RUTGERS
Center for State Health Policy

The 2009 New Jersey Family Health Survey Methods Report

The 2009 New Jersey Family Health Survey
Methods Report

Susan Brownlee, Ph.D.
Joel C. Cantor, Sc.D.
Dorothy Gaboda, M.S.W., Ph.D.
Jose Nova, M.S.

October 2010

Rutgers Center for State Health Policy

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

The New Jersey Family Health Survey was supported by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Preface

This report provides a brief summary of the methods, plus a detailed methodology report from the survey vendor Abt SRBI.

See companion report for questionnaire.

NJFHS results available at www.cshp.rutgers.edu.

2009 New Jersey Family Health Survey
Summary of Survey Methods

The 2009 New Jersey Family Health Survey (NJFHS) was conducted between 11-3-08 and 11-5-09 by the Rutgers Center for State Health Policy (CSHP) and funded by The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The general goals of the survey were to provide precise population-based estimates of health care coverage, access, use, and other health topics important for policy formulation and evaluation in New Jersey over the next 3-5 years, to complement existing CSHP studies, and to provide trend data on important health care indicators.

Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc. (Abt SRBI) conducted the survey fieldwork for the project under contract to Rutgers CSHP. The survey was a random-digit-dialed telephone survey of 2,100 families with landlines and 400 families with cell phones residing in the state of New Jersey covering 7,336 individuals. Low-income families (<200% FPL; n=570) and families with young adult unmarried children ages 19-30 (either living in the household or not; n=1151) were oversampled. The state was divided into 5 geographically contiguous areas containing socioeconomically similar counties and proportionate samples were drawn from each area in order to ensure representativeness for different areas of the state. The overall response rate was 45.4%; the landline response rate was 61.7% and the cell phone response rate was 26.0% (all using the AAPOR "response rate 3" formula).

The survey averaged 37.1 minutes in length (landline version 36.7 minutes, cell phone version 39.3 minutes), and landline respondents were paid $15 for completing the survey while cell phone respondents were paid $25. Addresses supplied by the respondents in order to receive the incentives were geo-coded for latitude and longitude via GPS software. Interviewing was conducted in both English and Spanish. The selected respondent in the family was the person who was most knowledgeable about the health and health care needs of the family. This person answered questions concerning all members of the household related by blood, marriage, domestic partnership, adoption, guardianship, or foster care, plus any other young adult children ages 19-30 not living in the household. The topics covered in the survey included health care coverage and young adult dependent coverage; health status; health care utilization (including detailed sections on emergency department utilization and patient-doctor relationship); access to care; attitudes about care-seeking and coverage; obesity (including food and physical activity behaviors and environment); caregiving and caregiver assistance; employment and earnings; and demographics.

The cell-phone sample was drawn from New Jersey families who only have a cell-phone (no landline available) or who have both a landline and a cell phone, but mainly use the cell-phone to receive calls and would be "very or somewhat unlikely" to answer the landline if it rang.

Sample weights were developed to adjust for differences in probably of selection of households and for possible biases arising from non-response or sample frame

coverage gaps. For the landline respondents, base sampling weights to account for the 5 geographic strata were calculated as the population count of telephone numbers in the geographic divided by the total number of sample telephone numbers for the main sample and oversample released replicates for that stratum. As the cell phone sample is a state-wide equal probability sample, for these respondents the base weight equals the population count of telephone numbers in the cellular sampling frame divided by the total number of sample telephone numbers for the released replicates. Base sampling weights for respondents with both a landline and cell phone (which occurred in both the landline and cell phone samples) were multiplied by 0.50. All sampling weights were then divided by the count of telephone devices in the household (separately for cell phone only, landline only, and landline + cell phone households).

The base sampling weight was put through three iterations of sample "raking procedures" to assure that NJFHS population estimates reflect official estimates of population counts and demographics from the US Census Bureau. These population control totals non-telephone adjustment margin, ages of oldest and youngest adult in household, number of adults and children in household, total number of persons in household, own/rent home, telephone usage group, region of residence, household poverty level, presence of unmarried person in household ages 19-30, family/non-family household, highest education level among adults, race-ethnicity, education, marital status, gender and age) were drawn from the New Jersey 2005-2007 American Community Survey (ACS) PUMS. Non-telephone coverage was estimated by asking respondents about phone service interruptions in the past year. It has been shown that households with transient telephone coverage are much more similar to continuous non-telephone households than to continuous telephone households on both demographic variables and other variables such as health status and health insurance coverage. Telephone usage group population totals were developed from the 2008 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) PUF for the Northeast Census Region (NCHS does not release state estimates). The 2009 percentage of cell-only households in the Northeast Census Region was estimated by applying the published NCHS percent increase in these households from July-December 2007 to July-December 2008 to the 2008 NHIS PUF estimate. Weights above the 97th and below the ^{3rd} percentiles were trimmed to the 97th and 3rd percentiles, respectively, to reduce the increase in sampling variability arising from unequal weights.

Methodology Statement for "2009 New Jersey Family Health Survey"

The purpose of the 2009 *New Jersey Family Health Survey* (NJFHS) was to provide New Jersey policymakers with updated, population-based estimates regarding the health and health care services being provided within the state. In particular, issues such as health insurance coverage, access to care, use of and satisfaction with health care services, and obesity issues were studied. Given that past research has shown the existence of significant differences from state-to-state on these issues, it was necessary to collect data specific to New Jersey in order to help inform state-level health policy decisions.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The NJFHS project was designed with 2 main versions:

1. an RDD landline version
2. a Cell Phone version

RDD version

The RDD version was conducted with 2100 New Jersey families between 11/3/08 and 11/5/09. The survey, averaging 36.7 minutes in length, was completed by the adult, 18 years of age or older, from each household that was the most knowledgeable to speak about the family's health insurance coverage and other health issues (*Note: A "family" is defined as a household where the members are related by blood, marriage, domestic partnership, adoption, guardianship or foster care).* Households containing only one adult, or containing multiple adults all of whom were NOT related to one another, were also asked to complete the survey. However, such households were only asked to complete the survey in regards to him/herself, and thus the non-related members of the households, when applicable, were not discussed. However, households containing all non-related adults were called back in order to attempt to complete the survey separately with the other non-related adult(s).

This version utilized a random digit dial (RDD), cross-sectional sample of landline telephone numbers from the state of New Jersey. The 2100 interviews were stratified proportionately across 5 geographic regions of the state:

- **Region 1** = Cape May, Cumberland, Salem, and Atlantic counties;
- **Region 2** = Gloucester, Camden, and Burlington counties;
- **Region 3** = Ocean, Monmouth, and Middlesex counties;
- **Region 4** = Mercer, Somerset, Morris, Hunterdon, Warren, and Sussex counties;
- **Region 5** = Passaic, Bergen, Union, Essex, and Hudson counties.

The number of completed interviews obtained from each region was proportionate to each region's household population compared to the entire household population of the state (see Appendix A for number of interviews completed by region).

The survey was also translated into Spanish and administered by a bi-lingual interviewer when needed. Only 70 of the 2100 (3.3%) completed RDD surveys were conducted in Spanish.

Cell Phone version

The Cell Phone version was conducted with 400 New Jersey families on their cell phone. In order to qualify for participation, the respondent's household must have met one of the following criteria:

- The household uses ONLY a cell phone (or cell phones) exclusively and does NOT contain a traditional landline telephone. Such households are referred to as "Cell Phone Only" households; or
- The household does contain a traditional landline; however, the respondent indicated that the household mainly uses a cell phone (or cell phones) to receive calls, and that it would be "somewhat unlikely" or "very unlikely" that the landline telephone would be answered if it rang and someone was able to answer it. Such households are referred to as "Cell Phone Mainly" households.

This version was conducted between 11/6/08 and 7/21/09. The survey, which averaged 39.3 minutes in length, was identical to that of the RDD landline version, except for specific cell phone screening questions which were necessary to determine if the household qualified as "Cell Phone Only" or "Cell Phone Mainly." As in the RDD version, the survey was completed by the adult, 18 years of age or older, from each household that was the most knowledgeable to speak about the family's health insurance coverage and other health issues. Additionally, single-adult households, and households containing more than one adult, all of whom were not related to one another, were asked to complete the survey.

The sample consisted of a statewide, cellular telephone sample of numbers which were designated for the state of New Jersey. Given the limitation of not being able to accurately predict the specific region of the state that a particular cell phone record is from, there were no region quotas imposed on this sample.

There was also a Spanish-translated version of the survey which was administered by a bi-lingual interviewer when needed. A total of 56 of the 400 (14.0%) completed Cell Phone version surveys were conducted in Spanish.

Sub-quotas
In addition to the overall quota targets for each version, there were also 2 sub-quota targets that needed to be reached:

1. Households with an income level below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level
2. Households containing at least 1 individual who was:
    a. NOT currently married, and
    b. Between the ages of 19 to 30

The minimum number of completed interviews that needed to be obtained for each of the above sub-quotas was 500 and 1150, respectively. The final count that was actually obtained was 570 and 1151, respectively. Completed interviews from both the RDD landline and Cell Phone versions counted towards each of these sub-quotas.

Targeted Screening for Households with an unmarried, 19 to 30 year old
During the initial administration of the RDD and Cell Phone versions, it became apparent that the minimum sub-quota of 1150 households with an unmarried, 19 to 30 year old individual was not going to be reached through normal screening procedures. Therefore, it became necessary at a certain point in the administration of the project to begin special screening procedures in order to specifically target households that contained an unmarried, 19 to 30 year old individual in order to help reach this sub-quota.

This targeted screening was conducted only with the RDD landline version; the cell phone version continued to be administered normally. Specifically, we conducted 1433 of the 2100 total RDD interviews using the normal screening procedure of asking to speak with the adult, 18 years of age or older, from each household that was the most knowledgeable to speak about the family's health insurance coverage and other health issues. The remaining 667 of the 2100 total RDD interviews were conducted with households whereby we would first screen to confirm the presence of an unmarried, 19 to 30 year old individual living in that household before completing the survey with the most knowledgeable adult. In both screening procedures, the same cross-sectional, statewide sample of New Jersey telephone numbers was utilized.

Incentives
Both the RDD landline and Cell Phone versions offered an incentive to respondents for completion of the survey. A $15 incentive was given to those completing the RDD landline version, and $25 was given to those completing the Cell Phone version. No incentive was offered to respondents who only partially completed the survey, or who were willing to participate but did NOT qualify.

Tape Measure Worksheets
Those households which completed the survey AND also contained at least 1 child between the ages of 3 to 18 years old were sent, via regular mail, a tape measure and a worksheet so that they could record the height and weight of each 3 to 18 year old child in that household. A $5 incentive check was sent along with the tape measure and

worksheet as a means of trying to increase the likelihood of each respondent completing and returning the worksheet. In total, 747 households were sent the tape measure and worksheet, with 298 completing and returning it (39.9%).

SAMPLE DESIGN

The primary objective of the sample design for the NJFHS was to provide a probability sample of households in New Jersey.

RDD landline version
The sample for this version was drawn using our sampling vendor, Survey Sampling Inc. (SSI) and was limited to landline telephone numbers, thus excluding households without telephone service and households that only have cellular telephone service. A cross-sectional, statewide sample from the state of New Jersey was drawn by dividing the state into 1 of 5 regions:

- **Region 1** = Cape May, Cumberland, Salem, and Atlantic counties;
- **Region 2** = Gloucester, Camden, and Burlington counties;
- **Region 3** = Ocean, Monmouth, and Middlesex counties;
- **Region 4** = Mercer, Somerset, Morris, Hunterdon, Warren, and Sussex counties;
- **Region 5** = Passaic, Bergen, Union, Essex, and Hudson counties.

After each telephone exchange was assigned to a region, the desired amount of sample from each region was selected.

The RDD landline sample from each region was then divided into random sub-samples called replicates. Each replicate contained records from each region in proportion to each region's household population as compared to the total household population of New Jersey. This allowed for the controlled release of the sample so as to ensure that each region obtained the correct number of interviews while maintaining a true probability sample. The telephone numbers in each replicate were processed through an SSI procedure that removed a substantial proportion of the business numbers.

Cell Phone version
The sample for this version was also drawn using our sampling vendor, Survey Sampling Inc. (SSI). SSI has a cellular sampling methodology that we have already used on several cell phone surveys. The SSI cellular sampling frame consists of dedicated 1000 cellular banks in New Jersey. Mixed use (e.g., shared by landline and cellular) 1000 banks in New Jersey are divided into 100 banks, and if a 100 bank contains no residential directory-listed telephone numbers the 100 bank is added to the cellular sampling frame. A random sample of telephone numbers was then drawn from this frame.

The cell phone sample was also divided into replicates. It was not, however, processed through the SSI procedure used to remove business and non-working numbers.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT / HOUSEHOLD SCREENING

The survey instrument was a modified version of the one used for the administration of the 2001 NJFHS project. The content was identical across all versions of the project (i.e. – RDD landline, Cell Phone, and RDD landline w/targeted screening), with the exception of special screening questions in the "Cell Phone" and "RDD w/targeted screening" versions which were necessary in order to confirm that each household met the criteria for participation in either of those versions.

The average length of the survey was 37.1 minutes overall. By version, the average lengths were as follows:

- RDD version
  - 36.7 minutes
    - *N=1433 "Non-Targeted Completes"*
      - 36.7 minutes
    - *N=667 "Targeted Completes"*
      - 37.6 minutes
- Cell Phone version
  - 39.3 minutes

The survey instrument was translated into Spanish once the English version was deemed final. An independent translation firm was contracted to conduct the translation. This firm then utilized a separate translator to back-translate the Spanish translation into English as a quality control measure. Finally, the Spanish-translation was reviewed internally by bi-lingual staff members in order to address any inconsistencies or recommendations for alternate translations with the translation firm.

Household Screening

Once contact was made with a household, we asked to speak with an adult, 18 years of age or older, who was the most knowledgeable to speak about the family's health insurance coverage and other health issues. After confirming that we were talking with the appropriate respondent, the household was then inventoried to determine:

- County of Residence (to determine which region they live in)
- the number of individuals living in the household
- the age, gender, and (if applicable) marital status of each individual
- the relationship of each individual to the respondent

This information then allowed us to determine if the household was a "Family Household" or a "Non-Family Household". A "Family Household" is defined as one where 2 or more of the residents of the household are related by blood, marriage, domestic partnership, adoption, guardianship, or foster care. A "Non-Family Household" is one whereby there is only 1 resident of the household, or whereby none of the residents are related to one another.

In some instances, a household will contain multiple families living together. In such cases, the respondent was asked to only answer the survey questions in regards to his/her own family, and thus the members of the other family were not discussed. However, a later attempt was made to contact these "Multiple Family Households" again in order to try and interview the other family which was not previously discussed. In total, we encountered 11 households which contained multiple families living together.

Similar to the handling of "Multiple Family Households," "Non-Family Households" containing multiple non-related individuals were asked to only answer the questions in regards to him/herself, and future attempts were made to these households in order to try and interview the other non-related members.

When attempting to re-contact "Multiple Family Households" or "Non-Family Households" with additional non-related adults, a separate, unique identification number was generated for each of these cases so that they could be treated as separate sample records. In order to easily identify these newly spawned records, their ID numbers always began with the number "9." Furthermore, the ID number of the original record which spawned this new case was retained as part of the newly spawned record's sample data so that we could link them later if so desired.

PRE-TEST

Once the initial draft of the survey instrument was finalized, a Pre-test was conducted with a sampling of households in order to gauge the average length of the survey, as well as to determine if the need existed to make modifications to any of the survey questions.

A total of 2 separate rounds of Pre-test interviewing were conducted, with a total of 13 interviews being collected from each. The dates of the Pre-tests were:

1. 8/14/08 through 8/16/08
2. 9/30/08 through 10/2/08

DATA COLLECTION

After the 2nd Pre-test concluded, a final round of changes to the survey instrument was implemented, and data collection began on 11/3/08 for the RDD landline version of the project. Data collection on the Cell Phone version began 3 days later on 11/6/08 so that sufficient evaluation of the data collected from the RDD landline version could take place in order to confirm that there were no problems with the programming that needed to be addressed.

The Spanish-translated version was implemented and began being utilized on 12/12/08.

The targeted screening of households that contained an unmarried, 19 to 30 year old individual began on 3/12/09 and concluded on 10/30/09.

DATA PROCESSING / CODING

Upon completion of data collection, the data were checked for any inconsistencies or errors that required "cleaning." There were a couple of instances whereby a small number of households did NOT answer questions which they should have been asked. In these instances, special call backs were made to these households in order to collect the missing data. Once this data was collected, it was then corrected in the final data set which was provided to the client.

Coding was performed on those questions in the survey that elicited a verbatim response from the respondent. Two types of Coding procedures were employed: (1) move-ups, and (2) code creation. In the case of "move-ups," the verbatim response is simply changed into the code of a pre-existing category for that question. "Code creation" means that brand new codes not already existing for a particular question were constructed from the verbatim responses that were provided. For this project, the only questions requiring "code creation" were "H6boe" and "NHboe" (items dealing with the type of business or industry in which family members were employed). All other questions throughout the survey whereby a verbatim response was elicited simply had the process of "move-ups" conducted.

RESPONSE RATES

The Response Rates were calculated using the AAPOR "Response Rate 3" calculation. The equation for this calculation is conducted as follows:

- $I / ((I + P) + (R + NC + O) + e(UH + UO))$

  - I = Completes and Screen-Outs
  - P = Partial Interviews
  - R = Refusals and Break-offs
  - NC = Non-Contacts
  - O = Other
  - UH = Unknown Households
  - UO = Unknown Other
  - e = the estimated portion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible.

The final response rate for the project overall was **45.4%.**

By version, the response rates were as follows:

- RDD landline version
  - 52.6%
    - *N=1433 "Non-Targeted Completes"*
      - 31.6%
    - *N=667 "Targeted Completes"*
      - 61.7%
- Cell Phone version
  - 26.0%

A more detailed report of the disposition of the sample for each version can be found in Appendix B.

Methods Employed to Increase Response Rate

There were several tactics which were employed in order to get the maximum response rate possible amongst all of the versions of the project. The main method was the use of a 24-call design and an extended field period. This allowed us the ability to make numerous attempts to contact each household at various times of the day and across all days of the week, which in turn gives us the best opportunity for calling the household at a time when an individual will be there to answer our call. Furthermore, by spreading out these call attempts across an extended period of time, we also benefit from potentially contacting a different member of the household who may have been more agreeable to participation.

Another important factor in yielding a higher response rate was the use of the incentive for completion of the survey. For those respondents completing the RDD landline version, a $15 incentive was offered, and those completing the Cell Phone version were offered $25.

Lastly, the use of Refusal Conversion was employed in order to try and convince households that had previously refused participation to reconsider. When contacting such households, only experienced interviewers who had been identified as effective at Refusal Conversion were utilized. In addition, we allowed a minimum of 3 weeks to pass from the time of the initial refusal before attempting Refusal Conversion with the intent of trying to speak with a different member of the household, or to allow enough time to have gone by so that the original respondent had forgotten the initial refusal.

Refusal Conversion Letters

In order to help facilitate the Refusal Conversion effort, we sent a specially-worded letter to those households which had refused participation explaining the purpose and importance of the project, and urging them to reconsider their participation. In addition to the letter, a $5 incentive was included as a means of further aiding this effort. The letter included a Toll-free number that the respondent could call in order to participate when they reconsidered. The letter was also translated into Spanish, which was printed on the alternate side of the letter.

Being that each record in the project was generated at random, we did not possess any information for a household other than the telephone number. We thus needed to send the "refusal" records to an independent service that specializes in providing address information by conducting a reverse-directory phone number search. As a result of this, only those records which yielded an address from this "reverse directory search" were sent the Refusal Conversion letter. In total, we sent the Refusal Conversion letter to 6,172 records, of which 366 (6%) ended up completing the interview.

TAPE MEASURE WORKSHEETS

Those households which completed the interview and also contained at least 1 family member between the ages of 3 to 18 years old were sent a special worksheet and tape measure for the purpose of recording the height, weight, and age of each 3 to 18 year old family member in that household. Though the worksheet contained detailed instructions as to how the measurements were to be made, as well as which members of the family were to be measured, the name and gender of each 3 to 18 year old child, as well as the original survey respondent, was pre–merged into the worksheet prior to it being sent so that each household completed the worksheet about only those individuals for which we needed data.

The worksheet was also translated into Spanish, but only those respondents which completed the telephone survey in Spanish were sent this version of the worksheet.

As a means of increasing the return rate of the worksheets, a $5 incentive was included with the mailing. Additionally, a 2nd "reminder" mailing was sent to each non-responder, without an incentive, 3 weeks after the initial mailing. In total, 747 households were sent the tape measure and worksheet, with 298 completing and returning it (39.9%).

Note: During the administration of the project, a small sampling of qualified households were used to conduct a test of the effectiveness of offering the tape measure incentive in a different manner. Specifically, 55 of 747 households were sent the tape measure and worksheet WITHOUT the incentive check, and instead were sent a letter informing them that they would receive $5 upon returning the completed worksheet. Of these 55 cases, 27 of them returned a completed worksheet (49.1%). In addition, 67 of the 747 households were also sent no incentive along with the tape measure and worksheet, and were instead sent a letter offering them $10 if they returned a completed worksheet. Of these 67 cases, only 24 returned a completed worksheet (35.8%).

WEIGHTING

Weights were developed for six sample groups:

1. Households,
2. Family households,
3. Persons living in family households,
4. Children age 3-18 years living in family households,
5. Children age 3-18 years with completed worksheets, and

6. Persons living in households.

For each sample group two weights were created:

1. Weights that sum to the sample size of completed interviews, and
2. Weights that sum to the population size of the sample group.

Household Weights

- *Landline sample household completed interviews for households that do not contain any unmarried persons age 19-30 years:*
  - The main landline RDD sample consists of 5 geographic strata. For the main landline RDD sample replicates not part of the oversampling of households containing one or more unmarried persons age 19-30 years, the base sampling weight for a geographic stratum (samreg) equals the population count of telephone numbers in the geographic stratum divided by the total number of sample telephone numbers for the main sample replicates released for that stratum.

- *Landline sample household completed interviews that contain one or more unmarried persons age 19-30 years:*
  - The main landline RDD sample and the oversample consist of 5 geographic strata. For the main landline RDD sample replicates and the oversample replicates, the base sampling weight for a geographic stratum (samreg) equals the population count of telephone numbers in the geographic stratum divided by the total number of sample telephone numbers for the main sample released replicates for that stratum plus the total number of sample telephone numbers for the oversample released replicates for that stratum.

- *Cellular sample household completed interviews:*
  - The cell phone sample is a state-wide equal probability sample. Thus there is only one base sampling weight value. It equals the population count of telephone numbers in the cellular sampling frame divided by the total number of sample telephone numbers for the released replicates.

Table 1 gives the base sampling weight values.

Table 1. Base Sampling Weights

Sample	Region	Population Count of Telephone Numbers	Sample Size of Telephone Numbers	Base Sampling Weight
Main	1	631500	1178	536.1
Main	2	1148300	2171	528.9
Main	3	1877400	3533	531.4
Main	4	1558100	2955	527.3
Main	5	3247400	7943	408.8
Oversample	1	631500	3397	185.9
Oversample	2	1148300	4489	255.8
Oversample	3	1877400	9632	194.9
Oversample	4	1558100	6987	223.0
Oversample	5	3247400	16637	195.2
Cellular		10835000	12198	888.3

Based on responses to telephone usage questions, the landline sample household completed interviews were divided into three telephone usage groups:

1. Landline only,
2. Landline and cell, cell mainly, and
3. Landline and cell, not cell mainly

The cellular sample household completed interviews were divided into two telephone usage groups:

1. Cell only, and
2. Landline and cell, cell mainly

Landline and cell, cell mainly households were included in the landline and the cellular samples. The base sampling weight values of these households were therefore multiplied by 0.50.

The probability of sampling a household was directly related to the number of telephone devices (cellular telephone numbers and landline telephone numbers) associated with the household. For the cell only household completed interviews, the count of cell phones in the household was determined from question CSC1a. The maximum value was capped at 5. For the cell mainly completed interviews from the cellular sample, the count of cell phones in the household was determined from question CSC1a. The maximum value was capped at 5. For the cell mainly group, the number of landline telephone numbers in the household was not asked and so the count was set to 1.

For the landline only household completed interviews from the landline sample, the count of landline phones in the household was determined from question SC8a. The maximum value was capped at 3. **For the cell mainly and not cell mainly completed**

interviews from the landline sample, the count of landline phones in the household was determined from question SC8a. The maximum value was capped at 3. **For the cell mainly and not cell mainly completed interviews from the landline sample,** the count of cell phones in the household was determined from question SC8c. The maximum value was capped at 5.

Also, for the landline completed household interviews a household was classified as having an interruption in telephone service if question SC8b equals 1.

For cell only completed household interviews, the base sampling weight was divided by the count of cell phones in the household. For landline only completed household interviews, the base sampling weight was divided by the count of landline phones in the household. For the landline and cell completed household interviews, the base sampling weight was divided by the count of cell phones in the household plus the count of landline phones in the household.

The resulting weight is the adjusted base sampling weight which was used as the input weight to a raking procedure that calculated the final household weights. The raking procedure brought the weighted household sample into agreement with a set of population control totals. The population control totals were assembled from the New Jersey 2005-2007 American Community Survey (ACS) PUMS. The telephone usage group population control totals were developed from the 2008 National Health Interview (NHIS) PUF for the Northeast Census Region (NCHS does not release state estimates). The 2009 percentage of households in the Northeast Census Region that are cell only households was estimated by applying the published NCHS percent increase in cell only households in the Northeast Census Region from July-December 2007 to July-December 2008 to the 2008 NHIS PUF estimate. The population control totals for the household raking are given in Table 2. After the raking converged, the distribution of the household weights was examined. Weight values above the 95th percentile were truncated to the 95th percentile. Weights values below the 5th percentile were raised to the 5th percentile. Weight trimming was used to reduce the increase in sampling variability arising from unequal weights.

Family Household Weights

The final household weight was used as the input weight to the family household raking. The population control totals for family households were assembled using the New Jersey 2005-2007 ACS PUMS and the 2008 NHIS PUF for the Northeast Census Region. Table 3 gives the population control totals for the family household raking. After the raking converged, the distribution of the family household weights was examined. Weight values above the 97th percentile were truncated to the 97th percentile. Weights values below the 3rd percentile were raised to the 3rd percentile. Weight trimming was used to reduce the increase in sampling variability arising from unequal weights.

Person Weights

The final family household weight was used as the input weight to the persons living in family household raking. The population control totals for persons living in family households were assembled using the New Jersey 2005-2007 ACS PUMS and the 2008 NHIS PUF for the Northeast Census Region. Table 4 gives the population control totals for the persons living in family household raking. After the raking converged, the distribution of the person weights was examined. Weight values above the 97th percentile were truncated to the 97th percentile. Weights values below the 3rd percentile were raised to the 3rd percentile. Weight trimming was used to reduce the increase in sampling variability arising from unequal weights.

Random Child Weights

For family households with one or more children age 3 to 18 years, one child was randomly selected for the random child interview module. The raking input weight was calculated as the product of the final family household weight and the number of children age 3 to 18 years in the household. The maximum value for the number of children in the household was capped at 4. The population control totals for children age 3 to 18 years living in family households were assembled using the New Jersey 2005-2007 ACS PUMS and the 2008 NHIS PUF for the Northeast Census Region. Table 5 gives the population control totals for the children age 3 to 18 years living in family household raking. After the raking converged, the distribution of the child weights was examined. Weight values above the 97th percentile were truncated to the 97th percentile. Weights values below the 3rd percentile were raised to the 3rd percentile. Weight trimming was used to reduce the increase in sampling variability arising from unequal weights.

Child Worksheet Weights

For family households with one or more children age 3 to 18 years an attempt was made to collect a worksheet for each age-eligible child in the household. The raking input weight was the final family household weight. The population control totals for children age 3 to 18 years living in family households were assembled using the New Jersey 2005-2007 ACS PUMS and the 2008 NHIS PUF for the Northeast Census Region. Table 6 gives the population control totals for the children age 3 to 18 years living in family household raking. After the raking converged the distribution of the child worksheet weights was examined. Weight values above the 95th percentile were truncated to the 95th percentile. Weights values below the 5th percentile were raised to the 5th percentile. Weight trimming was used to reduce the increase in sampling variability arising from unequal weights.

Person in Household Weights

The calculation of weights for persons in family households was described above. The calculation of weights for persons in all households (family and nonfamily) was more difficult. Of the 509 interviews that were conducted in nonfamily households, 426 were single-person households and 83 were households with 2 or more persons. Of the 83 nonfamily households with 2 or more persons, only 3 of them (3.6%) completed more than one interview. The sample of persons thus substantially under-represents unrelated individuals living in households with two or more such persons.

The final household weight was used as the input weight to the persons living in household raking. The population control totals for persons living in households were assembled using the New Jersey 2005-2007 ACS PUMS and the 2008 NHIS PUF for the Northeast Census Region. Table 7 gives the population control totals for the persons living in family household raking. For poverty status, nativity, gender and race/ethnicity it was decided to use two-variable raking margins: age group (0-18 years vs. 19 years or older) by poverty status, age group by nativity, age group by gender, and age group by race/ethnicity. These two-variable margins were used in the raking because children had a different distribution than adults.

To reduce any bias associated with the underrepresentation of unrelated individuals in households with two or more such persons, the household type raking control variable split persons living in nonfamily households into nonfamily households with one versus two or more unrelated individuals.

Weight trimming was used to reduce the increase in sampling variability arising from unequal weights. After the first raking converged the distribution of the person weights was examined. Weight values above the 95th percentile were truncated to the 95th percentile. Weight values below the 5th percentile were raised to the 5th percentile. Using the trimmed weight from the first raking as the input weight, the second raking was run. Weight values above the 95th percentile were truncated to the 95th percentile. Weight values below the 5th percentile were raised to the 5th percentile. Using the trimmed weight from the second raking as the input weight, the third and final raking was run. Weight values above the 95th percentile were truncated to the 95th percentile. Weight values below the 5th percentile were raised to the 5th percentile. The trimmed weight from the third raking is the final person weight.

Table 2. New Jersey Household Population Control Totals *(N=3,143,405)*		*Sample Size = 2500*	
Variable	**Description**	**Household Population Size**	**Percent**
Non-telephone adjustment margin			
1	Landline interview - interruption in telephone service	156873	5.0%
2	All other interviews	2986532	95.0%
Age of oldest adult in household			
1	18-34	421647	13.4%
2	35-44	655081	20.8%
3	45-54	716149	22.8%
4	55-64	565683	18.0%
5	65-74	368631	11.7%
6	75+	416214	13.2%
Age of youngest adult in household			
1	18-24	487628	15.5%
2	25-34	615901	19.6%
3	35-44	689307	21.9%
4	45-54	469279	14.9%
5	55-64	374137	11.9%
6	65+	507153	16.1%
Number of adults in household			
1	1 Adult	972807	30.9%
2	2 Adults	1600979	50.9%
3	3 Adults	380233	12.1%
4	4+ Adults	189386	6.0%
Number of children in household			

1	0 Children	1996271	63.5%
2	1 Child	490406	15.6%
3	2 Children	443289	14.1%
4	3+ Children	213439	6.8%
Total persons in household			
1	1 Person	809088	25.7%
2	2 Persons	944566	30.0%
3	3 Persons	538447	17.1%
4	4 Persons	514144	16.4%
5	5 Persons	230475	7.3%
6	6+ Persons	106685	3.4%
Tenure status			
1	Own	2122018	67.5%
2	Rent	1021387	32.5%
Telephone usage group			
1	Landline Only	741215	23.6%
2	Landline and Cell - Cell Mainly	378466	12.0%
3	Landline and Cell - Not Cell Mainly	1591820	50.6%
4	Cell Only	431904	13.7%
Region of residence			
1	Cape May, etc.	277828	8.8%
2	Gloucester, etc.	436942	13.9%
3	Ocean, etc.	733112	23.3%
4	Mercer, etc.	540688	17.2%
5	Passaic, etc.	1154835	36.7%
Household poverty level			

1	at or above 200% poverty	2457370	78.2%
2	below 200% poverty	686035	21.8%
Presence of unmarried person in household age 19-30 years			
1	1 or more Unmarried age 19-30	595913	19.0%
2	0 Unmarried age 19-30	2547492	81.0%
Type of household			
1	Family household	2185416	69.5%
2	Nonfamily household	957989	30.5%
Total		3143405	

Table 3. New Jersey Family Household Population Control Totals *(N=2,185,416)*		*Sample Size = 1991*	
Variable	**Description**	**Family Household Population Size**	**Percent**
Non-telephone adjustment margin			
1	Landline interview - interruption in telephone service	164626	7.5%
2	All other interviews	2020790	92.5%
Age of oldest adult in household			
1	18-34	258699	11.8%
2	35-44	513001	23.5%
3	45-54	552828	25.3%
4	55-64	401591	18.4%
5	65-74	237355	10.9%
6	75+	221942	10.2%
Age of youngest adult in household			
1	18-24	439592	20.1%
2	25-34	478052	21.9%
3	35-44	545569	25.0%
4	45-54	312054	14.3%
5	55-64	218266	10.0%
6	65+	191883	8.8%
Number of adults in household			
1	1 Adult	163083	7.5%
2	2 Adults	1474484	67.5%
3	3 Adults	366229	16.8%
4	4+ Adults	181620	8.3%
Number of children in household			

1	0 Children	1046306	47.9%
2	1 Child	485318	22.2%
3	2 Children	441111	20.2%
4	3+ Children	212681	9.7%
Total number of persons in household			
1	2 Persons	822766	37.6%
2	3 Persons	522160	23.9%
3	4 Persons	507563	23.2%
4	5 Persons	227861	10.4%
5	6+ Persons	105066	4.8%
Highest education level among adults in the household			
1	HS Grad or less	556217	25.5%
2	Some college	576641	26.4%
3	College graduate	1052558	48.2%
Race/ethnicity classification of the household			
1	All persons in HH are Non-Hispanic White	1346708	61.6%
2	All persons in HH are Non-Hispanic Black	242143	11.1%
3	All persons in HH are Non-Hispanic Asian	150487	6.9%
4	All persons in HH are Hispanic	251429	11.5%
5	All other HHs	194649	8.9%
Tenure status			
1	Own	1633952	74.8%
2	Rent	551464	25.2%
		2185416	100.0%

Telephone Usage Group			
1	Landline Only	401401	18.4%
2	Landline and Cell - Cell Mainly	285622	13.1%
3	Landline and Cell - Not Cell Mainly	1331651	60.9%
4	Cell Only	166742	7.6%
Region of residence			
1	Cape May, etc.	160110	7.3%
2	Gloucester, etc.	327910	15.0%
3	Ocean, etc.	525109	24.0%
4	Mercer, etc.	405127	18.5%
5	Passaic, etc.	767160	35.1%
Presence of unmarried person in household age 19-30 years			
1	1 or more Unmarried age 19-30	469897	21.5%
2	0 Unmarried age 19-30	1715519	78.5%
Household poverty level			
1	at or above 200% poverty	1818886	83.2%
2	below 200% poverty	366530	16.8%
Total		2185416	

Table 4. New Jersey Population Control Totals for Persons Living in Family Households *(N=7,295,799)*		*Sample Size = 6827*	
Variable	**Description**	**Population Size of Persons**	**Percent**
Non-telephone adjustment margin			
1	Landline Interview - interruption in telephone service	678853	9.3%
2	All other interviews	6616946	90.7%
Number of adults in household			
1	1 Adult	454196	6.2%
2	2 Adults	4366629	59.9%
3	3 Adults	1460957	20.0%
4	4+ Adults	1014017	13.9%
Number of children in household			
1	0 Children	2677326	36.7%
2	1 Child	1618920	22.2%
3	2 Children	1831464	25.1%
4	3+ Children	1168089	16.0%
Total number of persons in household			
1	2 Persons	1683651	23.1%
2	3 Persons	1628825	22.3%
3	4 Persons	2077204	28.5%
4	5 Persons	1175542	16.1%
5	6+ Persons	730577	10.0%
Tenure status			
1	Own	5443980	74.6%
2	Rent	1851819	25.4%

Telephone usage group			
1	Landline Only	1257947	17.2%
2	Landline and Cell - Cell Mainly	1034704	14.2%
3	Landline and Cell - Not Cell Mainly	4446509	60.9%
4	Cell Only	556639	7.6%
Region of residence			
1	Cape May, etc.	470554	6.4%
2	Gloucester, etc.	1055153	14.5%
3	Ocean, etc.	1686279	23.1%
4	Mercer, etc.	1337290	18.3%
5	Passaic, etc.	2746523	37.6%
Presence of unmarried person in household age 19-30 years			
1	1 or more Unmarried age 19-30	1915281	26.3%
2	0 Unmarried age 19-30	5380518	73.7%
Household poverty level			
1	at or above 200% poverty	5972172	81.9%
2	below 200% poverty	1323627	18.1%
Education of person (Age 16+)			
1	age 0-17 years	2064592	28.3%
2	HS Grad or less	2277038	31.2%
3	Some college	1274651	17.5%
4	College graduate	1679518	23.0%
Marital status of person (Age 16+)			
1	age 0-15 years	1823330	25.0%
2	Married	3501072	48.0%
3	Divorced or Separated or Widowed	560828	7.7%

4	Never married or living with partner	1410569	19.3%
Gender of person			
1	Male	3579427	49.1%
2	Female	3716372	50.9%
Race/ethnicity of person			
1	Non-Hispanic White	4498380	61.7%
2	Non-Hispanic Black	923520	12.7%
3	Non-Hispanic Asian	574777	7.9%
4	Hispanic	1184558	16.2%
5	Non-Hispanic all other races	114564	1.6%
Age category of person			
1	0-5	666045	9.1%
2	6-18	1501004	20.6%
3	19-23	439288	6.0%
4	24-30	552078	7.6%
5	31-44	1543142	21.2%
6	45-54	1112616	15.3%
7	55-64	746939	10.2%
8	65 and older	734687	10.1%
Total		7295799	

Table 5. New Jersey Population Control Totals for Children Age 3 to 18 Years Living in Family Households *(N=1,838,078)*		*Sample Size = 878*	
Variable	**Description**	**Population Size of Children Age 3 to 18 Years**	**Percent**
Non-telephone adjustment margin			
1	Landline Interview - interruption in telephone service	76440	4.2%
2	All other interviews	1761638	95.8%
Age of oldest adult in household			
1	18-34	214046	11.6%
2	35-44	755580	41.1%
3	45-54	616892	33.6%
4	55-64	143459	7.8%
5	65+	108101	5.9%
Age of youngest adult in household			
1	18-24	390995	21.3%
2	25-34	381640	20.8%
3	35-44	789107	42.9%
4	45+	276336	15.0%
Total adults in household			
1	1 Adult	258139	14.0%
2	2 Adults	1144444	62.3%
3	3 Adults	289674	15.8%
4	4+ Adults	145821	7.9%
Total children age 0 to 17 years in household			

1	0 Children	42849	2.3%
2	1 Child	415834	22.6%
3	2 Children	763003	41.5%
4	3+ Children	616392	33.5%
Total number of persons in household			
1	2 Persons	78245	4.3%
2	3 Persons	310607	16.9%
3	4 Persons	699042	38.0%
4	5 Persons	460834	25.1%
5	6+ Persons	289350	15.7%
Tenure status			
1	Own	1307109	71.1%
2	Rent	530969	28.9%
Telephone usage group			
1	Landline Only	284929	15.5%
2	Landline and Cell - Cell Mainly	280121	15.2%
3	Landline and Cell - Not Cell Mainly	1122520	61.1%
4	Cell Only	150508	8.2%
Region of residence			
1	Cape May, etc.	122163	6.6%
2	Gloucester, etc.	269457	14.7%
3	Ocean, etc.	416387	22.7%
4	Mercer, etc.	340679	18.5%
5	Passaic, etc.	689392	37.5%

Presence of unmarried person in household age 19-30 years			
1	1 or more Unmarried age 19-30	325790	17.7%
2	0 Unmarried age 19-30	1512288	82.3%
Household poverty level			
1	at or above 200% poverty	1378770	75.0%
2	below 200% poverty	459308	25.0%
Highest education level among adults in household			
1	HS Grad or less	483920	26.3%
2	Some college	509184	27.7%
3	College graduate	844974	46.0%
Race/ethnicity of child			
1	Non-Hispanic White	1049878	57.1%
2	Non-Hispanic Black	283023	15.4%
3	Non-Hispanic Asian + All Others	170952	9.3%
4	Hispanic	334225	18.2%
Gender of child			
1	Male	945303	51.4%
2	Female	892775	48.6%
Age category of child			
1	3-5 years	337074	18.3%
2	6-18 years	1501004	81.7%

Table 6. New Jersey Population Control Totals for Children with Completed Worksheets Age 3 to 18 Years Living in Family Households *(N=1,838,078)*		*Sample Size = 473*	
Variable	**Description**	**Population Size of Children Age 3 to 18 Years**	**Percent**
Non-telephone adjustment margin			
1	Landline Interview - interruption in telephone service	76440	4.2%
2	All other interviews	1761638	95.8%
Age of oldest adult in household			
1	18-44	969626	52.7%
2	45-54	616892	33.6%
3	55-64	143459	7.8%
4	65+	108101	5.9%
Age of youngest adult in household			
1	18-24	390995	21.3%
2	25-34	381640	20.8%
3	35-44	789107	42.9%
4	45+	276336	15.0%
Total adults in household			
1	1-2 Adults	1402583	76.3%
2	3 Adults	289674	15.8%
3	4+ Adults	145821	7.9%
Total children age 0 to 17 years in household			
1	0-1 Child	458683	24.9%

2	2 Children	763003	41.5%
3	3+ Children	616392	33.5%
Total number of persons in household			
1	2-3 Persons	388852	21.2%
2	4 Persons	699042	38.0%
3	5 Persons	460834	25.1%
4	6+ Persons	289350	15.7%
Tenure status			
1	Own	1307109	71.1%
2	Rent	530969	28.9%
Telephone usage group			
1	Landline Only + Landline and Cell - Not Cell Mainly	1407449	76.6%
2	Landline and Cell - Cell Mainly	280121	15.2%
3	Cell Only	150508	8.2%
Region of residence			
1	Cape May, etc.	122163	6.6%
2	Gloucester, etc.	269457	14.7%
3	Ocean, etc.	416387	22.7%
4	Mercer, etc.	340679	18.5%
5	Passaic, etc.	689392	37.5%
Presence of unmarried person in household age 19-30 years			
1	1 or more Unmarried age 19-30	325790	17.7%
2	0 Unmarried age 19-30	1512288	82.3%

Household poverty level			
1	at or above 200% poverty	1378770	75.0%
2	below 200% poverty	459308	25.0%
Highest education level among adults in household			
1	HS Grad or less	483920	26.3%
2	Some college	509184	27.7%
3	College graduate	844974	46.0%
Race/ethnicity of child			
1	Non-Hispanic White	1049878	57.1%
2	Non-Hispanic Black	283023	15.4%
3	Non-Hispanic Asian + All Others	170952	9.3%
4	Hispanic	334225	18.2%
Gender of child			
1	Male	945303	51.4%
2	Female	892775	48.6%
Age category of child			
1	3-5 years	337074	18.3%
2	6-18 years	1501004	81.7%

Table 7. New Jersey Population Control Totals for Persons Living in Households *(N=8,473,863)*		*Sample Size = 7,336*	
Variable	**Description**	**Population Size of Persons**	**Percent**
Non-telephone adjustment margin			
1	Landline Interview - interruption in telephone service	701865	8.3%
2	All other interviews	7771998	91.7%
		8473863	100.0%
Type of Household			
1	Family household	7295799	86.1%
2	Nonfamily household - one person in household	808215	9.5%
3	Nonfamily household - two or more persons in household	369849	4.4%
		8473863	100.0%
Number of adults in household			
1	1 Adult	1264051	14.9%
2	2 Adults	4640576	54.8%
3	3 Adults	1510620	17.8%
4	4+ Adults	1058616	12.5%
		8473863	100.0%
Number of children in household			
1	0 Children	3826012	45.2%
2	1 Child	1634114	19.3%
3	2 Children	1841386	21.7%
4	3+ Children	1172351	13.8%
		8473863	100.0%
Total number of persons in household			
1	0 Persons	808215	9.5%
2	1 Person	1940143	22.9%
3	3 Persons	1684140	19.9%
4	4 Persons	2107092	24.9%
5	5 Persons	1190746	14.1%
6	6+ Persons	743527	8.8%
		8473863	100.0%

Tenure status			
1	Own	6015820	71.0%
2	Rent	2458043	29.0%
		8473863	100.0%
Telephone usage group			
1	Landline Only	1644106	19.4%
2	Landline and Cell - Cell Mainly	1161401	13.7%
3	Landline and Cell - Not Cell Mainly	4779974	56.4%
4	Cell Only	888382	10.5%
		8473863	100.0%
Region of residence			
1	Cape May, etc.	575353	6.8%
2	Gloucester, etc.	1221502	14.4%
3	Ocean, etc.	1947791	23.0%
4	Mercer, etc.	1528295	18.0%
5	Passaic, etc.	3200922	37.8%
		8473863	100.0%
Presence of unmarried person in household age 19-30 years			
1	1 or more Unmarried age 19-30	2151607	25.4%
2	0 Unmarried age 19-30	6322256	74.6%
		8473863	100.0%
Age Group by Household poverty level			
1	Age 0 to 18 / at or above 200% poverty	1617891	19.1%
2	Age 0 to 18 / below 200% poverty	562576	6.6%
3	Age 19+ / at or above 200% poverty	5135477	60.6
4	Age 19+ / below 200% poverty	1157919	13.7
		8473863	100.0%
Education of person (Age 18+)			
1	age 0-17 years	2076422	24.5%
2	HS Grad or less	2808919	33.1%
3	Some college	1543808	18.2%
4	College graduate	2044714	24.1%

		8473863	100.0%
Marital status of person (Age 16+)			
1	age 0-15 years	1832831	21.6%
2	Married	3548910	41.9%
3	Divorced or Separated or Widowed	1150841	13.6%
4	Never married or living with partner	1941281	22.9%
		8473863	100.0%
Age Group by Nativity of Person			
1	Age 0 to 18 / Native Born	2051165	24.2%
2	Age 0 to 18 / Foreign Born	129302	1.5%
3	Age 19+ / Native Born	4728495	55.8%
4	Age 19+ / Foreign Born	1564901	18.5%
		8473863	100.0%
Age Group by Gender of person			
1	Age 0 to 18 / Male	1118162	13.2%
2	Age 0 to 18 / Female	1062305	12.5%
3	Age 19+ / Male	3007138	35.5%
4	Age 19+ / Female	3286258	38.8%
		8473863	100.0%
Age Group by Race/ethnicity of person			
1	Age 0 to 18 / Non-Hispanic White	1220608	14.4%
2	Age 0 to 18 / Non-Hispanic Black	336180	4.0%
3	Age 0 to 18 / Non-Hispanic Asian + Non-Hispanic Other	208708	2.5%
4	Age 0 to 18 / Hispanic	414971	4.9%
5	Age 19+ / Non-Hispanic White	4090186	48.3%
6	Age 19+ / Non-Hispanic Black	748115	8.8%
7	Age 19+ / Non-Hispanic Asian + Non-Hispanic Other	545640	6.4%
8	Age 19+ / Hispanic	909455	10.7%
		8473863	100.0%
Age category of person			
1	0-5	668554	7.9%
2	6-18	1511913	17.8%

3	19-23	491157	5.8%
4	24-30	707463	8.3%
5	31-44	1794401	21.2%
6	45-54	1303155	15.4%
7	55-64	927675	10.9%
8	65 and older	1069545	12.6%
Total		8473863	100.0%

GEO-CODING

During the survey, respondents were asked to provide their address information as a means of sending them their incentive check. This same address information was then used to have basic geo-coding performed for those households that provided a complete and accurate address. The final list of complete addresses was fed through special GPS software which yielded the latitude and longitude for each of these households.

Of the 2500 completed interviews for the entire project, there were a total of 2148 records which provided complete and accurate address information and were thus processed through the geo-coding software. All 2148 of these records yielded latitude and longitude results after being processed.

APPENDIX A

Basic Details

- **Dates of Completion:**
  - RDD landline version – 11/3/08 through 11/5/09
  - Cell Phone version – 11/6/08 through 7/21/09

- **Average Survey Lengths**
  - Overall – 37.1 minutes
    - *RDD landline version* – 36.7 minutes
      - "Non-targeted" – 36.7 minutes
      - "Targeted" – 37.3 minutes
    - *Cell Phone version* – 39.3 minutes

- **Sub-Quotas**
  - *Region*

Region	Quota	HH Population	% of State HH Pop.
1	150	223,887	7.14%
2	303	451,999	14.42%
3	483	721,860	23.02%
4	373	557,362	17.78%
5	791	1,180,382	37.65%
TOTAL	**2100**	**3,135,490**	**100%**

  - *Below 200% Poverty Level*
    - N=570
      - RDD landline version – N=424
        - *"Non-Targeted" – N=285*
        - *"Targeted" – N=139*
      - Cell version – N=146

  - *Unmarried, 19 to 30 Year Old Individual*
    - N=1151
      - RDD landline version – N=948
        - *"Non-Targeted" – N=281*
        - *"Targeted" – N=667*
      - Cell Phone version – N=203

APPENDIX B

Final Sample Disposition Report – Overall

Interview (Category 1)		**TOTAL**
Complete	1.000	2500
Screen-outs	1.100	6929
Partial	1.200	89
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)		
Refusal and breakoff	2.100	1271
Refusal	2.110	3491
Respondent never available	2.210	258
Answering machine household-no message left	2.221	2344
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	2.320	447
Household-level language problem	2.331	513
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)		
Always busy	3.120	16
No answer	3.130	3194
Call blocking	3.150	1
Technical phone problems	3.160	213
No screener completed	3.210	6010
Not eligible (Category 4)		
Fax/data line	4.200	3184
Non-working/disconnect	4.300	29660
Temporarily out of service	4.330	707
Cell phone	4.420	31
Business, government office, other organizations	4.510	5081
Quota filled	4.800	33
Other	4.900	673
Total phone numbers used		66645
Completes and Screen-Outs (1.0/1.1)	I	9429
Partial Interviews (1.2)	P	89
Refusal and break off (2.1)	R	4762
Non Contact (2.2)	NC	2602
Other (2.3)	O	960
Unknown household (3.1)	UH	3424
Unknown other (3.2, 3.9)	UO	6010
Not Eligible (4.0)	NE	39369
e = Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible.	(I+P+R+NC+O)/((I+P+R+NC+O)+NE)	0.312
Response Rate 3	I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))	0.454

Final Sample Disposition Report – RDD Landline Version ("Non-Targeted" & "Targeted")

Interview (Category 1)		**TOTAL**
Complete	1.000	2100
Screen-outs	1.100	5861
Partial	1.200	38
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)		
Refusal and breakoff	2.100	887
Refusal	2.110	1915
Respondent never available	2.210	146
Answering machine household-no message left	2.221	1288
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	2.320	375
Household-level language problem	2.331	370
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)		
Always busy	3.120	14
No answer	3.130	3118
Call blocking	3.150	1
Technical phone problems	3.160	199
No screener completed	3.210	4427
Not eligible (Category 4)		
Fax/data line	4.200	3167
Non-working/disconnect	4.300	25716
Temporarily out of service	4.330	355
Cell phone	4.420	31
Business, government office, other organizations	4.510	4352
Quota filled	4.800	33
Other	4.900	54
Total phone numbers used		54447
Completes and Screen-Outs (1.0/1.1)	I	7961
Partial Interviews (1.2)	P	38
Refusal and break off (2.1)	R	2802
Non Contact (2.2)	NC	1434
Other (2.3)	O	745
Unknown household (3.1)	UH	3332
Unknown other (3.2, 3.9)	UO	4427
Not Eligible (4.0)	NE	33708
e = Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible.	(I+P+R+NC+O)/((I+P+R+NC+O)+NE)	0.278
Response Rate 3	I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))	0.526

Final Sample Disposition Report – RDD Landline Version ("Non-Targeted" Only)

Interview (Category 1)		**TOTAL**
Complete	1.000	1433
Screen-outs	1.100	15
Partial	1.200	35
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)		
Refusal and breakoff	2.100	316
Refusal	2.110	1236
Respondent never available	2.210	60
Answering machine household-no message left	2.221	476
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	2.320	190
Household-level language problem	2.331	150
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)		
Always busy	3.120	3
No answer	3.130	1512
Call blocking	3.150	1
Technical phone problems	3.160	60
No screener completed	3.210	919
Not eligible (Category 4)		
Fax/data line	4.200	996
Non-working/disconnect	4.300	7863
Temporarily out of service	4.330	223
Cell phone	4.420	13
Business, government office, other organizations	4.510	1368
Quota filled	4.800	0
Other	4.900	30
Total phone numbers used		16899
Completes and Screen-Outs (1.0/1.1)	I	1448
Partial Interviews (1.2)	P	35
Refusal and break off (2.1)	R	1552
Non Contact (2.2)	NC	536
Other (2.3)	O	340
Unknown household (3.1)	UH	1576
Unknown other (3.2, 3.9)	UO	919
Not Eligible (4.0)	NE	10493
e = Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible.	(I+P+R+NC+O)/((I+P+R+NC+O)+NE)	0.272
Response Rate 3	I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))	0.316

Final Sample Disposition Report – RDD Landline Version ("Targeted" Only)

Interview (Category 1)		**TOTAL**
Complete	1.000	667
Screen-outs	1.100	5846
Partial	1.200	3
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)		
Refusal and breakoff	2.100	571
Refusal	2.110	679
Respondent never available	2.210	86
Answering machine household-no message left	2.221	812
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	2.320	185
Household-level language problem	2.331	220
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)		
Always busy	3.120	11
No answer	3.130	1606
Call blocking	3.150	0
Technical phone problems	3.160	139
No screener completed	3.210	3508
Not eligible (Category 4)		
Fax/data line	4.200	2171
Non-working/disconnect	4.300	17853
Temporarily out of service	4.330	132
Cell phone	4.420	18
Business, government office, other organizations	4.510	2984
Quota filled	4.800	33
Other	4.900	24
Total phone numbers used		37548
Completes and Screen-Outs (1.0/1.1)	I	6513
Partial Interviews (1.2)	P	3
Refusal and break off (2.1)	R	1250
Non Contact (2.2)	NC	898
Other (2.3)	O	405
Unknown household (3.1)	UH	1756
Unknown other (3.2, 3.9)	UO	3508
Not Eligible (4.0)	NE	23215
e = Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible.	(I+P+R+NC+O)/((I+P+R+NC+O)+NE)	0.281
Response Rate 3	I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))	0.617

Final Sample Disposition Report – Cell Phone Version

Interview (Category 1)		**TOTAL**
Complete	1.000	400
Screen-outs	1.100	1068
Partial	1.200	51
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)		
Refusal and breakoff	2.100	384
Refusal	2.110	1576
Respondent never available	2.210	112
Answering machine household-no message left	2.221	1056
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	2.320	72
Household-level language problem	2.331	143
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)		
Always busy	3.120	2
No answer	3.130	76
Call blocking	3.150	0
Technical phone problems	3.160	14
No screener completed	3.210	1583
Not eligible (Category 4)		
Fax/data line	4.200	17
Non-working/disconnect	4.300	3944
Temporarily out of service	4.330	352
Business, government office, other organizations	4.510	729
Quota filled	4.800	0
Other	4.900	619
Total phone numbers used		12198
Completes and Screen-Outs (1.0/1.1)	I	1468
Partial Interviews (1.2)	P	51
Refusal and break off (2.1)	R	1960
Non Contact (2.2)	NC	1168
Other (2.3)	O	215
Unknown household (3.1)	UH	92
Unknown other (3.2, 3.9)	UO	1583
Not Eligible (4.0)	NE	5661
e = Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible.	(I+P+R+NC+O)/((I+P+R+NC+O)+NE)	0.462
Response Rate 3	I/((I+P) + (R+NC+O) + e(UH+UO))	0.260

RUTGERS
Center for State Health Policy

112 Paterson Street
5th Floor
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
www.cshp.rutgers.edu