or “margin of sampling error” in conjunction with non-probability samples.
11. A description of how the weights were calculated, including the variables used and the sources of weighting parameters, if weighted estimates are reported.
12. Contact for obtaining more information about the study.

EXAMPLE 3

DUAL FRAME LANDLINE/CELL PHONE SAMPLE DESIGN

METHODOLOGY

The sponsoring agency, (XXX) [1], contracted with (YYY) [1] to conduct the (ZZZ Study) from (date) through (date) [4]. The goal of this poll was to measure attitudes toward various political issues.

For the (ZZZ Study), (YYY) surveyed a nationally representative sample (all 50 states) of (number) U.S. residents aged 18 or older [3]. The sample consisted of a landline component (number) and a cell phone component (number) [5]. Of the (number) interviews, (number) interviews were conducted with respondents with no landline telephone. (number) interviews were completed in English and (number) were completed in Spanish [9].

This report is organized in four sections. The first section discusses the sample design. The next section describes data collection and fielding. The final two sections address weighting procedures and the response rate of the survey.

I. Sample Design (8)

To address concerns about coverage, the study employed an overlapping, dual-frame, landline/cell phone telephone design [9]. The RDD landline sample was generated through (sample company) [6] and sampling system. The standard (sample company) and sampling system RDD methodology produces a strict single stage, Equal Probability Selection Method (epsem) sample of residential telephone numbers. The sample was generated shortly before the beginning of data collection to provide the most up-to-date sample possible, maximizing the number of valid telephone extensions. Following generation, the RDD sample was prepared using (sample company) and sampling system screening procedure, which limits sample to non-zero banks, and identifies and eliminates a large percentage of all non-working and business numbers. Within households, the last birthday method was employed to randomly select one adult aged 18 or older to be interviewed.

Using a procedure similar to that used for the landline sample, (sample company) [6] generated a list of cell phone telephone numbers in a random fashion.

In order to ensure sufficient representation of the Spanish speaking population, the landline sample was checked against existing telephone directories, and phone numbers matching households with Hispanic surnames were dialed by a Spanish-speaking interviewer. (XXX) interviews were completed from this subsample (number in Spanish).

II. Field Preparations, Fielding and Data Processing

The questionnaire was developed by the (ZZZ) researchers in consultation with the (YYY) project team. The questionnaire was translated into Spanish so respondents could choose to be interviewed in English or Spanish, or switch between the languages according to their comfort level. The questionnaire containing the complete wording of all questions asked is available at: www.abcdef.com/ZZZ_study [2].

Prior to the field period, (ZZZ) programmed the study into CfMC 8.1 Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) software. Extensive checking of the program was conducted to ensure that skip patterns and sample splits followed the design of the questionnaire.

Pretesting

Seventeen pretest interviews were conducted prior to the field period. The live pretest of the survey instrument and survey administration procedures was conducted on (Date). (ZZZ) representatives monitored the pretest live between times PM (EST). (ZZZ) provided a detailed summary of pretest findings, which included feedback from the interviewers. The final draft of the questionnaire was revised on the basis of the pretest. Most changes were deletions made in order to shorten the survey instrument, and improve respondent-comprehension of questions.

The field period for this study was (Date through Date)[4]. All interviews were done through the CATI system. The CATI system ensured that questions followed logical skip patterns and that complete dispositions of all call attempts were recorded.

CATI interviewers received written materials about the survey instrument and received formal training for this particular project. The written materials were provided prior to the beginning of the field period and included an annotated questionnaire that contained information about the goals of the study as well as detailed explanations as to why questions were being asked, the meaning and pronunciation of key terms, potential obstacles to be overcome in getting good answers to questions, and respondent problems that could be anticipated ahead of time, as well as strategies for addressing the potential problems.

Interviewer training was conducted both prior to the study pretest and immediately before the survey was launched. Call center supervisors and interviewers were walked through each question from the questionnaire. Interviewers were given instructions to help them maximize response rates and ensure accurate data collection.

In order to maximize survey response, (ZZZ) enacted the following procedures during the field period:

- An average of number follow-up attempts were made to contact non-responsive numbers (e.g. no answer, busy, answering machine)
- Each non-responsive number was contacted multiple times, varying the times of day, and the days of the week that call-backs were placed using a programmed differential call rule
- Interviewers explained the purpose of the study and, when asked, stated as accurately as possible the expected length of the interview (number minutes)
- Respondents were offered the option of scheduling a call-back at their convenience
- Specially trained interviewers contacted households where the initial call resulted in a refusal in an attempt to convert refusals to completed interviews
- The study included an incentive of \$ number for any cell phone respondent who requested compensation for his or her time

Deliverables

(YYY) delivered a detailed account of marginal distributions for each question after the first weekend of interviewing.

At the end of the field period (YYY) delivered a set of number banners of crosstabulations, including combination tables for multiple related questions, along with a full topline for all weighted survey responses and combination/sample breakdown tables (see appendix X), and a fully labeled SPSS dataset.

III. Weighting Procedures [11]

The final data for this survey were weighted to correct for possible variance in the likelihood of selection for a given case, and to balance the sample to known population parameters in order to correct for systematic under- or over-representation of meaningful social categories.

The weighting procedure involved the following steps:

Baseweight

1. Dual-user correction (DUC) : To correct for differences in the likelihood of selection for respondents answering both landlines and cell phones (dual users), compared with single mode users, respondents who have either only a landline phone or only a cell phone received a weight of 1. Those with both types of phones in their household received a weight of .5. Respondents refusing this question received the mean adjustment for their respective frame (landline or cell phone).
2. Within-household selection correction (WHC): Landline respondents who were the only adult in their household received a weight equivalent to half the weight of landline respondents with two or more adults in their household. The weights were adjusted to have a mean of 1.0. Cell phone respondents received a weight of 1 as their adjustment since no within-household selection was done for cell phone respondents.
3. A baseweight (or sample weight) was calculated as the product of these two adjustments (DUC*WHC).

Post stratification weighting

1. With the baseweight applied, the data underwent the process of iterative post-stratification balancing ('raking'). The sample was adjusted to approximate the U.S adult population distribution, based on the 2012 March Supplement of the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS). Post-stratification weighting was conducted to the following parameters: age (18-29; 30-49; 50-64; 65+) by gender; race (White; Black/AA; Hispanic-U.S. born; Hispanic-foreign born; Other); education (less than high school grad, high school grad, some college; college degree or more); number of adults in the household; population density (divided into quintiles); Census Region by gender, and phone usage (cell phone only, dual-user and landline only). The levels of these phone use categories were determined by the estimates for adults in the CDC's NHIS estimates for the first half of 2012.
2. To control the variance produced by the weights the weights were truncated to a range of .25 to 3.0.

Margin of Sampling Error [10]

Weighting procedures increase the variance in the data with larger weights causing greater variance. Complex survey designs and post data-collection statistical adjustments increase variance estimates and, as a result, the error terms applied in statistical testing. Design effect for the (ZZZ) Study was x.xx. Accounting for sample size and design effect, the margin of sampling error for this study was +/- x.x%.

Table 1 compares the distribution along various demographic attributes between Census (or NHIS) benchmark data, the unweighted sample, and the weighted sample.

Table 1: Comparisons of Final Weighted Data to Census Parameters (main categories)*:

	Raw N	Total Unweighted	Total Weighted	Parameter
Male	XXX	50%	49%	48%
Female	XXX	50%	51%	52%
18-29	XXX	12%	21%	22%
30-49	XXX	29%	35%	35%
50-64	XXX	36%	26%	26%
65+	XXX	23%	18%	18%
White	XXX	72%	66%	65%
Black/AA	XXX	9%	11%	11%
Hispanic-Born in U.S.	XXX	5%	7%	6%
Hispanic-Born outside U.S.	XXX	5%	7%	8%
Other	XXX	6%	7%	6%
Less than HS	XXX	7%	12%	13%
High School	XXX	23%	33%	33%
Some College	XXX	25%	26%	25%
College or More	XXX	45%	29%	28%
1 adult in the HH	XXX	22%	17%	17%
2 Adults in the HH	XXX	51%	53%	53%
3 Adults in the HH	XXX	16%	18%	18%
4 adults or more in the HH	XXX	11%	11%	12%
Lowest Population Density Quintile**	XXX	21%	20%	20%
Highest Population Density Quintile**	XXX	15%	20%	20%
Northeast	XXX	20%	18%	18%
North Center	XXX	24%	22%	21%
South	XXX	35%	37%	37%
West	XXX	21%	23%	23%
Cell Phone Only***	XXX	19%	34%	35%
Dual-User***	XXX	74%	58%	57%
Landline Only***	XXX	7%	8%	8%

*-Percentages do not add to 100% due to rounding and refusals; **-Quintiles based on county levels for population density calculated as total population divided by the county's land area as reported in the 2010 decennial Census; ***-Benchmarks are based on the NHIS estimates for adults living in households who have telephone coverage (~98% of households).

IV. Response Rate

The response rate for the landline component of this study was number % and for the cell phone component number % using AAPOR’s RR3 formula. Following is a full disposition of the sample selected for this survey:

	LL	Cell	Total
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)			
Complete	XXX	XXX	XXX
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)			
Refusal (Eligible)	XXX	XXX	XXX
Break off	XXX	XXX	XXX
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	XXX	XXX	XXX
Answering Machine – Household	XXX	XXX	XXX
Language problem	XXX	XXX	XXX
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)			
Always busy	XXX	XXX	XXX
No answer	XXX	XXX	XXX
Technical phone problems	XXX	XXX	XXX
Call blocking	XXX	XXX	XXX
No screener completed	XXX	XXX	XXX
Answering Machine – DK if Household	XXX	XXX	XXX
Household, unknown if eligible respondent	XXX	XXX	XXX
Not eligible (Category 4)			
Fax/data line	XXX	XXX	XXX
Non-working number	XXX	XXX	XXX
Business, government office, other organizations	XXX	XXX	XXX
No eligible respondent	XXX	XXX	XXX
Total phone numbers used	XXX	XXX	XXX

For more information, contact XXXXX at EMAIL.[12]

Endnotes of Checklist Items

1. Who sponsored and conducted the research study (and sources of funding if different from sponsor).
2. The exact wording and presentation of questions and response options whose results are reported (and any preceding instructions or questions that might reasonably be expected to influence results).
3. A definition of the population under study and its geographic location.
4. Dates of data collection.
5. A description of the sampling frame(s) and its coverage of the target population, including mention of any segment of the target population that is not covered by the design.
6. The name of the sample supplier, if the sampling frame and/or the sample itself was provided by a third party.
7. [If applicable]: The methods used to recruit the panel or participants, if the sample was drawn from a pre-recruited panel or pool of respondents.
8. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected, recruited, intercepted or otherwise contacted or encountered, along with any eligibility requirements and/or oversampling. If quotas were used, the variables defining the quotas will be reported. If a within-household selection procedure was used, this will be described. The description of the sampling frame and sample design will include sufficient detail to determine whether the respondents were selected using probability or non-probability methods.
9. Method(s) and mode(s) used to administer the survey (e.g., CATI, CAPI, ACASI, IVR, mail survey, web survey) and the language(s) offered.
10. Sample sizes (by sampling frame if more than one was used) and a discussion of the precision of the findings. For probability samples, the estimates of sampling error will be reported, and the discussion will state whether or not the reported margins of sampling error or statistical analyses have been adjusted for the design effect due to weighting, clustering, or other factors. Reports of non-probability samples will only provide measures of precision if they are accompanied by a detailed description of how the underlying model was specified, its assumptions validated and the measure(s) calculated. To avoid confusion, it is best to avoid using the term “margin of error” or “margin of sampling error” in conjunction with non-probability samples.
11. A description of how the weights were calculated, including the variables used and the sources of weighting parameters, if weighted estimates are reported.
12. Contact for obtaining more information about the study.

EXAMPLE 4

MIXED MODE SURVEY FOR A DUAL FRAME ADDRESS BASED SAMPLE COMBINED WITH A LANDLINE RDD SAMPLE

The (funder) [1] contracted with the (organization reporting the results) [1], and its subcontractor, (survey firm) [1] to conduct a mixed mode survey (MMS) of adults aged 18 and older living in the United States (excluding Hawaii and Alaska) [3]. The goal of the MMS was to document health insurance coverage and access to and use of health care for the non-institutionalized population in (target area). The survey was conducted starting (start date) through (end date) [4].

Sample Design [8]: The MMS survey moved to a dual sample frame design that combines a random-digit-dial (RDD) landline telephone sample and an address-based (AB) household sample [5]. The decision to rely on the dual-frame sample for the MMS reflects the changing telephone environment in the United States. Cell phone-only households are increasing rapidly in the United States, with 30% of households estimated to be cell phone-only in the second half of 2010, as compared to 25% in 2009 (Blumberg and Luke 2011). In order to capture cell phone-only households in the sample frame for the ABCD, the decision was made to include an address-based-sample (AB sample), along with the RDD sample, for the survey. The AB sample captures households with landline phones, cell phone-only households and non-telephone households, supplementing the landline sample of the traditional RDD survey. One limitation of both the AB sample and the RDD sample is that they will miss homeless persons. This is estimated to be less than 1% of the population.

Since the survey is relying on two sample frames, households that could be included in both the RDD and AB sample frames have a greater probability of being selected for the survey than households who could only be captured in one of the sample frames, all else equal. That is, households with a landline telephone, who are included in both the RDD and AB sample frames, have a higher probability of being selected for the survey than households without a landline telephone (including cell phone-only households and non-telephone households), since they are only included in the AB sample frame. To address this issue, we oversampled households without a listed landline telephone number in the AB sample frame (as it is this stratum that includes the cell phone-only households and non-telephone households). We also undersampled the households without a listed landline number in the RDD sample to counterbalance their oversample in the AB sample. (The goal was to keep the proportion of households without a listed landline telephone number in the combined sample roughly comparable to their share of the overall population.)

The sample records in the four strata—RDD sample with a listed telephone number, RDD sample without a listed telephone number, AB sample with a listed telephone number, and AB sample without a listed telephone number--were randomized and put into small random subsamples or “replicates” to be released as needed for the study. In order to obtain a sample that was generally consistent with the distribution of telephone ownership, we allocated approximately 75% of the sample to the AB sample and 25% to the RDD sample. Both the AB sample and the RDD sample were purchased from Market Systems Group’s Genesys sampling system [6].

Survey Mode: The goal of the survey was to obtain interviews with an overall sample of x,xxx households. Data were collected using multiple modes—telephone, web, and mail [9]. The table 1 shows the number of completions for each mode of data collection with a separate category for in-bound (toll free) telephone calls from sample members requesting to complete the survey by telephone versus outbound phone interviews where a telephone interviewer called the respondent. For the most part, questions were identical for telephone, web, and mail instruments, although there were some changes to simplify the process of obtaining the household roster and the process used to select the random target person within the household in the mail survey. For all sampled households, the most recent birthday method was employed to select the target respondent. For those completing the survey on-line, there was

access to both staff telephone numbers and a link for emailing for technical support. The MMS is administered in two languages--English, and Spanish [9]. A copy of the questionnaire is available at www.mixedmodesurvey.org/xxxxx, along with raw frequencies for all questions, broken down by family income [2].

Table 1: Total Number of Completed Interviews for the RDD and AB Samples, by Survey Mode							
	RDD sample			AB sample			Total Sample
	Total	With Known Address	With No Known Address	Total	With Listed Landline Telephone Number	With No Listed Landline Telephone Number	
Total Interviews	x,xxx	xxx	xxx	x,xxx	x,xxx	x,xxx	x,xxx
Phone-outbound	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	x,xxx
Phone-inbound	xx	xx	x	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
Web/Internet	xxx	xxx	x	xxx	xxx	xxx	x,xxx
Mail	xx	xx	x	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx

The specific steps for the data collection process were as follows.

1. Advance letters were sent to all households for whom we had an address, which included all households in the AB sample as well as telephone numbers in the RDD sample that had listed addresses. The advance letter invited the household to participate in the study and offered the option of calling in to the survey center using a 1-800 telephone number, completing a web-based survey, or completing a mail survey. The letters to the RDD sample and the AB sample with a listed telephone number also notified people that they would be receiving a call in the next few weeks to complete the survey.
2. Telephone interviews were attempted with all households for which we had a telephone number, including the entire RDD sample and the households in the AB sample with a listed telephone number. The initial call occurred within a few days of the mailing of the advance letters.
3. Reminder notices were sent to all non-responding households in the AB sample and the members of the RDD sample that have a listed address. These were sent out four weeks after the advance letters were mailed.
4. A final reminder notice was sent to all non-responding households in the AB sample and the RDD sample that had a listed address. A copy of the mail instrument was sent to all non-responding households. The final reminder is sent out four weeks after the first reminder notice is mailed and it included a copy the mail instrument.

In order to encourage participation in the survey, all respondents were notified that through their participation in the study they would be entered into a drawing to win \$xxx. In addition, for members of the AB sample without a listed phone number, an additional incentive of \$20 was offered. Information on

the incentives was provided in all advance letters and reminder letters and in the introduction to the survey.

Call Rules for the CATI Interviews. For all RDD sample members and AB sample members with a listed telephone number, the initial telephone interviewing attempt included one initial call plus six callbacks. If an interview was not completed at that point, the telephone number aside for at least two weeks to “rest.” After that rest period, an additional six callbacks were attempted. After another four-week rest period, the sample was dialed back three more times. Overall, households received at least 15 call attempts. To increase the probability of completing an interview, we established a differential call rule that required that call attempts be initiated at different times of day and different days of the week.

Completed Interviews: Table 2 shows the number of completed interviews done in households that had only a cell phone, only a landline phone, both a landline and cell phone, and the residual categories for no telephone or telephone status unknown. We completed surveys with xxx cell phone-only households, x,xxx landline and cell phone households, xxx landline-only households, and xx non-telephone households [10].

Table 2: Completed Interviews for the RDD and AB Samples, by Household Telephone Status							
	RDD sample			AB sample			Total Sample
	Total	With Known Address	With No Known Address	Total	With Listed Landline Telephone Number	With No Listed Landline Telephone Number	
Total Interviews	x,xxx	xxx	xxx	x,xxx	x,xxx	x,xxx	x,xxx
Cell phone-only	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
Landline phone-only	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
Cell phone and landline phone	xxx	xxx	xxx	x,xxx	x,xxx	xxx	x,xxx
No telephone	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx

Response rates: Response rates are one method used to assess the quality of a survey, as they provide a measure of how successfully the survey obtained responses from the sample. The American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has established standardized methods for calculating response rates (AAPOR, 2008). This survey uses AAPOR’s response rate definition RR3, with an AAPOR-approved alternative method of addressing ineligible households (described below). We report the overall response rates achieved for the RDD and AB samples, and for the combined RDD and AB sample. The response rate for the combined RDD and AB samples was xx.x%. Additional information on the sample disposition for the MMS is available upon request. The response rates for the RDD and AB samples in the MMS were xx.x% and xx.x%, respectively.

Sample weights [11]: All tabulations based on the survey data were prepared using weights that adjust for the complex design of the survey, for undercoverage, and for survey nonresponse. Separate weights were constructed for the landline sample and for the combined landline and address based samples. The relative weights of the landline and address based samples were determined using 2012 NHIS estimates of the share of adults in households with landlines and cell phones.

The final weights were constructed from a base weight for each adult that reflects his or her probability of selection for the survey and a post-stratification adjustment to ensure that the characteristics of the overall sample were consistent with the characteristics of the population as projected by the U.S. Census Bureau. Specifically, the final weights include an adjustment to ensure that the age, sex, race/ethnicity, and geographic distribution of the sample are consistent with the distribution of the population. This adjustment is needed since some adults are less likely than others to be included in the survey, resulting in their being under-represented in the sample. The analyses in this report rely on the combined landline and cell phone sample. The overall design effect for the final weights (including adjustments for phone status, age, sex, race/ethnicity, and geography) was x.xx [10].

Precision of Estimates [10]: Therefore the margin of sampling error for total respondents is +/-x.xx % at the 95% confidence level. The margin of sampling error for respondents whose family income was less 300% of the Federal Poverty Level was +/-x.xx%, respondents whose family income was 300-500% of the Federal Poverty Level was +/-x.xx%, and the margin of sampling error for analysis of respondents who were Uninsured was +/-x.xx%

For more information about this survey, contact XXXXX at EMAIL.[25]

Endnotes of Checklist Items

1. Who sponsored and conducted the research study (and sources of funding if different from sponsor).
2. The exact wording and presentation of questions and response options whose results are reported (and any preceding instructions or questions that might reasonably be expected to influence results).
3. A definition of the population under study and its geographic location.
4. Dates of data collection.
5. A description of the sampling frame(s) and its coverage of the target population, including mention of any segment of the target population that is not covered by the design.
6. The name of the sample supplier, if the sampling frame and/or the sample itself was provided by a third party.
7. [If applicable]: The methods used to recruit the panel or participants, if the sample was drawn from a pre-recruited panel or pool of respondents.
8. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected, recruited, intercepted or otherwise contacted or encountered, along with any eligibility requirements and/or oversampling. If quotas were used, the variables defining the quotas will be reported. If a within-household selection procedure was used, this will be described. The description of the sampling frame and sample design will include sufficient detail to determine whether the respondents were selected using probability or non-probability methods.
9. Method(s) and mode(s) used to administer the survey (e.g., CATI, CAPI, ACASI, IVR, mail survey, web survey) and the language(s) offered.
10. Sample sizes (by sampling frame if more than one was used) and a discussion of the precision of the findings. For probability samples, the estimates of sampling error will be reported, and the discussion will state whether or not the reported margins of sampling error or statistical analyses have been adjusted for the design effect due to weighting, clustering, or other factors. Reports of non-probability samples will only provide measures of precision if they are accompanied by a detailed description of how the underlying model was specified, its assumptions validated and the measure(s) calculated. To avoid confusion, it is best to avoid using the term “margin of error” or “margin of sampling error” in conjunction with non-probability samples.
11. A description of how the weights were calculated, including the variables used and the sources of weighting parameters, if weighted estimates are reported.
12. Contact for obtaining more information about the study.

EXAMPLE 5 WEB SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

(SURVEY FIRM) [1] conducted the (SURVEY NAME) on behalf of (SPONSOR) [1]. The (SURVEY NAME) is a survey of all (GRADUATE COLLEGE) alumni with email addresses. The definition of alumni includes holders of (COLLEGE) degrees (e.g., MBA, DBA) as well as those who have completed executive education courses (e.g., AMP, PMD). Alumni living both in the United States and overseas were eligible to participate [3]. The survey asked questions about the competitiveness of the United States, defined as the ability to compete successfully in global markets while supporting high and rising living standards, as well as attitudes to policies that may increase U.S. competitiveness and strategies that firms use or may use in the future to improve national competitiveness.

The survey used web and paper modes [9]. The decision to exclude the telephone mode, used in 2011 “core” sample was taken based on the finding in the 2011 methods report that no substantive differences existed between the 2011 core and “noncore” samples, the latter lacking telephone mode and a pre-notification letter. The paper mode was primarily available for respondent download on demand through (SURVEY FIRM)’s web survey platform.

INSTRUMENT

The instrument was developed jointly by (SPONSOR) and (SURVEY FIRM). The instrument, which was fielded in English only [9], is found in Appendix A [2].

Cognitive Testing

In order to ensure that the survey was understood by respondents as intended by the survey designers, (SURVEY FIRM) conducted eight cognitive testing interviews via telephone. In the interviews, the interviewer read the each item to the respondent, who had been asked to think aloud, describing their thought processes as they answered the question. The interviewer would ask follow-up questions in some situations. These included asking respondents how they defined a particular term, what they thought the question was “getting at,” and (in cases where respondent interpretation was at variance with the intentions of the survey designer) how the question could be reworded. Additional questions were asked at the end of the cognitive interview regarding any items that were particularly problematic, whether any questions “just didn’t get it,” and whether any salient topics had been left out.

Paper Survey

The paper survey was designed generally following Dillman’s (2000) recommendations for paper survey layout. Paper survey layout (shown in Appendix B) did, however, differ from the recommended format by not implementing a shaded background with white boxes for question response. As implementing this design feature would have increased professional time considerably for a survey mode that was not expected to be used often, a cost-benefit analysis dictated foregoing this feature.

In order to minimize the need for branching with the paper survey and reduce its length, multiple versions of paper surveys were created on the basis of a respondent’s employment status, whether their firm had any U.S. operations, and the type of location decision (if any) they had participated in. To select a paper survey, respondents checked a box on the first page of the web survey. The web survey then asked the introductory series of questions as well as questions needed to determine which version of the paper survey the respondent was to receive (see Appendix B, p. xx for details on the conditions different versions of the paper survey were offered under). Once the version of the paper survey the respondent

was to received had been determined, it was sent as a PDF file (depending on the browser used and options selected, this may have shown on screen or been downloaded as a file). Older respondents were more likely to choose to respond by paper mode. In cases when respondents had difficulty accessing a paper survey, (SPONSOR) or (SURVEY FIRM) staff logged onto the web survey as the respondent and asked the questions needed to determine which version of the paper survey the respondent required. The paper survey was then either emailed or faxed to the respondent (by preference), or mailed (if the respondent did not have access to email or a fax machine). Respondents returned paper surveys by fax, mail, and as scanned email attachments.

Web Survey

The web survey used a layout designed to match (SPONSOR) style, incorporating the logo used for (SURVEY NAME). Screenshots of the web survey can be seen in Appendix C [2].

SAMPLE

The (SURVEY NAME) was designed to include all (COLLEGE) alumni with email addresses. Its design excludes all alumni with email addresses. (SPONSOR) defines alumni as graduates of its degree-awarding programs, as well as its executive education programs. All living alumni were considered to be eligible for the survey, regardless of their retirement status, field of employment, or whether they were located in the U.S. or overseas.

(SURVEY FIRM) staff combined the (SPONSOR) alumni database used for the 2011 survey (N=XX,XXX) with an updated alumni database provided by (SPONSOR) (N=XX,XXX), yielding a file with N=XX,XXX alumni. First, alumni found in the 2011 database but not the 2012 database were excluded (N=X,XXX; remaining population of N=XX,XXX). Second, alumni without an email address were excluded (N=XX,XXX; remaining population of XX,XXX). Third, alumni with an [SPONSOR] database flag of “no contact overall” were excluded (N=XX4; remaining population N=XX,XXX). Fourth, alumni with an (SPONSOR) database flag of “no contact email” were excluded (N=XXX; remaining population N=XX,XXX). Fifth, alumni who had been invited to respond to the (DIFFERENT SURVEY NAME), which ran in parallel to the (SURVEY NAME), were excluded (N=XXX; remaining population N=XX,XXX). Sixth, alumni with hard refusals to the 2011 survey were excluded (N=XX; remaining population N=XX,XXX). The resulting population consisted of N=XX,XXX alumni [5,8].

FIELD OPERATIONS

Email Invitation

An invitation email was sent to N=XX,XXX alumni beginning on the afternoon of August XX, 2012. An initial small batch was sent on the XXth in case any problems were encountered. It consisted of n=XXX respondents to the 2011 survey and n=XXX alumni who had not completed the 2011 survey. The remainder of the sample was emailed on the morning of August XX, 2012.

The discrepancy between the N=XX,XXX emailed and the N=XX,XXX eligible alumni is due to the accidental exclusion of N=XXX alumni. These cases were added to the sample on September XX, 2012.

The invitation email was sent under the signature of (NAME) from (SPONSOR) mail servers and was sent as an HTML formatted email using the logotype of the (SURVEY). Alumni received one of two versions of the invitation: one for respondents to the 2011 survey and one for those who did not respond to the 2011 survey. The reply address to the letter was (NAME)’s office (queries were forwarded to the director of the (SURVEY) by the Dean’s office). The decision to send email from (SPONSOR) rather than (SURVEY FIRM) was based on the perceived greater credibility of (SPONSOR) for its alumni, which was thought to enhance the probability of response. The email formatting used was similar to other (SPONSOR) email messages sent to alumni. The email contained an embedded unique URL link that

allowed alumni to go directly to the survey. The texts of the invitation email can be found in Appendix D, pp. xx-xx.

First Email Reminder

The first email reminder was sent under the signature of [NAME] to all nonrespondent alumni on September X, 2012 (N=XX,XXX). Respondents who refused to participate in the survey in communications with (SURVEY FIRM) or (SPONSOR) were excluded from the sample. In order to enhance the response rate to the survey, it was decided to vary the style and tone of the email. (NAME) wrote the reminder text in his own style (which was subjected to minimal editing in order to preserve the style) and the note was sent without HTML formatting. (The text of the reminder letter can be found in Appendix D, p. xx.) As before, the email was sent from (SPONSOR) servers. The reply to address was to (NAME)'s office (queries were forwarded to the manager of the (SURVEY)). The logic behind these decisions was to have the email reminder appear as close to an ordinary email as possible. It was thought that this would convey a sense of authenticity and personalization to the request, as well as potentially being more attractive for a subset of the population.

Invitations for Incorrectly Excluded Alumni

As noted above, N=XXX alumni were incorrectly excluded from the sample. These alumni were sent invitations from (NAME) on September XX, 2012. The email text and format were identical to those used for previous respondents. (All XXX had responded to the 2011 survey.)

Note to Alumni Club Presidents

Taking advantage of its close connections with alumni and the tight interconnections between alumni, (SPONSOR)'s director of external relations reached out to alumni ambassadors to send reminders to alumni they knew on September XX, 2012. The text of the note is found in Appendix D, p. xx.

Second Email Reminder

The second email reminder was sent to all nonrespondent alumni, except for those who had originally been incorrectly excluded, a total of N=XX,XXX, on September XX, 2012 under the signature of (NAME). (The email can be found in Appendix D, p. xx.) As before, the email was sent from (SPONSOR) servers. The reply to address was (NAME)'s office and messages were directly monitored by the director of the (SURVEY).

Third Email Reminder

A third email reminder was sent to all nonrespondent alumni (N=XX,XXX), including those who had originally been incorrectly excluded, on September XX, 2012. This email was sent under (NAME)'s signature, again from (SPONSOR) servers using his office email account as a reply to address. The text of the email can be found in Appendix D, p. xx.

Closing the Survey

The survey was closed on September XX, 2012. The field period for the survey was August XX-September XX, 2012. [4]

WEIGHTING [11]

Data were cell-weighted to age x location x sex parameters for the population. Cell weights were calculated as the population size of a given age x location x cell divided by the size of the sample (i.e., completed surveys) in the same age x location x sex cell. This scales the weights so that cells with lower proportions of the population responding receive greater weights, adjusting for the cell's under-representation. Cells with higher proportions of the population responding receive lower weights, adjusting for the cell's over-representation. The weights were then rescaled to sum to the sample size instead of the population size. Calculations and weights are shown in Table 1, below.

Table 1. Weighting Calculations

Age	Female		Male	
	International	U.S.	International	U.S.
<i>Population</i>				
25-39				
40-49				
50-59				
60-69				
70+				
Missing				
<i>Sample</i>				
25-39				
40-49				
50-59				
60-69				
70+				
Missing				
<i>Weight</i>				
25-39				
40-49				
50-59				
60-69				
70+				
Missing				
<i>Weight Adjusted to n</i>				
25-39				
40-49				
50-59				
60-69				
70+				
Missing				

Note: Display of weights truncated at three decimal places.

Precision of Estimates [10]

The (SURVEY NAME) was a census, in that it attempted to contact all (SPONSOR) alumni with an email address and who were not invited to participate in the (OTHER SURVEY). Although the census fell short of full response (see Final Dispositions and Outcome Rates), the resulting observations do not form a random sample drawn from a specified population. As such, sampling error (the extent to which responses to a survey may be expected to differ from those of the population from which the survey sample was drawn due to the sampling process) does not apply. (The sample sizes for all subgroups examined in the following analyses are, however, reported). The weights described previously adjust for systematic (i.e., nonsampling) errors between the population of (SPONSOR) alumni and the respondents to the survey on known characteristics (age and location).

Final Dispositions and Outcome Rates

Final dispositions and outcome rates are shown in Table 2, below. A total of XX interviews were completed. [10] The column “All Alumni” shows dispositions including cases that were ineligible: alumni that requested not to be contacted by any means, alumni that requested not to be contacted via email, alumni that refused the 2011 (SURVEY), alumni without email addresses, and those that were

ineligible because they were included in the sample for the 2012 (SURVEY NAME)/(OTHER SURVEY). The column eligible alumni excluded these cases. American Association for Public Opinion Research outcome rates are calculated for this column. Overall, a response rate of XX.X% (AAPOR formula 1) was achieved.

Table 1. Final Dispositions and Outcome Rates Including Alumni Without Contact Information

	All Alumni	Eligible Alumni
1.0	Interview	
<i>1.1</i>	<i>Completed interview</i>	
<i>1.2</i>	<i>Partial interview</i>	
2.0	Eligible non-interview	
<i>2.10</i>	<i>Refusal and break-off</i>	
<i>2.11</i>	<i>Refusal</i>	
2.111	Alumni list: no contact all	
2.112	Alumni list: no contact email	
2.113	Refusal (2011)	
2.114	Refusal (2012)	
<i>2.12</i>	<i>Break-off</i>	
2.121	Implicit: logged on to survey, did not complete any items	
3.0	Unknown eligibility, non-interview	
<i>3.10</i>	<i>Nothing known about respondent/contact information</i>	
<i>3.11</i>	<i>No invitation sent</i>	
3.111	No email address	
3.112	[other] survey	
<i>3.19</i>	<i>Nothing ever returned</i>	
	Total All Cases	
	Response Rate 1	
	Cooperation Rate 1	
	Refusal Rate 1	
	Contact Rate 1	

For more information about this survey, contact XXXXX at EMAIL.[12]

Endnotes of Checklist Items

1. Who sponsored and conducted the research study (and sources of funding if different from sponsor).
2. The exact wording and presentation of questions and response options whose results are reported (and any preceding instructions or questions that might reasonably be expected to influence results).
3. A definition of the population under study and its geographic location.
4. Dates of data collection.
5. A description of the sampling frame(s) and its coverage of the target population, including mention of any segment of the target population that is not covered by the design.
6. The name of the sample supplier, if the sampling frame and/or the sample itself was provided by a third party.
7. [If applicable]: The methods used to recruit the panel or participants, if the sample was drawn from a pre-recruited panel or pool of respondents.
8. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected, recruited, intercepted or otherwise contacted or encountered, along with any eligibility requirements and/or oversampling. If quotas were used, the variables defining the quotas will be reported. If a within-household selection procedure was used, this will be described. The description of the sampling frame and sample design will include sufficient detail to determine whether the respondents were selected using probability or non-probability methods.
9. Method(s) and mode(s) used to administer the survey (e.g., CATI, CAPI, ACASI, IVR, mail survey, web survey) and the language(s) offered.
10. Sample sizes (by sampling frame if more than one was used) and a discussion of the precision of the findings. For probability samples, the estimates of sampling error will be reported, and the discussion will state whether or not the reported margins of sampling error or statistical analyses have been adjusted for the design effect due to weighting, clustering, or other factors. Reports of non-probability samples will only provide measures of precision if they are accompanied by a detailed description of how the underlying model was specified, its assumptions validated and the measure(s) calculated. To avoid confusion, it is best to avoid using the term “margin of error” or “margin of sampling error” in conjunction with non-probability samples.
11. A description of how the weights were calculated, including the variables used and the sources of weighting parameters, if weighted estimates are reported.
12. Contact for obtaining more information about the study.

EXAMPLE 6

AREA PROBABILITY FACE-TO-FACE SURVEY

The (survey organization name) [1] conducted this study in collaboration with (client name) of (organization name) [1], who obtained funding for this study from (funding organization) [1]. The goal of the study was to (study purpose). The method chosen for gathering this information was an in-person survey of residents in (specify geographic area) [9]. The interviews were conducted in both English and Spanish [9]. The study protocol was submitted for review by the (institution) Institutional Review board, and the protocol was approved on (date). This report describes the study methodology.

STUDY DESIGN

The goal of the study was to provide estimates for the following six community areas of (specify geographic areas). The design required one in-person interview with a randomly selected adult aged 18 or older from within randomly selected households in each of the target community areas. Each participating adult received a cash incentive of (specify \$\$) for completing the interview.

Sample Design [3,5,8]

Adult individuals living in households from each of the six selected community areas comprised the sample for this study. The goal of the study was to obtain 300 completed face-to-face interviews in each community area for a total of 1,800 completed interviews. A **three-stage** probability sample design was employed. At the **first** stage, 15 census blocks from each of the six neighborhoods were randomly selected. The blocks were selected using Probability Proportionate to Size sampling (PPS), meaning that census blocks within each of the neighborhoods were selected proportionate to the number of individuals age 18 and over who lived on each block according to the 2000 U.S. Census. After the blocks were selected, interviewers recorded each housing unit on each block in a process known as block listing.

In the **second** stage, households were selected at random from the blocks. PPS sampling prescribes that an equal number of housing units be selected from each block. Thus, once a block is selected, the more households on the block, the less likely a particular household on that block will be selected. Ideally, in PPS sampling, the probability of a block being selected multiplied by the probability of a household being selected from that block results in an equal probability of selection of households. In this ideal situation, no weights would be necessary. In keeping with this sampling plan, we attempted to randomly select XX households from each of the blocks. In some cases there were fewer than XX housing units on a block; when this happened, we randomly selected equal numbers of households from the remaining blocks in the neighborhood.

The XX blocks within each neighborhood were randomized and placed in sub sections known as replicates. One block from each neighborhood was assigned to a replicate. Sample was released in randomized replicates over time for two reasons. First, if we need to conduct analysis or end data collection before the entire sample has been released, the sample we will have worked at that point will be a random selection of the entire sample. Second, as we work through the sample and finalize replicates, we can use the information from earlier replicates to improve the projections about needed sample for upcoming sample releases. We released replicates on each of the following dates: [insert dates].

The **third** stage of selection refers to random selection of an individual within the household. The adult questionnaire was administered to a randomly selected adult 18 years of age and older in the household who spoke either English or Spanish. The adult was selected using the Trodahl-Carter-Bryant method of selection. This methodology allows the interviewer to randomly select which eligible adult

household member should be interviewed after finding out the number and gender of eligible individuals in the household [8]. A copy of the household selection screener can be found in Appendix X.

Because all study designs are different, there is never a way to precisely predict the starting sample size necessary to achieve a targeted number of completed interviews. In lieu of a precise model, [survey organization name] estimates starting sample size based upon experience from similar studies. We based the anticipated completion rates for this study (and consequently, the starting sample size necessary) on actual completion rates from other area probability studies conducted in this region by (survey organization name) in the past. We forecast the following sampling rates for this study: XX% of the households that we listed would be non-duplicates, XX% of those would be occupied, XX% of occupied households would be contacted to conduct a screener, XX% of these would cooperate to the screener, XX% of those who cooperated would be eligible, XX% of the eligible would be contacted for the final interview, and XX% of those would complete the interview. Based on these rates, we originally estimated a total starting sample size of X,XXX.

Survey Instrument

The draft survey questionnaire was subjected to cognitive testing, during which XX cognitive interviews were completed with a convenience sample of XX adults. Participants received \$xx for participating in these interviews. The instrument was tested in both English and Spanish. As a result of the testing, several items were modified by the questionnaire design team. The final survey instrument contained 475 items. A copy of the final version of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix X [2].

A formal pretest of the study design and the survey instruments was conducted in [date]. Two experienced interviewers conducted household screening and interviews on X blocks from one of the selected community areas. The interviewers completed a total of XX pretest interviews. Respondents received a \$50 incentive. The study team slightly modified some of the questionnaire items based on feedback from the pretest.

MAIN STUDY

Interviewers listed each street address on the selected blocks in [date]. Interviewing for the main study began in [date]. All data collection was completed in [date] [4].

Advance Letters

Advance letters were mailed to each household to introduce the study and explain its purpose. These letters were addressed to “Resident.” Given the neighborhood focus of the study letters were printed on letterhead from a local community agency signed by key agency staff whenever possible. Copies of the advance letters are provided in Appendix D. Advance letters were mailed that had been translated into Spanish to sampled households in those community areas where census data indicated a large percentage of people of Hispanic origin; the other communities received letters in English only.

Validation

A minimum of XX% of each interviewer’s work at random was validated by a supervisor to ensure that each interview was conducted correctly.

Field Procedures

To maximize chances of finding respondents at home, interviewers attempted in-person contacts at different times of the day and on different days of the week. We conducted at least 85 percent of all interviewing during evening and weekend hours, as many adults were at work during weekdays. If an

English-only interviewer reached a Spanish-speaking household, field staff transferred the case to a bilingual interviewer for the duration of the data collection period.

FINAL DISPOSITION OF SAMPLE/RESPONSE RATES

Calculation of Response Rates, Overall

Interviews were attempted at a total of XXXX households in the six neighborhoods; a total of XXXX interviews were successfully completed [10]. Tables 1a and 1b show the disposition of sample and the rates for the adult cases. Appendices G and H contain a description of the disposition codes and rates, respectively. Appendix I reports dispositions and final rates separately for each community area.

Table 1a. Disposition of Sample, Entire Final Sample

Code	Disposition	Number	Percent
01	Completed English—adult and child		
02	Completed Spanish—adult and child		
01	Completed English—adult only		
02	Complete Spanish—adult only		
30	No answer/busy		
32	Eligible respondent not available		
33	Unscreened respondent not available		
34	Unable to access building		
40	Final refusal screener		
41	Final refusal English		
42	Final refusal Spanish		
55	Not able to interview during survey period		
56	Never able to interview		
60	Other eligible		
70	Ineligible, no adults in household over 18/under 75		
87	Non-residential		
88	Ineligible, foreign language		
90	Other ineligible		
TOTAL			

Table 1b. Sample Numbers and Rates, Entire Final Sample

	Number	Rate
Total sample		
Non duplicates		
Residential		
Contact to screener		
Cooperation to screener		
Eligible		
Contact to final		
Cooperation to final		

Response rate

Refusal rate

Cooperation rate

The **response rate** is the number of completed interviews divided by the eligible sample. The number of eligibles includes those for whom we could complete a screener and could therefore determine eligibility (*known* eligibles) plus the cases we assumed to be eligible (*assumed* eligibles). The assumed eligibles include a proportion of those residences with which we could not make contact and a proportion of those households in which we did make contact but could not conduct a screener.

We assume that households where we cannot make contact are residential and eligible to the same degree as the sample in which we can make that determination. In other words, the “no answer” cases (disposition 30) and “unable to access building” cases (disposition 34) are multiplied by the percent residential and the eligibility rate.

For households with which we make contact yet cannot conduct a screener, we assume the unscreened sample is eligible to the same degree as the screened sample. Therefore, we multiply these cases by the eligibility rate. The number of residences for which we could not conduct a screener can be determined from Table 1b. These cases are equal to the “contact to screener” cases minus the “cooperation to screener” cases, or XXX cases. Assuming XX% of these are eligible, an additional XXX cases are included as eligibles in the calculation of response rates.

The total eligible sample is then the number we know to be eligible, plus the fraction of no contacts described above, plus the fraction of unscreened respondents described above. For the overall sample, the number of eligibles is X,XXX. The resulting response rate is XX.X% (X,XXX completes divided by X,XXX eligibles). Note that the response, cooperation and refusal rates reported in this document conform to the standards of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR, 2000). Specifically, the response rates reported are based on AAPOR formula RR3; the cooperation rates are based upon AAPOR formula COOP3; and the refusal rates are based upon AAPOR formula REF2.

The refusal rate is the number of refusals divided by the eligible sample. Only refusals of eligible and assumed eligible respondents are included. Therefore, the total number of refusals equals the XXX who refused after screening (dispositions 41 and 42) plus XX.X% of the XXX who refused prior to screening (disposition 40), for a total of XXX refusals. The refusal rate is therefore XX.X%. The cooperation rate is the number of completed interviews divided by the number of completed interviews plus the number of refusals, or XX.X%.

SAMPLE WEIGHTING AND PRECISION [10, 11]

The calculation of weights for the sample was necessary for two reasons: (1) to account for differential probabilities of selection, and (2) to adjust, or post-stratify, the sample to resemble the census distribution of the population by neighborhood. The calculation of the final weight, which is the estimated number of individuals in the population that the sampled person represents, is calculated in stages as described in this section.

Selection Weights

A selection weight is equal to the inverse of the probability of selection. In this study, there were three probabilities of selection for each case:

- (1) *The probability the block was selected.* For this study the probability that a block was selected equals the number of people 18 and over on the block divided by the number of people 18 and over in the neighborhood. As such, blocks that have larger populations of people age 18 and over had a higher probability of being selected than blocks with fewer people in this age group. An exception to this is that the final eight blocks selected for Roseland were randomly selected without regard for population size. The probability of selection of the block is the same for the adult and child datasets.
- (2) *The probability the household was selected.* This equals the number of households selected on the block divided by the total number of households on the block. The probability of a household being selected is the same for the adult and child datasets.
- (3) *The probability that the particular respondent was selected from among the eligible individuals.* This is 1 divided by the number of eligible individuals age 18 and older.

For each case, the final probability of selection was calculated by multiplying the three probabilities noted above together. The inverse of this probability was calculated and this inverse is the selection weight.

Post-stratification Weights

Post-stratification weights were calculated for the dataset to ensure that the marginal distribution of several demographic variables conformed to the marginal distributions of the same variables from the 2000 Census for the six neighborhoods. The variables used in the weighting procedure were age group (18–29; 30–44; and 45 and older), gender, and race. Calculating the post-stratification weights involved several steps outlined below. Appendix X contains the SPSS syntax for the weight calculations.

After applying the selection weight, we compared the gender distribution in the sample data to that of the Census data. The initial gender weights were the ratio of the Census percentages to the study sample percentages (e.g., % men in Census data divided by % men in sample data).

We weighted the study data with the initial gender weight and compared the weighted frequencies of age group to the age groups in the Census (18–29; 30–44; 45 and older). We computed the initial age weights as the ratio of the Census percentages to the study percentages. This weight was then multiplied by the gender weight from the first step to create a second-stage weight.

We weighted cases with the second-stage age weight and compared the study race distribution with that of the Census. Race weights were computed as the ratio of Census percentages to study percentages. The race weights were multiplied by the age weights from the second stage for a third stage of weights.

Weighting was completed in this manner until the study sample percentages for each neighborhood had been adjusted to the demographic variables in the Census for each neighborhood. This took several iterations for some of the variables.

For the final stage of weight calculation we adjusted the weights such that the sum of weighted cases would equal the population ages 18 and older in the 2000 Census for each neighborhood.

The variable named *xxxxxx* in the dataset is the post-stratification weight. Because the sampled cases have been weighted proportionally to the size of the neighborhood, data for all neighborhoods can be analyzed together to find aggregate proportions.

Cluster Adjustments

Interviews were clustered by city block; thus, additional adjustments to the data file are necessary to conduct appropriate analyses. Because the residents residing on each block are more similar to one

another than are residents residing on different blocks, greater homogeneity can be expected within and greater heterogeneity can be expected across sub-regions.

Although cluster sample designs such as the one employed in this study produce significant cost savings over simple random samples, statistical adjustments are required to compensate for this within sub-region homogeneity. If left uncorrected, this within sub-region homogeneity can lead to biased standard errors and inappropriate statistical inferences. In the data file, the variable *xxxx* can be used to identify the six strata (or sub-regions.) We strongly recommend use of the XXXXX statistical package or similar software for making these adjustments.

SURVEY LIMITATIONS

Four potential sources of error must be considered in any survey, including sampling, coverage, nonresponse, and measurement error. Each of these is briefly discussed below.

Sampling Error

It is important to recognize that the random sample of interviews completed as part of this study is but one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected. The estimated population parameters (e.g., the proportion in need of specific types of services, the proportion male vs. female, etc.) from each of these potential samples would vary from one another by random chance. The average of these potential deviations for any population parameter is referred to as the *standard error of the estimate*. Standard errors can be used to construct confidence intervals around a survey's population estimates. Confidence margins for smaller geographic sub-region estimates will be less precise. We also note again that the standard errors used to estimate confidence margins for this study should be adjusted for the survey's complex sample design using the STATA statistical package (StataCorp, 2001) or similar software.

The design effect for this survey is Z.ZZ. Sampling error for the complete sample is +/- X percentage points at the 95% confidence interval. For the community areas, sampling errors range from +/- X.X to +/- X.Y percentage points [10].

Coverage Error

Coverage error refers to the exclusion of eligible cases and the inclusion of ineligible cases from a sample frame. In this study, potential sources of coverage error could include misclassifications of occupied housing units as unoccupied and the failure to identify some housing units altogether. Given our quality control procedures, we are confident that coverage error in this study is very low.

Nonresponse Error

Nonresponse error is concerned with the bias introduced into survey estimates when individuals who are randomly selected for inclusion in the study decline or are otherwise unable to participate. The most basic concern is that those who do not participate are in some important ways different from those who do, thereby introducing a systematic bias. Nonresponse is only a problem when the respondents are different from nonrespondents. Using standard response rate definitions supplied by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (2000), the total response rate of households initially sampled for this survey was xx.x%. Several approaches were employed to evaluate nonresponse error in this survey. Findings from these analyses are presented in Appendix X.

Measurement Error

In addition to sampling, coverage, and non-response bias, numerous sources of measurement error may influence results. For example, question wording, the ordering of questions within the instrument, and the mode of data collection may each influence data quality. None of these forms of potential measurement error can be definitively eliminated. However, we have attempted to minimize error associated with the design of the survey instrument through careful pretesting and reviews by our questionnaire review experts. Also, although face-to-face interviews generally are considered the most representative mode of survey data collection, it is known that self-administered surveys sometimes are more appropriate for the collection of highly sensitive information. Consequently, the need for some services that may be viewed as more stigmatizing may be underestimated in this study.

SURVEY ANALYSES

Primary analyses of all data from this survey are provided in the accompanying substantive report, which is also available at: www.xxxx.edu/finalreport.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information regarding this study, contact XXXXX at EMAIL.[12]

Endnotes of Checklist Items

1. Who sponsored and conducted the research study (and sources of funding if different from sponsor).
2. The exact wording and presentation of questions and response options whose results are reported (and any preceding instructions or questions that might reasonably be expected to influence results).
3. A definition of the population under study and its geographic location.
4. Dates of data collection.
5. A description of the sampling frame(s) and its coverage of the target population, including mention of any segment of the target population that is not covered by the design.
6. The name of the sample supplier, if the sampling frame and/or the sample itself was provided by a third party.
7. [If applicable]: The methods used to recruit the panel or participants, if the sample was drawn from a pre-recruited panel or pool of respondents.
8. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected, recruited, intercepted or otherwise contacted or encountered, along with any eligibility requirements and/or oversampling. If quotas were used, the variables defining the quotas will be reported. If a within-household selection procedure was used, this will be described. The description of the sampling frame and sample design will include sufficient detail to determine whether the respondents were selected using probability or non-probability methods.
9. Method(s) and mode(s) used to administer the survey (e.g., CATI, CAPI, ACASI, IVR, mail survey, web survey) and the language(s) offered.
10. Sample sizes (by sampling frame if more than one was used) and a discussion of the precision of the findings. For probability samples, the estimates of sampling error will be reported, and the discussion will state whether or not the reported margins of sampling error or statistical analyses have been adjusted for the design effect due to weighting, clustering, or other factors. Reports of non-probability samples will only provide measures of precision if they are accompanied by a detailed description of how the underlying model was specified, its assumptions validated and the measure(s) calculated. To avoid confusion, it is best to avoid using the term “margin of error” or “margin of sampling error” in conjunction with non-probability samples.
11. A description of how the weights were calculated, including the variables used and the sources of weighting parameters, if weighted estimates are reported.
12. Contact for obtaining more information about the study.