Supporting Statement B for:

California Health Interview Survey

Cancer Control Module

(CHIS-CCM) <mark>2011</mark> (NCI)

<mark>OMB No. 0925-0598
Expiry Date 2/28/2011</mark>

<mark>December, 2010</mark>

<mark>This submission is a revision from the 2008 submission and
the yellow highlights indicate changes.</mark>

Nancy Breen,
Project Officer

Applied Research Program
Division of Cancer Control and Population Sciences
National Cancer Institute
National Institutes of Health

6130 Executive Blvd.
Bethesda, MD 20892
breenn@mail.nih.gov
Phone: 301-496-4675
FAX: 301-435-3710

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B: COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1:   CHIS Cancer Control Module 2011 and Demographic Core

Attachment 2:   Organizations and Publications Using CHIS Data

Attachment 3:   CHIS Making an Impact (Brief)

Attachment 4:   Privacy Impact Assessments (PIAs)

Attachment 5A-F: CHIS Advisory Board, Technical Advisory Committee, and
Data Disclosure Advisory Committee Membership
- 5A: CHIS Advisory Board
- 5B: CHIS Adult Technical Advisory Committee
- 5C: CHIS Adolescent Technical Advisory Committee
- 5D: CHIS Multicultural Technical Advisory Committee
- 5E: CHIS Sampling Design and Survey Methodology Technical Advisory Committee
- 5F: CHIS Data Disclosure Advisory Committee

Attachment 6A-E: CHIS 2011 Subject Contact Materials
- 6A: Survey Advance Letter
- 6B: Telephone Introduction and Consent/Assent Scripts
- 6C: Screener Refusal Conversion Letter
- 6D: Extended Interview Refusal Conversion Letter
- 6E: Permission Refusal Conversion Letter

Attachment 7:   Memo from NIH Privacy Act Officer

Attachment 8:   Office of Human Subject Research (OHSR) Determination and UCLA Institutional Review Board Approval

Attachment 9:   Certificate of Confidentiality

Attachment 10A-C: CHIS Data Security Policies
- 10A: CHIS Data Collection Security Policies
- 10B: CHIS Data Access Center Policies and Procedures
- 10C: CHIS Data Delivery Protocol

Attachment 11:   CHIS Geographic Strata and Selection Probabilities

B: COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

B.1.   Respondent Universe and Sampling Methods

Respondent Universe: CHIS is a telephone survey of California's civilian, non-institutionalized population residing in households. The survey excludes potential respondents who are unable to speak English or one of the four non-English languages in which the survey is offered. One adult (age 18 or older) and, whenever possible, one adolescent (age 12-17) for whom the selected adult is the parent/guardian will be selected from participating households to receive the survey. The target sample size is 48,000 adults and 4,000 adolescents. Additionally, approximately 150 adults and 16 adolescents will complete a pilot version of the CHIS survey prior to fielding. Additional information on the sample design is included in **Attachment 11**, which shows the 44 geographic strata, the target sample size within stratum, the total number of households per stratum based on California Department of Finance (CDOF) population projections for 2011, and the approximate unadjusted selection probability within each stratum.

Sample Design and Sampling Methods: The survey methods are consistent with the OMB Guidance on Agency Survey and Statistical Information Collections (January 20, 2006). CHIS uses a dual-frame sampling design. The first frame is a geographically stratified RDD sample of landline numbers in California with a supplemental oversample of various ethnic sub-populations. The second frame consists of households who use a cell phone as their primary telephone. The data from these two sampling frames will be integrated into a

single data file in order to provide a more representative sample of California's non-institutionalized population.

The geographically stratified RDD sample is designed to produce both state-level estimates and county-level estimates for most of California's 58 counties. The sample is allocated to 44 geographic areas (sampling strata), defined as counties or aggregates of smaller counties with a minimum population size of 50,000 persons per stratum. A minimum sample of 500 persons is allocated to each stratum to maximize the effective sample size for county-level estimates and statewide estimates for major racial and ethnic groups. An ethnic oversample will supplement the RDD sample to provide robust estimates for Koreans (n=500), and Vietnamese (n=500).

The second frame of the CHIS sample will collect data on the significant and growing population segment of cell phone users. According to the National Center for Health Statistics, one out of every four American households had cell phones but no landlines during the second half of 2009.[1] The purpose of the CHIS cell phone sample is to improve the coverage of the telephone survey and minimize any bias that could result from limiting the sample to residential households with landlines.[2] A pilot study was conducted as an adjunct to CHIS 2005 to determine the feasibility of conducting CHIS with a sample of households with cellular telephone service only (no landline service), and a cell phone

---

[1] Blumberg, Stephen J., Julian V. Luke. 2009. "Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates From the National Health Interview Survey, July – December 2009." Division of Health Interview Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics.
http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhis/earlyrelease/wireless201005.pdf

[2] Tucker, Clyde, J. Michael Brick, Brian Meekins. 2007. Household Telephone Service and Usage Patterns in the United States in 2004: Implications for Telephone Samples. Public Opinion Quarterly. 71(1), 3-22.

sample of 825 households was conducted during CHIS 2007. Pilot data from CHIS 2005 and data from CHIS 2007 show that response rates for cell phone only users were similar to or slightly lower than those with landline phones, and that no practical limitations significantly influenced survey administration. In 2009, cell phone sample was expanded to include households who use a cell phone as their principal telephone. In 2011, it is anticipated that the sample size of households who use cell phones as their principle telephone will be expanded.

Respondent Selection: CHIS is a multi-stage interview—first households are sampled and then respondents are selected within households. At the screener stage, an adult informant (age 18 or older) residing in a household is contacted and asked how many adults reside in the household. If there is only one adult in the household, that adult is selected as the adult respondent. If there are two adults living in the household, the Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) software randomly selects one adult to be the CHIS respondent. If there are three or more adults, the informant will be asked which adult had the most recent birthday, and that adult will be the selected respondent. If the selected respondent is an older adult (65 years and older) who is too frail or ill to participate, the informant will be asked to identify a proxy for the selected older adult.

During the adult interview, adolescents age 12-17 residing in the household will be enumerated. Only if the selected adult respondent is the parent or guardian of one or more adolescents in the household will an adolescent be randomly selected. Following the completion of the adult interview, the

interviewer will ask for the adult for consent to contact the selected adolescent. The interviewer will then attempt to contact the adolescent and ask him/her for assent to participate in the survey.

For the cell phone sample, the adult informant will first be asked whether he/she is speaking on a cell phone that is used solely for business purposes; if the respondent answers "yes" to this question, he/she is ineligible for participation in the cell phone component of the survey. If there is only one adult in the household or there are multiple adults and each adult has a cell phone, then the adult answering the dialed number will be selected. If some members of the household share a common cell phone then the CHIS sampling methods described above will be implemented to ensure that every adult in the household has an equal chance of selection. This randomization and selection approach yields a sample that is approximately representative of the adult and adolescent populations in each stratum in terms of characteristics such as age, gender, and race and ethnicity.

Reporting Race/Ethnicity Data: CHIS collects race/ethnicity information in the question format mandated by OMB in the 1997 Revisions (OMB Bulletin No. 00-02, March 9, 2000). In all previous cycles of CHIS, OMB approved the method used to collect and report race/ethnicity data. Respondents that report more than one racial group, or a racial group and Hispanic ethnicity, are subsequently asked if the respondent identifies "most" with a particular race/ethnicity; if the respondent most identifies with one group, s/he is then asked to identify that group. Consistent with previous cycles, the CHIS data set

will include a race variable that is based on OMB standards for race/ethnicity and supplemental information about which race/ethnicity the multi-racial respondents most identify with, if any. Lastly, the data set will include a race/ethnicity variable created based on California Department of Finance standards. Because CHIS is funded by state, federal, and private funders, these additional race/ethnicity questions are needed to meet the requirements of its California sponsors. They do not conflict with either the collection of race/ethnicity information or the construction of variables based on the OMB standards.

Race and ethnicity categories: Following OMB guidelines, CHIS asks respondents about race and ethnicity in two separate questions. Respondents are first asked if they are Latino or Hispanic. Respondents are then asked if they would describe themselves as Native Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, African American or White. These are the five minimum categories for data on race specified by the OMB. Additionally, in the demographic section of the CHIS 2011 CCM, an "other specify" category appears as a response in question QA11_G8. This option is available for coding purposes only and is not an option read to respondents. Sometimes individual respondents may choose to provide an answer that does not correspond to the five minimum race categories. In accordance with OMB requirements, CHIS does not specify how an individual should classify himself or herself. In addition, CHIS uses over 300 interviewers from the data collection sub-contractor. Due to the larger number of interviewers, it is difficult to establish a standard set of coding criteria and some interviewers may code one way while others may code

another when respondents provide answers outside of the five categories. Ultimately, the "other specify" response provides a means for aggregating data back into the five minimum set of race categories after the completion of data collection.

Based on Section B, number seven of the OMB's "Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity," additional race and ethnicity categories may be permitted provided that they can be aggregated back into the standard categories. The 2011 CHIS-CCM includes numerous sub-ethnic categories. These categories break down the race and ethnicity categories to provide more granular-level data, and they can all be aggregated back into the standard race and ethnicity categories.

The collection of sub-ethnic categories allows CHIS to study health disparities in sub-groups within the race and ethnicity categories. In addition CHIS has the necessary sample size to conduct such studies while still keeping respondent identities confidential. Collection of sub-ethnic group data is in line with CHIS' objective to provide information on relevant health behaviors and prevention services among the state's diverse population groups and geographic areas.

Furthermore, sub-ethnic group data has been collected in previous CHIS cycles. Consistent collection of data throughout the CHIS cycles provide the ability to trend and pool data for certain ethnic groups. The ability to pool data from separate CHIS cycles provides further protection of respondent confidentiality by increasing the sample size.

Response Rates: In reporting response rates for CHIS, it must first be acknowledged that response rates for state-level surveys vary widely and are not comparable to response rates for national surveys. California as a whole, and the state's urban areas in particular, are among the most difficult in the nation in which to conduct telephone interviews.[3] In addition, California response rates have been decreasing, consistent with the national trend observed in other RDD surveys.[4,5]

Several dimensions of the survey methods used in CHIS make achieving high response rates particularly challenging. First, CHIS is an RDD telephone survey. A telephone survey is the only cost-effective mode for achieving the CHIS sample objectives of providing local level data and estimates for the state's major racial and ethnic groups. Similar surveys that are conducted in person, such as the NHIS, have higher response rates but produce relatively small samples and are far more costly. Second, as a population-based survey of households, virtually every household contacted by CHIS is eligible to participate in the survey. In other population-based surveys, only a small minority of contacted households is eligible to participate. Because the relative number of eligible households is much smaller (denominator) and the screening much simpler, they are able to obtain higher response rates.

---

[3] Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2009. Summary Data Quality Report. California ranked 41st out of 54 reporting units in overall response rates and had the highest refusal rate reported for the 2009 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System.

[4] Curtin, R., S. Presser, and E. Singer. 2005. Changes in Telephone Survey Nonresponse Over the Past Quarter Century. Public Opinion Quarterly. 69(1), 87-98.

[5] Keeter, S., J. Best, M. Dimock, and P. Craighill. 2004. The Pew Research Center Study of Survey, Nonresponse: Implications for Practice. Paper presented at 2004 meetings of the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Comparing survey response rates is further complicated by the use of different methods of calculation. Both Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) and the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) have developed standard methods for calculating response rates; however, there is considerable variation in how these formulas are implemented. The central problem is the difficulty in resolving the eligibility of the sampled telephone numbers that are never answered. Differences in disposition codes used by various CATI programs, different methods for allocating responses to eligibility categories, and different cut-off points for coding an interview as complete all contribute to variation in response rates. In addition, some surveys report weighted response rates and others report unweighted rates. Finally, multi-stage surveys differ in how they incorporate the screener and extended interviews into the response rate formula.

In CHIS 2007, the latest CHIS cycle for which response rate analysis has been completed, response rates were comparable to those of other scientific surveys in California. The CHIS 2007 overall adult response rate was 21.1% compared to the 2007 California BRFSS overall response rate of 24.1%, as reported in the *2007 BRFSS Summary Data Quality Report*. Because BRFSS reports the screener and extended interview response rates as a single unit (rather than multiplying the screener by the extended interview rates to calculate overall response rates), it is difficult to assess the comparability of these overall response rates.

A survey's response rate is not the only, or even the best, measure of its quality. Groves and Peytcheva, for example examined response rates and nonresponse bias in 59 surveys and found no direct association between nonresponse rates and nonresponse bias. In fact, some surveys with response rates over 70 percent had levels of nonresponse bias that were similar to surveys with response rates under 20 percent, depending on the variable being studied.[6] Other studies of polls and omnibus surveys support the finding that low response rates are not necessarily associated with nonresponse bias.[7,8,9]

To assess CHIS validity, CHIS 2007 examined the effects of nonresponse in an address-based probability sample of persons who completed interviews in 980 Los Angeles County households. The sample of residential addresses was matched to telephone numbers, and those that were matched were contacted and interviewed by telephone using standard CHIS procedures. Two groups were targeted for in-person recruitment: (1) addresses without a matching telephone number; and (2) addresses with a matched telephone number that did not respond to telephone recruitment. Households in these two groups were recruited to participate by an in-person visit, but all interviews were conducted by telephone. The study yielded three groups: (1) persons recruited solely by telephone; (2) persons recruited by a household visit alone; and (3) persons who

---

[6] Groves RM, Peytcheva E. The impact of nonresponse rates on nonresponse bias. Public Opinion Quarterly. 2008;72(2):167-189.

[7] Curtin, Richard, Stanley Presser, and Eleanor Singer. 2000. "The Effects of Response Rate Changes on the Index of Consumer Sentiment." Public Opinion Quarterly 64:413–28

[8] Keeter, Scott, Carolyn Miller, Andrew Kohut, Robert Groves, and Stanley Presser. 2000. "Consequences of Reducing Nonresponse in a Large National Telephone Survey." Public Opinion Quarterly 64:125–48

[9] Merkle, Daniel, and Murray Edelman. 2002. "Nonresponse in Exit Polls: A Comprehensive Analysis." In Survey Nonresponse, ed. R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, and R. J. A. Little, pp. 243–58. New York: Wiley.

did not respond to initial telephone calls but were recruited through a household visit.

Comparisons of the telephone recruitment group with the initial nonresponse group (groups 1 and 3) revealed that nonresponders were more likely to be younger, be Latino, live in households with children, and report lower levels of educational attainment and income. Statistical analyses revealed that these two groups differed with respect to one of nine health behavior indicators and with respect to four of 21 health care access and utilization indicators. After logistic regressions were performed for standard demographics (age, gender, race, ethnicity, education, home ownership, children) typically used during the weighting of CHIS data, only one difference remained statistically significant: tested for a sexually transmitted disease in the past 12 months. The results of this study demonstrate that there was no evidence of significant, systematic nonresponse bias in CHIS. For additional details on this study, see http://www.chis.ucla.edu/pdf/dataquality3_doc.pdf.

A number of proven strategies to maximize the response rates will be implemented in CHIS; these efforts are documented in B.3.

B.2. Procedures for the Collection of Information

Survey Introduction: CHIS data will be collected via telephone interviews from civilian, residential households in California. The RDD sample frame will be matched against list directories, using reverse directory services, to obtain address information so that an advance letter can be mailed to potential respondent households to explain the purpose of this study (see **Attachment 6A**). The advance letter will be mailed to all non-cell phone respondents, about 75 percent of the households in the CHIS sample. The CHIS sample of cell-phone telephone numbers cannot be matched to addresses; therefore, cell phone households will not receive advance letters.

Survey Administration: CHIS interviews will be administered as an RDD survey through a CATI system by interviewers trained by the data collection contractor and CHIS staff. ==CHIS data collection is anticipated to begin April 2011 and to continue throughout the calendar year to distribute the data collection burden and minimize seasonal bias.==

CHIS interviewers will receive at least 18 hours of project-specific instruction in addition to the general interviewer skill training and CATI skill training provided to new interviewers. In addition, each interviewer will receive four hours of refusal avoidance training that focuses on providing answers to frequently asked questions, voice quality, and listening skills. Periodically, interviewers will also receive refresher training.

To minimize data entry errors, data consistency checks and range checks will be built into the CATI programming for CHIS. To ensure quality in the

interviewing process, interviews will be randomly monitored both in person and via telephone from a remote station throughout the data collection period. All CHIS telephone calls made by the interviewers will be logged daily in detailed tracking reports, which will routinely be reviewed for irregularities and used as a check on progress.

B.2.1. Statistical Methodology for Stratification and Sample Selection

RDD Sample: CHIS uses an RDD telephone number generation technique that uses 100-banks with one or more listed telephone numbers to create a sample of potential residential households within each stratum. This produces a selection probability for a household that is equal to the ratio of the number of households selected into the sample over the total number of households known to exist in a stratum. Additional information on the sample design is included in **Attachment 11**, which shows the 44 geographic strata, the target sample size within each stratum, the total number of households per stratum (based on California Department of Finance (CDOF) population projections for 2009), and the approximate unadjusted selection probability within each stratum. To create the Korean and Vietnamese oversamples, CHIS employs geographic oversampling in areas of high concentration of these subgroups and also samples from a surname list sample. The interviewer confirms the ethnicity of each respondent whose telephone number comes from the surname list sample prior to enrolling the respondent in the survey.

Cell Phone Sample: The cell phone sample will be drawn from a statewide RDD sample of cell phone numbers from 1000-blocks in California that

are cellular (NXXTYPE types 04, 55, 60) or PCS (types 65, 68). Additional technical restrictions in the sampling include restricting the sample to telephone numbers which can be dialed into and the exclusion of toll-free telephone numbers.

B.2.2. Estimation Procedure

CHIS data will be statistically weighted to account for the differential probability of selecting persons into the sample, and the weights will be raked to the various domains of California population totals. Specific strategy for drawing and weighting the CHIS sample will depend on the results of the recently fielded CHIS 2009, and as such, final specifications are not available at this time. The methods detailed below, therefore, enumerate the anticipated estimation procedure.

The estimation procedure will first weight the data on the probability of household selection. Adjustments will be made for households without telephones. Then, the weights of households with more than one voice line will be adjusted to correct for their greater than normal probability of selection. Next, the person-level weight will be created by multiplying the adjusted household weight by the number of adults in a household. A post-stratification estimation procedure will then be performed to the person-level weight to bring the sum of weights to the total adult population using CDOF data projections for the appropriate year. Seven variables will be used in the post-stratification procedure to determine the final person weight: age, gender, race, ethnicity, geographic stratum (i.e. city, county, strata, and state), education, and home ownership.

The ethnic surname list sample will be combined with the RDD sample and weighted together, using the dual-frame method developed for CHIS 2003 where the base weight accounts for the multiple selection probabilities for samples drawn from both the RDD and the surname list. The selection probability may then be directly calculated for each sampled telephone number in both frames by using the list of numbers eligible for the surname samples to determine for every RDD sampled number whether or not it was eligible to be sampled for the surname sample as well.

The weighting procedure for the cell phone sample will require modeling because there is no reliable data source that provides totals and characteristics of the cell phone population in California.

The cell phone sample selection probabilities and nonresponse adjustments will be performed using the same procedures as used in the landline or regular RDD sample. The steps involved are: basic probability of selection of the telephone number from the frame, adjustment for nonresponse, adjustment for number of cell-phones (if necessary), and adjustment for the probability of selecting an adult from the household (if the cell phone is shared). Subsequently the RDD and the cell samples will be combined, and the standard CHIS raking procedures will be utilized to adjust the California population totals.

CDOF data, proportionally adjusted for individuals residing in group quarters using 2000 Census data, will be used as the official control totals. The CDOF provides population projections by race, age, sex and ethnicity at the county level that have been used in all CHIS work to date (the 2001 CHIS used

data from the 2000 Census originally, but was re-weighted to the CDOF to be

consistent with the other years of CHIS). These are the same data as are used in

the projections that drive other major surveys (e.g., CPS uses national

projections of age, sex, race and ethnicity as control totals) and are the official

population totals for California.

These methods will ensure that the final weighted CHIS data set

represents the California's population with the smallest undercoverage and

nonresponse error possible for the proposed design.

B.2.3. Degree of Accuracy Needed for the Purpose Described in the Justification

CHIS is used for estimates of disease prevalence, program participation,

health behaviors, insurance status, etc., for individual counties, race/ethnic

groups and other subpopulations of interest (e.g. the elderly) in the California

population. The large sample size allows robust estimates for any subpopulation

with a sample size of 450 or more with a margin of error of less than 5

percent. For gender, race, ethnicity, or age, estimates at the state level can be

obtained with a margin of error of less than 5 percent. At the county/stratum

level, the minimum sample size of 500 will produce estimates with a margin of

error at or below 7 percent, even with split male/female analyses. In short, CHIS

estimates should approximate the California population.

B.2.4. Unusual Problems Requiring Specialized Sampling Procedures

To maximize participation among California's diverse ethnic populations,

CHIS will be administered in five languages: English, Spanish, Chinese

(Mandarin and Cantonese dialects), Korean, and Vietnamese. Building on materials previously translated for the CHIS 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007 ==and 2009== questionnaires, new questions are translated and reviewed for cultural adaptation. Specially trained bilingual/bicultural interviewers will conduct non-English interviews.

B.2.5. Use of Periodic (Less Frequent Than Annual) Data Collection Cycles

==CHIS-CCM 2011 is proposed as a continuous data collection.==

B.3.   Methods to Maximize Response Rates and Deal with Non-Response

A number of generally accepted techniques used to maximize response rates in previous cycles will be repeated in this cycle. As an initial strategy, CHIS uses an advance letter to differentiate the survey from telemarketing. The advance letter (**Attachment 6A**) explains the purpose of the survey, the sponsors, and its importance, as well as assuring potential respondents that their participation in the survey is voluntary and that their confidentiality will be protected. ==In CHIS 2007, 62 percent of households were mailed an advance letter and these households had a screener response rate almost 4.3 percentage points higher than the "no-letter" households.== Because having an address is highly related to screener response rates, CHIS will work with the data collection contractor to further improve its ability to match telephone numbers with addresses.

To increase interviewer's skills in encouraging individuals to participate in the survey, training, coaching, and monitoring was intensified for CHIS 2009. The

next CHIS cycle training will focus on introducing the survey and handling reluctant or difficult to reach respondents.

Other techniques to increase response rates in previous CHIS cycles will also be repeated, including: leaving a message on answering machines (only on first encounter) to announce the survey; dialing a non-responding telephone number at least 14 times over a range of time periods (daytimes, evenings, weekends, etc.); and providing a toll-free number for respondents to call back and set an interview appointment time.

Mailing a "refusal conversion" letter to households that do not firmly decline an initial invitation to participate has also been effectively employed in national RDD surveys as a way to convert these households to participate in the survey. In experiments conducted during CHIS 2005, this method helped convert about one-third of reluctant households, which subsequently completed the survey. The method was implemented in CHIS 2007 and CHIS 2009, and will be implemented again. If a mailing address is available, a letter will be mailed to the household asking them to reconsider and restating the importance, legitimacy and purpose of the survey. The potential participant will then be re-contacted to provide an additional opportunity to participate in the study. Specially trained interviewers will make refusal conversion telephone calls. Sample refusal conversion letters are included in **Attachments 6C-E**.

CHIS 2005 implemented a pre-paid $2 financial incentive, which increased initial cooperation rates by three percentage points. CHIS will continue to include pre-paid financial incentives of $2.00 in the advance letter sent to all households

with an available address. This result is consistent with other research, which indicates that pre-paid incentives result in more interviews, more appointments, and lower resistance.[10,11]

CHIS 2009 experimented with interview staging methodology in an effort to increase survey participation. Interview staging, which refers to the sequencing of the screener and extended interviews, will be continued in this CHIS data collection period. In the "two-stage" design, separate calls are made to complete the screener interview and subsequent adult extended interview. The purpose of the "two-stage" design is to reduce the interviewers' task of completing the screener and then conducting a 30-minute interview by breaking up the tasks into two discrete, separate, and smaller components. The screener interview is the most difficult to complete and by separating this short 2-minute task it may be easier and simpler for the interviewer to complete the screener. In addition, the "two-stage" method allows screener cases to be assigned to interviewers who are best suited to complete the task and extended interview cases to those who are best suited to complete that task. The "two-stage" method generated a higher initial screener cooperation rate than a "one-stage" design in which interviewers attempted the extended interview immediately upon completion of the screener. CHIS 2009 initial screener cooperation rate increased by 4 percentage points relative to CHIS 2007.

---

[10] Brick, J. M., Hagedorn, M. C., Montaquila, J., Roth, S. B., and C. Chapman. 2003. Monetary Incentives and Mailing Procedures in a Federally Sponsored Telephone Survey. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
[11] Cantor, D., Cunningham, P., Triplett, T., and R. Steinbach. 2003. Comparing Incentives at Initial and Refusal Conversion Stages on a Screening Interview for a Random Digit Dial Survey.

By implementing these approaches, we expect to achieve an approximate 60 percent extended adult interview response rate and a 40 percent screener response rate.

B.4. Tests of Procedures or Methods to be Undertaken

Most CHIS-CCM 2011 questions are adopted from previous NHIS Cancer Supplements. New questions were cognitively pre-tested. For these reasons, questions used in the CHIS-CCM 2011 are expected to produce reliable data.

The English version of the final draft instrument will be pre-tested with nine persons (the OMB maximum prior to approval). Due to the small number of subjects, the pretest will be conducted as an interviewer administered, telephone interview with a paper and pencil instrument rather than a CATI system. These pre-tests will check the flow, clarity, and difficulty level of the questions.

The instrument will also be submitted to a CATI pilot test before it is fielded. The pilot test will test the adaptation of the instrument to the CATI system. A total of 150 pilot test interviews are currently planned after OMB approval is obtained. After the first round of pilot testing, the final English version will be translated into other languages and subsequently pilot tested in each language in which CHIS is offered.

B.5. Individuals Consulted on Statistical Aspects and Individuals Collecting and/or Analyzing Data

As described in Supporting Statement, Section A.8, a Sample Design and Survey Methods TAC, consisting of statisticians and survey experts, provides expert advice to CHIS on the weighting schemes, imputation methods, and

analytical plans. Members of this TAC are listed in **Attachment 5E**. In addition,

at the recommendation of the Sample Design and Survey Methods TAC, a

survey mode planning workgroup including national experts may be convened to

propose survey design options for measuring survey bias in preparation for

CHIS. A Request for Proposals (RFP) was released by UCLA purchasing on

August 9, 2010 and companies are currently undergoing a competitive bidding

process to be the data collection subcontractor for CHIS 2011as required by the

State of California. UCLA anticipates awarding the contract by October 1, 2010.

As described in Supporting Statement, Section A.2. (Purpose and Uses of

Information), CHIS data is widely used by state and federal agencies, county

health departments, universities, research organizations, advocacy groups,

community organizations, health care providers, doctoral students, and

others. **Attachment 2** provides lists of organizations that have used CHIS data

and peer-reviewed peer publications based on CHIS data, as well as descriptions

of the types of research conducted.