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Outline of today’s talk

- What is Address Based Sampling
- Why we chose ABS as the sampling method for this mail survey
- The sample design process
- The project’s implementation
- Personalization: Experimental design and results
- Priority Mail: Description of use for final mailing
- Costs of ABS sampling compared to estimated RDD cost
- Lessons learned and suggestions for future investigation
What is Address Based Sampling

• The Delivery Sequence File (DSF) from the United States Postal Service is a database containing all delivery point addresses.

• Sampling vendors have access to this database, and in combination with other resources, use it to create an extremely accurate frame from which to draw a random sample of households.

• Address based sampling provides an increasingly attractive alternative to random digit dial (RDD) methods of sampling.
Why we chose ABS for this study

- **Topic** – A self administered questionnaire preferred given the sensitive nature of questions about contraception use.
- **Cost** – A mail survey is a less expensive mode than a telephone survey.
- **Coverage** – Reaching a young and diverse sample using RDD telephone methodology would be hard to accomplish. The study design called for sampling in a very specific geographic area.
- **Timing** – We had one month following agreement to conduct the survey to put it in the field. Given out production schedule and programming load at that time, a mail survey was quicker to prepare for field.
The Sample Design Process

• Worked with Genesys to learn about and order an address based sample for the project.

• Calculated the expected percentage of households with a woman in the required age range (25%) based on Census - American Community Survey figures.

• Calculated an expected response rate of 40 to 45%.

• Using the desired number of 1,200 completes, calculated a required sample size of 12,500 households to get the needed completes.

• Researchers wanted an African-American oversample, as well as urban and suburban representation, so a plan to sample half of the households from the city of St. Louis (50% African American), and half from the county of St. Louis (20% African American) was adopted to provide both.
The Sample Design Process

• Worked with Genesys to decide on types of addresses to include in sample
  • Choices include
    • P.O. Boxes
    • Drop Addresses (apartment buildings where un-personalized mail is left outside of individual mailboxes)
    • Rural routes or other types of “simplified” addresses
• Decisions on inclusion of the above address types should be made based on the geographic area and population density of your target sample
The Project Implementation

• 4 waves of data collection
  • Full mailing: cover letter, postage-paid return envelope, $2 incentive, questionnaire, screener postcard (allowing households with no eligible women to opt out)
  • Reminder postcard
  • Full mailing without incentive to non-responders
  • Full mailing without incentive to non-responders
The Project Implementation

• Address based sample does not have names available for all households, only those that match the listed household telephone database - estimated to be 60% to 80%.

• How to address households was discussed, literature reviewed, and we decided to conduct experiments.

• Designed first experiment with three levels of personalization to the salutation.
The Project Implementation

• Wondered if addressing a household where a name is available (estimated to be wrong 15% of the time), by the wrong name would be worse than “or current resident” junk mail approach.

• Client wanted to send out final mailing via Priority mail rather than first class, so we incorporated this into the experimental design at the final mailing.
Methods: Experimental treatments for salutation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matched</td>
<td>Unmatched</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>The &lt;Surname&gt; House</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>St. Louis Resident</td>
<td>3,446</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>4,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Our Neighbor At</td>
<td>3,446</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>4,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,340</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Methods: Experimental treatments for Priority mailing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>First Class</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>The &lt;Surname&gt; Household</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>St. Louis Resident</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>2,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Our Neighbor At</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>2,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>6,907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the effects of treatment on participation

• Before the final mailing:
  • Effects of salutations on
    • returning questionnaires
    • returning screener postcards
    • returned as undeliverable
• For the final mailing
  • Effects of salutations and mailing type on
    • returning questionnaires
    • returning screener postcards
• Final response rates
Questionnaire Return Rate by Salutation within Sample Before Third Mailing

![Bar graph showing return rates by salutation and sample type.](image)

- **Before Third Mailing**
  - **All**:
    - Neighbor: 10.54%
    - Municipal: 11.46%
    - Surname: 13.31%
  - **Matched**:
    - Neighbor: 11.26%
    - Municipal: 12.07%
    - Surname: 13.31%
  - **Unmatched**:
    - Neighbor: 8.25%
    - Municipal: 9.53%
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Screener Post Card Return Rate by Salutation within Sample Before Third Mailing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neighbor</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Surname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>28.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched</td>
<td>24.87</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>28.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmatched</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Questionnaire Return Rate by Mailing Type, Third Mailing Only

![Bar chart showing return rates by mailing type and priority for all, matched, and unmatched categories.](chart.png)

- **All**: 2.17 (1st Class), 3.91 (Priority)
- **Matched**: 2.21 (1st Class), 4.27 (Priority)
- **Unmatched**: 2.00 (1st Class), 2.27 (Priority)
Screener Card Return Rate by Mailing Type, Third Mailing Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Type</th>
<th>All Returned</th>
<th>Matched Returned</th>
<th>Unmatched Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Class</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
<td>6.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Response rate by wave for matched sample
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Response rate by wave for unmatched sample

First Class | Priority | First Class | Priority
---|---|---|---
Neighbor | Municipal

- First Class: 5.80%, 7.03%, 3.82%, 6.97%
- Priority: 8.23%, 8.23%, 9.81%, 9.81%
Experiment results

• Surname condition yielded highest response rates
  • Next time address to
    • “The <Surname> Household or Current Resident”
    • “The Woman in Your Household”
• Municipality somewhat better than Neighbor
  • Worth the costs?
  • Harder to implement with more geographically diverse samples
• Personalization as indicated by salutation more effective for Screener Postcard
  • Interaction between personalization and burden of the request
## Overall Study Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Sample N</th>
<th>Completed Surveys</th>
<th>Confirmed Ineligible</th>
<th>Undeliverable</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Louis</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of St. Louis</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Costs for implementing ABS mail survey

• Costs to think about include
  • Pre-incentives ($2 in each outgoing wave 1 survey)
  • Screening postcard, stamped rather than metered, included in every wave
  • Large N for wave mail outs
  • Priority mailing for final wave
    • The first class mailing was sent for .58 per mailing
    • The priority mailing was sent for $4.60 per mailing

The additional completes from that mailing were therefore obviously quite expensive, and probably not cost effective
Costs for implementing ABS mail survey

- Overall project cost was $158,702
- Estimated RDD Telephone survey budget was $286,535
- Savings of over $127,000, or 45%
Lessons learned and suggestions for future investigation

- ABS sample can be used to randomly sample from the general population, including local samples and oversamples.

- Screening is a challenge, and not as reliable as RDD household screening, so a cost versus quality tradeoff needs to be weighed when considering this method.

- Conducting mail surveys with ABS sample may provide significant cost savings over an RDD telephone survey, depending on the project.
Lessons learned and suggestions for future investigation

• More research needs to be done on how best to address sample where names are not available.

• May want to consider adding “Do Not Forward” to geography based ABS studies.

• Response rate calculations are challenging
  • Should you use an estimator modified for mail
  • Should you use Census data to estimate prevalence of sample you are looking for
  • Should matched names returned as undeliverable be treated as ineligible, or re-fielded with less personalization?
Lessons learned and suggestions for future investigation

- Researching ABS methods before attempting to order from a sampling firm is recommended to avoid sampling errors.

- Researchers who use ABS should be encouraged to share the results, and the methods, very clearly, to help untangle the best ways to use this methodology.
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