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Background

• Trouble with the NSFG Cycle 6
• Lower than expected response rate
• How to cope with it?
  – Two-phase design to concentrate resources and address non-response bias
  – Similar solution in prior round of NSFG (Judkins, Mosher, and Botman, 1991)
  – Hansen and Hurwitz discussed the use of two-phase sampling for nonresponse in 1946
NSFG-6 (Groves and Heeringa, 2006)

• Three phase design: Phase 1 looked at best number of callbacks

• After main phase (phase 2), a final phase
  – Retained about a third of the cases from Phase 2
  – Used the most productive interviewers from the prior phases
  – Relaxed the rules for collecting screening data from proxy informants
  – Used a prepaid incentive of $5 for the screener,
  – increased the incentive amount for the main interview (offering an additional $40 over the Phase 2 amount)
Phases in NSFG 6

• Phase 1: decided to cap call attempts at 14 during the second phase; estimates unlikely to change enough to justify the added costs of further callbacks

• Phase 2: two propensity (discrete hazard) models developed, based on frame variables and variables derived from paradata
  – likelihood a household would be screened on the next call
  – the likelihood that a sample case would complete a main interview on the next call

• Phase 3: SSUs grouped into 16 strata, based on the number of active cases in the SSU at the end of Phase 2 and the total estimated propensities for those cases; segments in the highest quartiles on each of these variables were sampled at higher rates than those in the lower quartiles
Goals of Final Phase

• Focus effort on SSUs with many possible cases
• Focus effort where cases have high (not low) propensities
• Implied goals: Maximize RR and sample size, while controlling costs
Set Off a Flood of Studies

• Why? Not really much that was new
  – Real-time use of propensity models
  – New rhetoric (ACS-type design):

    Responsive designs are organized about design phases. A design phase is a time period of a data collection during which the same set of sampling frame, mode of data collection, sample design, recruitment protocols, and measurement conditions are extant. For example, a survey may start with a mail questionnaire attempt in the first phase, follow it with a telephone interview phase on non-respondents to the first phase and then have a final third phase of face-to-face interviewing…Note that this use of ‘phase’ includes more design features than merely the sample design, which are common to the term ‘multi-phase sampling.’ (Groves and Heeringa, 2006, pp. 440-441)
Follow-Up Studies

• Since then at least five experimental studies and four simulation studies
• Twin problems of rising costs, falling response rates
• In Canada, additional problem of cap on number of calls
• Minimize the impact of these problems on survey quality (that is, variance and non-response bias)
Follow-Up Studies: 2-Phase Design

- NISVS (Peytchev, Baxter, and Carley-Baxter, 2009)
- Telephone study with a two-phase design
- Phase 1 RDD sample with supplemental sample of listed telephone numbers
- Numbers that could be matched to an address were sent an advance letter with a $1 incentive; all cases were promised either $10 or $20. Phase 1 also varied description of topic
- Most cases received up to twenty calls during the first phase, but some got even more. In addition, refusal conversion was attempted during Phase 1. Overall, this phase produced a response rate 28.5 percent.
- Phase 2: Subsample cases, questionnaire went from 30 to 14 minutes, offered a prepaid incentive of $5 and a conditional incentive of $20. This phase produced a response rate of 9.8 percent (or 35.5 percent overall).
Peytchev et al. (2009) Results

• Look at 6 key estimates for males and females
• Compare phase 1 early versus late (6+ attempts): No significant change in estimates
• Phase 1 versus Phase 2: Male respondents were more likely to report victimizations in Phase 1 than in the Phase 2, with significant differences on four of six estimated victimization rates
• Impact of Phase 1 refusal conversion: male cases who never refused and those who were converted after refusing; like the Phase 2 male respondents, the converted Phase 1 male refusals also showed significantly lower victimization rates on four of six key estimates
Basic Strategies

- Two (or more) phase designs
- Case prioritization—vary level of effort for different types of cases
- Tailored data collection (e.g., different modes for cases with different anticipated propensities)
Options for Phase 2 (or Adaptive Designs)

- Stop working some cases (as in subsampling for Phase 2 or stop rules explored by Särndal and Lundquist)
- Increase incentives/tailor incentives
- Shorten questionnaire
- Switch modes/tailor modes
- Reassign to best interviewers (Luiten and Schouten, 2013)
- Prioritize cases
Pros and Cons: Dropping Cases

- Dropping cases definitely is easy to implement, especially in phone surveys
- Generally easier cases are dropped
  - Reduced response rate
  - Smaller sample size (Less impact on effective sample size)
  - Response rate maximization = Sample size maximization
Incentives

Diminishing returns (Mercer et al., 2015)

Long-term effect on survey climate?
Shortening the Questionnaire

• Loss of precision
• Is there an optimal point where there is a reasonable chance to impute remaining items?
Switching Modes

• Start with cheap mode for everyone
• Tailor mode choice to subgroup—assign high propensity cases to cheaper, low propensity mode (as in Luiten and Schouten, 2013)—increase balance, decrease costs
• Two potential issues
  – Mode effects on measurement: An exaggerated concern?
  – Kolenikov and Kennedy (2014) examine 297 variables, 19 showed significant differences between the telephone only and web groups but only four of these remained significant after adjusting for demographic differences
  – Starting with low propensity mode may lower ultimate response rate—having refused in one mode, cases may be more likely to refuse in a second mode
## Switching Modes—2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Mode Sequence</th>
<th>Overall Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dillman et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Mail then Telephone</td>
<td>82.8 (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone then Mail</td>
<td>80.4 (2999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web then Telephone</td>
<td>47.7 (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web then Mail</td>
<td>72.2 (5991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messer and Dillman (2011)</td>
<td>Residents of Washington state</td>
<td>Experiment 1a</td>
<td>53.6 (474)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail then Web ($5 prepaid)</td>
<td>44.4 (1018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web then Mail ($5 prepaid)</td>
<td>40.1 (648)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail then Web (No incentive)</td>
<td>25.7 (643)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web then Mail (No incentive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment 1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail then Web ($5 prepaid)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web then Mail ($5 prepaid)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millar and Dillman (2011)</td>
<td>WSU undergrads</td>
<td>Experiment 1</td>
<td>53.2 (681)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail then Web</td>
<td>50.2 (676)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web then Mail</td>
<td>64.5 (678)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth et al., 2010</td>
<td>Residents two WA towns</td>
<td>Mail then Web</td>
<td>71.1 (367)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web then Mail</td>
<td>55.1 (566)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reassigning/Prioritizing Cases

• Easier to do with telephone
• Potential cost tradeoffs in FTF (travel in better interviewers)
• Interviewer compliance also an issue: Wagner et al. (2012)—16 experiments in NSFG
  – Significantly increased number of calls to priority cases in seven of 16 experiments
  – Significantly increased response rate in two experiments
  – Maybe be optimizing the wrong thing (trip to the field vs. individual case)
Who to Prioritize?

• To date, “inverse” case prioritization—equalize propensities after intervention

\[ k = p_1 + (1 - p_1) p_2 \]

\[ p_2 = \frac{k - p_1}{1 - p_1} \]

• Target cases that reduce bias, improve balance the most

\[ V_i = \hat{\rho}_i W_i D_i , \]

where \( D_i = \sqrt{(x_i - \bar{x})S^{-1}(x_i - \bar{x})} \).
Some Issues

• Unfortunately, we understand how to lower propensities better than to raise them

• Still, stopping rules may be best method for equalizing propensities and lowering costs; it would be useful to know how costs vary as function of time in the field (everyone thinks the last cases are much more expensive than early, easy cases)

• Balance the sample/equalizing the propensities:
  – During data collection vs. after the fact
  – It would be nice to have further empirical demonstrations (Särndal and Lundquist, 2014) as well as theory showing that balance during data collection helps with both bias and variance

• Better understanding of practical limits of weighting (cf. Tourangeau, Conrad, and Couper, 2013)
Some Issues—2

- Most important: It would be useful to understand better what has happened to the survey climate (world-wide) and what if anything can be done to improve it.
- We rushed to cure the problem without stopping to diagnose it.
Conclusions

• To return to my earlier question: What is new here?

• Three big shifts
  – Statistical models (propensity models) supplementing if not supplanting FI and supervisor judgment
    • Are we missing anything?
    • Expert system approach?
  – Difference between field and telephone narrowing (CARI, GPS)
  – Design focused less on sampling error and more on bias (especially non-response bias)
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