The Impact of Declining Response Rates on Survey Quality and Remediation Strategies*

Wanling Ma

March 5, 2024

1 Introduction

The phenomenon of declining response rates in surveys has become a pressing concern for researchers and statisticians worldwide. This trend threatens the quality of survey results, as lower participation rates can introduce non-response bias, compromising the representativeness and accuracy of findings. Addressing this challenge is paramount for maintaining the integrity and relevance of survey-based research. This paper examines the evidence of declining response rates across various survey modes, explores the implications for survey quality, and discusses remediation strategies aimed at mitigating these effects.

2 Declining Response Rates: An Overview

Over the past few decades, surveys have observed a consistent downward trend in response rates across different modes of data collection. This decline is documented in several studies, including Williams and Brick (2018), Dutwin and Buskirk (2020), and Daikeler, Bošnjak, and Lozar Manfreda (2020), which collectively underscore a significant shift in respondent behavior and participation willingness. Williams and Brick (2018) highlight a decline in response rates for face-to-face household surveys in the United States from 2000 to 2014. Similarly, Dutwin and Buskirk (2020) note falling response rates for national telephone surveys from 1996 to 2015, and Daikeler, Bošnjak, and Lozar Manfreda (2020) report lower response rates for web surveys compared to other modes, a trend that has stabilized between 2012 and 2016.

The implications of these findings are multifaceted. Firstly, they signal a growing challenge in engaging respondents across traditional and digital platforms. Secondly, this trend raises

*Code and data are available at: https://github.com/WanlingMa/ResponseRateImpact

questions about the potential impact on survey quality, particularly regarding the representativeness of survey data. As response rates decline, the likelihood of nonresponse bias increases, potentially skewing results and leading to inaccurate conclusions.

3 Impact on Survey Quality

The quality of survey data is intrinsically linked to its representativeness of the target population. As Groves and Peytcheva (2008) elucidate in their meta-analysis, low response rates are not inherently indicative of significant nonresponse bias. However, the risk of such bias escalates as the differences between respondents and nonrespondents grow, particularly when these differences are related to key survey outcomes. Nonresponse bias can distort survey findings, leading to erroneous interpretations and decisions based on the collected data.

The challenge, then, is to understand and quantify the extent of nonresponse bias introduced by declining participation rates and to implement strategies that can mitigate its impact on survey quality. This requires a multifaceted approach that encompasses both preventive measures during survey design and corrective actions during the analysis phase.

4 Remediation Strategies

4.1 Statistical Adjustments for Nonresponse

Statistical adjustments, such as weighting and imputation, are commonly employed to correct for nonresponse bias. Kalton and Flores-Cervantes (2003) discuss the application of weighting methods to adjust survey estimates based on known characteristics of the target population, thereby compensating for the discrepancies introduced by nonresponse. Similarly, Quartagno, Carpenter, and Goldstein (2019) explore the use of multiple imputation as a means to address missing data, providing a framework for incorporating survey weights in the imputation models to enhance the accuracy of post-data collection adjustments.

While these techniques offer valuable tools for remediation, they are not without limitations. The effectiveness of statistical adjustments depends on the availability and quality of auxiliary information that is predictive of both response propensity and the key survey outcomes. Identifying and incorporating such variables into the adjustment process is critical for minimizing nonresponse bias.

4.2 Building Better Nonresponse Propensity Models

The development of robust nonresponse propensity models represents a proactive approach to addressing declining response rates. Wagner et al. (2014), Amaya and Harring (2017), and Peytchev, Presser, and Zhang (2018) emphasize the importance of leveraging theory-driven variables that can predict survey participation. These studies illustrate the potential of integrating measures of social integration, such as volunteering and voting, into propensity models to enhance the effectiveness of nonresponse adjustments. By identifying variables that are both predictive of response behavior and related to key survey outcomes, researchers can improve the targeting of nonrespondents and refine post-survey adjustments to mitigate bias.

4.3 Post-Data Collection Adjustments

Post-data collection adjustments, including calibration weighting and multiple imputation, play a crucial role in compensating for nonresponse. S rndal and Lundquist (2014) and Han and Valliant (2020) explore the application of these techniques, demonstrating their potential to enhance survey estimates by aligning the respondent sample more closely with the target population. These strategies involve adjusting survey weights based on auxiliary variables to reduce sample imbalance and employing imputation methods to fill in missing data, thereby improving the representativeness and accuracy of survey results.

5 Conclusion

The challenge of declining response rates in surveys is multifaceted, impacting survey quality through increased risks of nonresponse bias. Addressing this issue requires a comprehensive approach that spans the entire survey process, from design to data collection to analysis. By employing statistical adjustments, developing theory-driven nonresponse propensity models, and implementing post-data collection adjustments, researchers can mitigate the adverse effects of nonresponse and enhance the quality of survey findings. As the survey landscape continues to evolve, these strategies will be crucial for ensuring the reliability and relevance of survey-based research.

References

Amaya, A., and J. R. Harring. 2017. "Assessing the Effect of Social Integration on Unit Nonresponse in Household Surveys." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 5 (4): 480–508. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smx001.

Daikeler, J., M. Bošnjak, and K. Lozar Manfreda. 2020. "Web Versus Other Survey Modes: An Updated and Extended Meta-Analysis Comparing Response Rates." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 8 (3): 513–39. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smz008.

Dutwin, D., and T. D. Buskirk. 2020. "Telephone Sample Surveys: Dearly Beloved or Nearly Departed? Trends in Survey Errors in the Era of Declining Response Rates." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 9 (3): 353–80. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smz044.

Groves, R. M., and E. Peytcheva. 2008. "The Impact of Nonresponse Rates on Nonresponse Bias: A Meta-Analysis." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72 (2): 167–89.

Han, D., and R. Valliant. 2020. "Effects of Outcome and Response Models on Single-Step Calibration Estimators." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 9 (3): 574–97. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smz057.

Kalton, G., and I. Flores-Cervantes. 2003. "Weighting Methods." *Journal of Official Statistics* 19 (2): 81–97.

Peytchev, A., S. Presser, and M. Zhang. 2018. "Improving Traditional Nonresponse Bias Adjustments: Combining Statistical Properties with Social Theory." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 6 (4): 491–515. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smx035.

Quartagno, M., J. R. Carpenter, and H. Goldstein. 2019. "Multiple Imputation with Survey Weights: A Multilevel Approach." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 8 (5): 965–89. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smz036.

S rndal, C.-E., and P. Lundquist. 2014. "Accuracy in Estimation with Nonresponse: A Function of Degree of Imbalance and Degree of Explanation." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 2 (4): 361–87. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smu014.

Wagner, J., R. Valliant, F. Hubbard, and L. Jiang. 2014. "Level-of-Effort Paradata and Nonresponse Adjustment Models for a National Face-to-Face Survey." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 2 (4): 410–32. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smu012.

Williams, D., and J. M. Brick. 2018. "Trends in u.s. Face-to-Face Household Survey Nonresponse and Level of Effort." *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 6 (2): 186–211. https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smx019.