



Maximizing Response in a Two-Phase Survey with Mail as the Primary Mode

Jill M. Montaquila, J. Michael Brick,
Mary C. Hagedorn, Douglas Williams

Presented at the 65th Annual AAPOR
Conference

Chicago, Illinois

The views presented in this paper are those of the authors and do not represent the official views of the United States Department of Education.

- Introduction
 - The National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES): Background
 - Motivation for redesign
- Overview of design
- Take-home message
- Embedded experiments
- Key findings
- Plans for the 2011 Field Test
- Summary

The National Household Education Surveys Program

- Sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics
- Surveys roughly every 2 years 1991-2007
- All surveys through 2007: RDD/CATI
- Within-household sampling (up to 3 persons)
- Sample sizes:
 - 34,000 – 64,000 completed household Screeners
 - 2,250 – 24,600 completed Topical surveys

Motivation for redesign

- Declining response rates
 - Screener response: Low 80's in early years – 53% in 2007
 - Topical rates: 90% in early years – 75% in 2007
- Declining coverage rates for landline RDD
 - January-June 2009: 22.7% of households were cell-only, and another 1.9% were phoneless (Blumberg and Luke 2009)
 - Exclusion of about 20% of landline telephone households (Fahimi, Kulp, and Brick, *POQ* 2009)


- 2009 Pilot Study to be followed by large-scale methodological Field Test in 2011
- Pilot Study objectives
 - Alternative to landline RDD
 - Must be feasible for a full-scale NHES collection
 - Rule out approaches that clearly were not worthwhile-- NOT to detect small differences
 - Work out operational kinks
 - Determine any needed schedule adjustments

- Key elements of Pilot Study design
 - Address-based sample (n=10,200)
 - Mail as primary mode, with test of phone follow-up
 - Two-phase collection
 - Screener
 - Topical survey (personalized)
 - Embedded experiments
 - Three samples
 - **National sample (n=10,200)**
 - Sample of addresses in linguistically isolated (Spanish) tracts (n = 800)
 - Targeted sample of households with children (n = 800)


Take-home Message

- Overall, Pilot Study provided evidence that the two-phase self-administered approach is feasible
 - Screener response rate: 59% vs. 53% in NHES:2007
 - Topical response rate: 75% (same as NHES:2007)
 - Certain conditions yield even higher rates
 - As high as
 - 64% for Screener (all-mail cases; screenout),
 - 85% for Topical (\$15, FedEx follow-up, all-mail Screeners)
 - Based on preliminary examination of key items
 - Item response rates were high
 - Little evidence of skip pattern issues
 - Passed “laugh test” comparison for key statistics

Embedded Experiments: Screener Phase



Embedded Experiments: Topical Phase



Key Findings

- Screenout and Engaging Screeners outperformed the Core Screener

National sample rates	Screenout	Core	Engaging
Screener response rate	61.8%	56.9%	57.2%
% of households with children	30.1	30.5	32.2
Topical response rate	73.1	74.8	76.3

Key Findings (Cont.)

- Screener follow-up stages picked up households with children at higher rates than the initial stage

Respondent subgroup	Percent of households with children
Overall	30.9
Initial respondents	27.4
Follow-up respondents	
Mail only for 1 st and 2 nd follow-up	34.8
Phone for 1 st or 2 nd follow-up	30.5

- (last figure should be 30.4)

More in Williams et al. (AAPOR 2010, Saturday 2:15 p.m., Concurrent Session C)

- Mail outperformed phone for follow-up
 - For Screener nonresponse, limited by ability to match phone numbers (57% match rate)
 - Even when phone number matches were available, phone follow-up was much less effective than mail
 - 19% of Screener cases assigned to phone follow-up finalized as nonworking/nonresidential
 - Only 17% of mail Topical nonresponse cases sent to phone for follow-up were completed

Key Findings (Cont.)

- Mail outperformed phone for nonresponse follow-up (cont.)

Assigned mode for Screener follow-up	1 st follow-up (Screener) completion rate	2 nd follow-up (Screener) completion rate
Mail (No vendor phone number)	42.8	27.1
Mail (Vendor phone number)	49.3	34.6
Phone (Vendor phone number)*	34.4	21.8
Phone (Vendor phone number), completed by phone	18.0	12.4

*Includes late mail returns received after case had been sent for telephone collection

Key Findings (Cont.)

- Incentives were effective in eliciting cooperation at the Topical phase
 - Topical response rates by incentive level:
 - \$0: 70%
 - \$5: 74%
 - \$15: 81%
 - No evidence that offering an incentive results in respondents with different characteristics, but the \$15 incentive elicited higher initial cooperation rates
 - More on this in Tubman and Williams (AAPOR 2010, Today, 1:45 p.m., Concurrent Session C)

Key Findings (Cont.)

- For Topical nonresponse follow-up, indication that FedEx might outperform Priority Mail
 - 53% of those followed up by FedEx responded, compared to 49% for Priority Mail (not significant at $\alpha=0.05$)

Linguistically Isolated Sample

- Experimented with English-only (Core) and Bilingual Screeners
- Similar response rates for English and Bilingual Screeners:
46.2% (English) vs. 45.8% (Bilingual)
- Language appears to be a key real barrier to participation (More on this in Zukerberg and Han, AAPOR 2010, Thursday, Poster Session 1)

Plans for the 2011 Field Test

- Mail as primary mode for Screener and Topicals; very limited use of telephone
- Screener form/material experiments
 - Asking for child's name vs. not asking
 - English only vs. bilingual vs. dual (English and Spanish) to Spanish surname/linguistically isolated
- Mailing service experiments
- Topical incentive experiments

- For NHES, transition to address-based sampling with mail as primary mode is promising
 - Higher response rates than last RDD collection
 - Much higher coverage rates than landline RDD
 - No apparent significant data quality issues
- Challenges (particularly language and literacy) remain
- Methodological experiments in 2011 Field Test will inform design of the future

Contact Information

Jill M. Montaquila

1600 Research Blvd., RE 482

Rockville, MD 20850

jillmontaquila@westat.com