Attachment O -- Non-response Bias Analysis of Private Establishments from the 2014 Medical Expenditures Panel Survey – Insurance Component (MEPS-IC)

Introduction:

When an expected unit response rate is below 80 percent, OMB Standards & Guidelines for Statistical Surveys recommends conducting a nonresponse bias analysis. Of the 42,055 sample units selected for the 2014 MEPS-IC, 27,226 (64.7%) responded, 11,776 (28.0%) did not respond, and 3,053 (7.3%) were out of sample or out of business. Removing the out of sample and out of business units from the response rate calculation results in an unweighted response rate of 69.8 percent. As shown in the formula below, nonresponse bias is a function of both the nonresponse rate and the difference between the respondent mean and the nonrespondent mean on the variable of interest:

$$\overline{\mathbf{Y}}_r = \overline{\mathbf{Y}}_n + \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}}{\mathbf{n}}\right) \left[\overline{\mathbf{Y}}_r - \overline{\mathbf{Y}}_m\right]$$

Respondent Mean = Full Sample Mean + (Nonresponse Rate)*(Respondent Mean –Nonrespondent Mean)

In the MEPS-IC we are most concerned about nonresponse bias in our key estimates- the percent of establishments offering health insurance, the percent of employees offered health insurance and the percent of employees enrolled in health insurance, among other important estimates. Unfortunately, since we do not have these estimates for the nonresponding establishments, we cannot directly measure the potential nonresponse bias in these estimates. However, from the sampling frame we have data for both responding and nonresponding establishments that are correlated with, or vary by, many of our key estimates. These variables include the size of the firm the establishment is in (number of employees), the industry group the establishment belongs to and the region of the country where the establishment is located (Census division). This analysis will compare the responding establishments to the nonresponding establishments on these sampling frame variables, using both a chi-square test of independence and a t-test to test differences in means and percentages.

The rest of this memo includes three sections where the differences between responding and nonresponding establishments will be tested and discussed, followed by a discussion of the weighting adjustments for nonresponse bias and a conclusion section.

Firm Size:

Firm size is highly correlated with at least one of our key measures, the percentage of establishments that offer health insurance. In 2014, 25.7 percent of private sector establishments in firms with less than 10 employees offered health insurance and this percentage increased to establishments in firms with 1,000 or more employees where 99.2 percent offered insurance. Table 1 presents the results of a chi-square test of the relationship between firm size and response. The test shows that response to the MEPS-IC is not independent of firm size and this may be a source of nonresponse bias.

To identify which firms size categories are possibly the source of this bias, table 2 shows the percent distribution of responding and nonresponding establishments across the firm size categories and the

results of testing the difference in these percentages. The results show those establishments in firms with less than 10 employees, and those with 25 to 99 employees may be a source of nonresponse bias.

Industry Group:

Most of the MEPS-IC key estimates vary by industry group. For example, in 2014 the percent of establishments that offered health insurance to their employees ranged from 23.6 percent for establishments in agriculture, fishing and forestry to 61.8 percent for those in mining and manufacturing. Table 3 presents the results of a chi-square test of the relationship between industry group and response. The test shows that response to the MEPS-IC is not independent of industry category and this may be a source of nonresponse bias.

To identify which industry category is possibly the source of this bias, table 4 shows the percent distribution of responding and nonresponding establishments across the industry categories and the results of testing the difference in these percentages. The results show those establishments in agriculture, fishing and forestry, mining and manufacturing, construction, and professional services may be a source of nonresponse bias.

Census Division:

Many of the MEPS-IC key estimates vary by Census division. For example, in 2013 the percent of employees in establishments that offered health insurance ranged from 82.0 percent for establishments located in West South Central to 88.6 percent for those located in New England. Table 5 presents the results of a chi-square test of the relationship between Census region and response. The test shows that response to the MEPS-IC is not independent of Census division and this may be a source of nonresponse bias.

To identify which Census division is possibly the source of this bias, table 6 shows the percent distribution of responding and nonresponding establishments across divisions and the results of testing the difference in these percentages. The results show those establishments located in 6 of the 9 divisions may be a source of nonresponse bias.

Weighting adjustments for nonresponse bias:

The base sampling weights of the respondents to the MEPS-IC are adjusted so that the respondents also represent the nonrespondents while minimizing the bias associated with nonresponse. The adjustment is made by controlling firm size, establishment size, industry group, type of firm, and state. Thus, a nonresponding establishment is represented by a responding establishment with characteristics similar to the extent possible in terms of these variables. A raking procedure is applied to adjust the weights of the respondents to represent all eligible establishments on the frame (i.e., both respondents and nonrespondents) while controlling for the marginal distributions of all these variables. The raking adjustment is expected to reduce any bias due to nonresponse to the extent the MEPS-IC estimates are associated with the characteristics used in the raking procedure. Since the MEPS-IC estimates are generally highly correlated with these characteristics, the weighting adjustment is expected to minimize the nonresponse bias to a large extent.

Conclusion:

The results of this analysis show that there is the potential for nonresponse bias in the MEPS-IC. Although we never really know the extent of any bias in the survey estimates, since the distributions of responding and nonresponding establishments are close, and since the weighting adjustment takes into account the important variables by which MEPS-IC estimates mostly vary, we can be fairly confident that, to the extent possible, nonresponse bias has been addressed in the MEPS-IC.

	Table 1. Chi-Square of Response by Firm Size, 2014 MEPS-IC					
	Firm Size	Responding (N)	Nonresponding (N)	Total		
Frequency	Less than 10	2653849	1263299	3917148		
Expected		2685550	1231598			
Percent		39.96	19.02	58.98		
Row Pct		67.75	32.25			
Col Pct		58.29	60.5			
	10 to 24	550138	240744	790882		
		542219	248663			
		8.28	3.63	11.91		
		69.56	30.44			
		12.08	11.53			
	25 to 99	377294	146313	523607		
		358979	164628			
		5.68	2.2	7.88		
		72.06	27.94			
		8.29	7.01			
	100 to 999	298031	138730	436762		
		299439	137323			
		4.49	2.09	6.58		
		68.24	31.76			
		6.55	6.64			
	1,000 or more	673818	298987	972805		
		666944	305861			
		10.15	4.5	14.65		
		69.27	30.73			
		14.8	14.32			
	Total	4553130	2088073	6641204		
		68.56	31.44	100		
	Statistic	DF	Value	Prob		
	Chi-Square	4	4776.6482	<.0001		
	Cramer's V		0.0268			

Table 2. T-test of Response by Firm Size, 2014 MEPS-IC								
				t	Pr>			
Firm Size	Responding (%)	Nonresponding (%)	DF	Value	t			
Less than 10	58.31	60.47	22377	-4	<.0001			
10 to 24	12.1	11.48	39000	1.76	0.0776			
25 to 99	8.28	7.01	23839	4.4	<.0001			
100 to 999	6.54	6.65	27276	-0.4	0.6883			
1,000 or more	14.77	14.39	22425	0.98	0.328			
Total	100	100						

	Table 3. Chi-Square of Response by Industry, 2014 MEPS-IC						
	Industry	Responding (N)	Nonresponding (N)	Total			
Frequency	Agriculture,	118102	63347.5	181450			
Expected	Fishing, and Forestry	124400	57050				
Percent		1.78	0.95	2.73			
Row Pct		65.09	34.91				
Col Pct		2.59	3.03				
	Mining and	206529	83937.3	290466			
	Manufacturing	199140	91326				
		3.11	1.26	4.37			
		71.1	28.9				
		4.54	4.02				
	Construction	362858	201415	564273			
		386859	177414				
		5.46	3.03	8.5			
		64.31	35.69				
		7.97	9.65				
	Utilities and	137421	61984	199405			
	Transportation	136710	62695				
		2.07	0.93	3			
		68.92	31.08				
		3.02	2.97				
	Wholesale Trade	241713	114359	356072			
		244119	111953				
		3.64	1.72	5.36			
		67.88	32.12				
		5.31	5.48				
	Financial Services	528676	237594	766270			
	and Real Estate	525346	240924				
		7.96	3.58	11.54			
		68.99	31.01				
		11.61	11.38				

Retail Trade	6	43184		286023	929207
	6	37053		292154	
		9.68		4.31	13.99
		69.22		30.78	
		14.13		13.7	
Professional Services	11	78993		507821	1686814
	11	56460		530354	
		17.75		7.65	25.4
		69.89		30.11	
		25.89		24.32	
Other	11	35655		531592	1667246
	11	43044		524202	
		17.1		8	25.1
		68.12		31.88	
		24.94		25.46	
Total	45	53130		2088073	6641204
		68.56		31.44	100
Statistic	DF		Value		Prob
Chi-Square		8		8512.2193	<.0001
Cramer's V				0.0358	

Table 4. T-test of Response by Industry, 2014 MEPS-IC								
				t	Pr >			
Industry	Responding (%)	Nonresponding (%)	DF	Value	t			
Agriculture, Fishing, and Forestry	2.59	3.04	20723	-2.44	0.0146			
Mining and Manufacturing	4.54	4.01	23455	2.4	0.0165			
Construction	7.99	9.61	20628	-5.11	<.0001			
Utilities and Transportation	3.01	2.98	22297	0.15	0.8811			
Wholesale Trade	5.31	5.48	21899	-0.7	0.4823			
Financial Real Estate	11.59	11.42	22334	0.48	0.6341			
Retail Trade	14.11	13.74	22434	0.98	0.3284			
Professional Services	25.92	24.25	39000	3.51	0.0005			
Other	24.94	25.47	22070	-1.07	0.2863			
Total	100	100			•			

	Table 5. Chi-Square of Response by Division, 2014 MEPS-IC				
	Division Responding (Y) Nonresponding (N) Total				
Frequency	New	240544	102128	342672	
Expected	England	234932	107740		
Percent	J	3.62	1.54	5.16	
Row Pct		70.2	29.8		
Col Pct		5.28	4.89		
	Middle	587908	335436	923344	
	Atlantic	633034	290310		
		8.85	5.05	13.9	
		63.67	36.33		
		12.91	16.06		
	East	670924	289825	960749	
	North	658678	302071		
	Central	10.1	4.36	14.47	
		69.83	30.17		
		14.74	13.88		
	West	388453	137034	525487	
	North	360268	165219		
	Central	5.85	2.06	7.91	
		73.92	26.08		
		8.53	6.56		
	South	861378	416445	1277823	
	Atlantic	876060	401763		
		12.97	6.27	19.24	
		67.41	32.59		
		18.92	19.94		
	East	242474	92219.5	334693	
	South	229462	105231		
	Central	3.65	1.39	5.04	
		72.45	27.55		
		5.33	4.42		
	West	480372	227581	707952	
	South	485364	222589		
	Central	7.23	3.43	10.66	
		67.85	32.15		
		10.55	10.9		
	Mountain	355633	140220	495853	
		339951	155902		
		5.35	2.11	7.47	
		71.72	28.28		
		7.81	6.72		

Pacific		725446		347185	1072630
		735383		337248	
		10.92		5.23	16.15
		67.63		32.37	
		15.93		16.63	
Total		4553130		2088073	6641204
		68.56		31.44	100
Statistic	DF		Value		Prob
Chi-					
Square		8		24415.1746	<.0001
Cramer's					
V				0.0606	

Table 6. T-test of Response by Geographic Division, 2014 MEPS-IC								
Division	Responding (%)	Nonresponding (%)	DF	t Value	Pr > t			
New England	5.3	4.85	39000	1.84	0.066			
Middle Atlantic	12.92	16.07	20505	-7.97	<.0001			
East North Central	14.74	13.87	39000	2.27	0.0231			
West North Central	8.52	6.59	24796	6.77	<.0001			
South Atlantic	18.92	19.93	21814	-2.3	0.0216			
East South Central	5.33	4.41	24142	3.94	<.0001			
West South Central	10.54	10.92	21901	-1.09	0.2777			
Mountain	7.8	6.74	23623	3.72	0.0002			
Pacific	15.93	16.62	21868	-1.68	0.0939			
Total	100	100						