



MIDUS Milwaukee 2: Final Field Report

Prepared for:



The MIDUS Study
University of Wisconsin–Madison
Institute on Aging
December 2017

Table of Contents

Overview	3
University of Wisconsin Survey Center	3
Instruments	4
CAPI Interview	4
Self-Administered Questionnaire.....	5
Cognitive Telephone Interview	5
Sample Description	5
Tracing.....	5
During the SAQ Phase	6
During the Cognitive Interviewing Phase	6
Study Design and Field Procedures and Protocols.....	6
Advance Letters.....	7
Sequencing	7
Non-Response and Refusal Protocol	8
Respondent Incentives.....	10
CAPI Interviewer Training.....	10
Interviewer Observation Questions	11
Quality Control.....	11
Verification Interviews	11
Weekly Conference Calls	11
Cognitive Interviewer Training	11
Data Entry Protocol and Staff Training.....	12
Interim and Final Data Deliveries	12
Delivery of Contact Information	12
Delivery of Interim Data Files.....	12
Final Data Deliveries	12
Response Rates.....	13



Sample Description and Response Rate Report MIDUS Milwaukee 2 (P1170) December 2017

Overview

The Midlife in the U.S. (MIDUS) is a national longitudinal study that investigates how the health and well-being of Americans is affected by work, relationships, health, economic turmoil, and personal outlooks, and to understand the factors that best protect health from midlife into old age.

The MIDUS Milwaukee 2 (referred to internally as MKE2) was a followup survey of Milwaukee African Americans who were first interviewed in 2005 (MKE1) as part of the MIDUS 2 national survey effort. Similarly, the MKE2 survey was conducted by the University of Wisconsin Survey Center (UWSC) as part of the MIDUS 3 national survey project. The MKE2 survey project was conducted for MIDUS Principal Investigator Dr. Carol Ryff at the University of Wisconsin Institute on Aging.

The overall purpose of MKE2 was to conduct a longitudinal follow-up with MKE1 respondents approximately 10 years later. Most content in the MKE2 interview was identical to the MKE1 interview, while a few survey items were new or modified. Like the initial interview in 2005, this follow-up interview was conducted as a computer-assisted personal interview (CAPI) in the respondent's home or a nearby neutral location such as a library study room. For those respondents who no longer lived in Wisconsin or bordering states (making the CAPI format prohibitively expensive), UWSC attempted to complete telephone interviews with them.

At the conclusion of the CAPI interview, field interviewers handed off a self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) for the respondent to complete and return (via mail) at their convenience. After completing the SAQ protocol, UWSC called respondents to ask them to complete a short 20-minute cognitive assessment via the phone (referred to internally as the Brief Test of Adult Cognition by Telephone (BTACT) interview).

University of Wisconsin Survey Center

Founded in 1987, the University of Wisconsin Survey Center (UWSC) serves the survey research needs of a wide variety of clients including faculty, staff, and administration at the University of Wisconsin; faculty and staff at other universities; federal, state, and local governmental agencies; and not-for-profit organizations. A department in the College of Letters and Science of the University of Wisconsin—Madison, the UWSC provides a complete range of survey research capabilities. The mission of the Survey Center is to assist researchers by providing the highest quality survey research services.

Professor Nora Cate Schaeffer is the Faculty Director of the UWSC, and John Stevenson is the Associate Director. Eric White, Augie Salick, Kate Krueger, Brendan Day, and Chris Schlapper were involved in instrument and CAPI

tools programming. Kerryann DiLoreto was the Lead Project Director, alongside Project Directors Vicki Lein, Karen Zoladz, and Griselle Sanchez.

Instruments

CAPI Interview

The CAPI interview for this project was conducted using a computer-assisted personal interviewing system (CAPI). The CAPI software employed by the UWSC is CASES 5.5 provided by the Computer-Assisted Survey Methods Program at the University of California-Berkeley.

The CASES program provides a comprehensive range of computer assisted interviewing tools. As a fully-featured CATI package, CASES has all the programs necessary to install sample (including importing pre-existing data into the sample records), prepare a data collection instrument, monitor survey progress, automatically send into the field those cases that require calling at a specific time or date (i.e. automatic call scheduling), code and clean data, produce reports, and output data into rectangular files for analysis.

Using the CASES program, the text of the survey appears question by question on a computer screen for the interviewer to read to the respondent. Routing through the interview is based on skip logic pre-programmed into the computer. Question wording may be adapted according to answers given previously in the interview. The system allows for pre-coded questions, open-ended questions, and combinations of the two. In addition, the computer allows only valid responses to be entered; when an invalid response is entered, the computer asks the interviewer to reenter the response.

The CAPI instrument consisted of questions about recession experience, health, education, occupation and industry, marriage; health insurance, finances, social networks, parents' health, children and household members, caregiving, living arrangements, community involvement, race and ethnicity, discrimination, life satisfaction, and contact information of family and friends to help us contact the participant in the future. The CAPI instrument also included hip and waist measurements and a section for interviewer observations. Showcards were used for items with long or complicated answer options.

A special feature of this study instrument was a section of questions administered via ACASI (Audio in Computer-Assisted Self-Interview). These sensitive questions on discrimination were pre-recorded in a female voice and then loaded into the instrument as .wav files. These files played through headphones attached to the laptop as respondents entered their answers on the keyboard. Respondents had the option of turning off the audio for the answer text, however the question text remained on at all times. Audio for the answer text could be turned on or off at each item. The on / off audio settings were logged by the CASES program.

UWSC documented changes to the instrument in a Word document and in an Excel sheet by variable name that was delivered to MIDUS with the final data delivery.

Extensive in-house testing and debugging was done of the CAPI instrument but there was no formal pretest.

The average length of the interview was 153 minutes, with a mode of 142 minutes. (Note: this average was calculated from timers in the instrument. It is the amount of time interviewers spent in the interview instrument itself, but not total time spent with the respondent from start to finish. This average includes situations where the interviewer was in the instrument during the consent process. Also, this average includes situations where the interviewer might have encountered a technical problem while in the instrument. As a result, this average may be considered slightly inflated. This mean and mode does not include the partial interviews.)

Self-Administered Questionnaire

A 44-page Self-Administered Questionnaire (SAQ) was fielded in this study using the 2005 MIDUS Milwaukee Refresher Oversample SAQ as a starting point. The only major change implemented was the replacement of Section D: Childhood, with a new Section D: Childhood and Race. In addition, some minor wording changes were made in Section F: Social Networks to update the types of social media listed in a couple questions.

Cognitive Telephone Interview

The Cognitive Telephone Interview or the Brief Test of Adult Cognition by Telephone (BTACT) interview for this project was conducted using a computer-assisted telephone interviewing system (CATI). The CATI software employed by the UWSC is CASES 5.5 provided by the Computer-Assisted Survey Methods Program at the University of California-Berkeley.

To the extent possible, the instruments and protocols for MKE2 replicated those used during MIDUS MKE1. However, in response to the increasing prevalence of cellular telephones over the years, MKE2 added a method to measure latency due to technology. The Metronome Count, developed and used first during the MIDUS Refresher, was conducted before and after the Red/Green Task, to account for response variance due to technology, both between and within calls.

By June, 2016, the Cognitive Interview instrument was programmed and both the instrument and the digital audio recording of the Cognitive Interview were tested. The Cognitive Interview was fielded in July 2016.

For additional information about the Cognitive Telephone Interview, please see a separate report prepared by Vicki Lein dated July 2017.

Sample Description

The production sample included all respondents who completed the baseline interview in 2005, except for those determined to be deceased during the intervening years. A total of N=518 were fielded in this effort. The sample was provided by the MIDUS client and imported into UWSC databases.

All cases were fielded all at once. Each case was assigned a priority score from 1 to 3 with 1 being the highest priority. This score was determined by the client with priority 1 cases having provided the most amount of data in the initial 2005 UWSC effort (Project 1) and subsequent MIDUS projects such as the daily diary study and biological collections.

Tracing

UWSC created an Access database, referred to as the Project Operations Database (POD), to store respondent contact information. This database was used by UWSC Tracking and Locating staff to update contact information for respondents as needed. The database had the ability to add new telephone or address information while at the same time keeping a record of old information.

Prior to mailing the advance letter to respondents, all cases were traced for updated contact information. If an advance letter was returned to UWSC, the database was updated with this information and the respondent was traced again.

During the CAPI Phase

If it was determined by the field interviewer that an address or telephone number was no longer good, the database was updated and the respondent was traced for new information.

In addition, if a field interviewer was told by an informant that the respondent was deceased or incarcerated, the respondent would be traced to attempt to confirm this information.

During the SAQ Phase

Tracing commenced for MKE2 when SAQ booklets were returned to UWSC as undeliverable. The Project Operations Database was then updated with any new information, including address and phone number.

During the SAQ and Cognitive interview phases, the tracing department also handled cases where the incentive checks for completing were returned undeliverable. The respondent was traced for new contact information so that the check could be resent.

During the Cognitive Interviewing Phase

During the Cognitive Interview, cases were sent for tracing when numbers were bad or when informants reported respondents no longer lived at the number. After 15 calls without contact, all cases were sent for tracing. If the Tracking and Locating Department found better information, the case was sent for further calling. If no better information was found, staff reviewed notes from the in-home interviewer for better phone information. If new numbers were not identified, the case was held and retraced again.

Study Design and Field Procedures and Protocols

Interviewing for MKE2 occurred from to June 11, 2016 – January 21, 2017.

UWSC employed 10 field interviewers. All 518 cases were fielded at the same time in an effort to maximize efficiency and increase the time available for multiple contacts on each case.

One important component of this round of interviews was to prioritize interviewing respondents who had participated in one or more MIDUS Projects 2-5. The scores ranged from 1 to 3, with 1 being the highest priority cases. While interviewers were trained to work all cases from the start of the field period, they were able to use this score to prioritize contact attempts and effort applied to cases.

For respondents who lived outside of the Wisconsin area, the interview was completed by telephone. For these telephone interviews, UWSC sent a physical copy of the showcards and a tape measure for the hip and waist measurements to the respondent prior to the interview.

Field Phase 1: CAPI Interview

Respondents were sent an advance letter to introduce this round of the study and inform respondents that interviewers would be contacting them shortly. Interviewers attempted to contact respondents to schedule and conduct the interview in-person. Interviewers called respondents, and as needed, made doorstep visits to respondents, sent text messages and email messages to respondents, called informants, and made doorstep visits to informants. At the end of the CAPI interview, the interviewer gave the respondent a \$50 cash incentive and the 44-page self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) with a postage-paid return envelope.

Field Phase 2: Reminder Call for SAQ

About 34 days after the CAPI interview was completed, reminder calls were made to respondents who did not return their completed SAQ. During these reminder calls, the interviewer encouraged the respondent to complete the SAQ and could also initiate a re-send of the SAQ booklet, return envelope, or both, if needed.

Field Phase 3: Return Visit for SAQ and Cognitive Interview

About 50 days after the CAPI interview was completed, Doorstep visits were made to respondents who did not return their completed SAQ, regardless of whether we reached the respondent for a reminder call. At this visit, interviewers offered assistance to complete the SAQ. They also invited respondents to complete the Cognitive Telephone Interview on the spot, or to schedule an appointment for the Cognitive Telephone Interview. If the SAQ or Cognitive Interview was completed on the spot, the interviewer gave the respondent their incentives in cash (\$25 for a completed SAQ and \$25 for completing the Cognitive interview).

Cognitive Telephone Interview

As soon as the SAQ was completed, the case flowed to the Cognitive Telephone Interview conducted by the UWSC CATI Lab, unless this interview was completed on the spot during a Return Visit.

Advance Letters

To introduce respondents to this round of the study, advance letters were mailed to all respondents approximately three days prior to the start of field period. In this way, interviewers were not doing “cold-calls” to respondents.

The letter itself was personalized, described the MIDUS study and explained that an interviewer would be contacting them shortly about an in-person interview.

Sequencing

Like the MIDUS Milwaukee Refresher effort, the MKE2 effort was complicated to field due to the fact that each case followed a unique trajectory or timeline, anchored by the CAPI complete date. About a month into the field period, UWSC was managing CAPI interviews, mail surveys, and cognitive telephone interviews concurrently. Some respondents went on to complete their mail survey within days of finishing the CAPI interview, while others took weeks to complete it. This delayed their fielding into the Cognitive telephone effort by as many weeks. The basic sequence of data collection is as follows:

- 1). A respondent was sent an advance letter telling them about the MIDUS Milwaukee study and that they would receive a call from an interviewer to schedule an interview.
- 2). After attempting to reach the respondent by phone three times, the field interviewer made doorstep visits alternating with email and text messages when available, while still continuing to try to reach the respondent by phone. The interviewer also tried to reach informants who might know how to get in touch with respondents.
- 3). When the CAPI interview was completed, the interviewer presented the respondent with a sealed envelope containing \$50 in cash. The respondent opened the envelope in the interviewer’s presence to confirm the amount and signed to acknowledge receipt of the cash.

- 4). Once the respondent received the cash incentive, the interviewer handed over a 44-page SAQ booklet, a letter explaining how to fill it out, and a postage-paid stamped envelope for the respondent to send the completed survey back in.
- 5). When the respondent sent back their completed SAQ, they were mailed a check for \$25 within one week.
- 6). Approximately one week after the payment for the mail survey was sent, cases were fielded for the Cognitive telephone survey.
- 7). An additional \$25 check was mailed to the respondent within one week of completing the Cognitive survey.
- 8). One week after the first SAQ survey was handed-over to the respondent, a postcard was sent to encourage the respondent to fill it out and send it back.
- 9). If a respondent did not return the first SAQ within 3 weeks of receiving it, a second SAQ was sent, with all the same materials as the first booklet but with a shorter, more direct cover letter.
- 10). If a respondent had not returned their completed SAQ within 2 weeks of the second booklet mailing, they were put into the Reminder Call effort, where a CAPI interviewer would call the respondent to encourage them to complete the SAQ. In most cases, the same CAPI interviewer who completed the CAPI interview with this respondent would make the reminder call. The interviewer could also flag an SAQ or return envelope to be mailed to the respondent if the respondent was missing one or both of these items. The interviewer would attempt to reach the respondent for a reminder call over the course of 12 days.
- 11). Whether or not the interviewer reached the respondent for the Reminder Call, 4 weeks after the second booklet mailing, the case was put into the Revisit effort, where a CAPI interviewer would make a doorstep visit to the respondent's home to inquire about the SAQ. If needed, the CAPI interviewer could supply the respondent with a third copy of the booklet, take and mail back a completed SAQ, or assist in the completion of the SAQ. If the interviewer received a completed booklet during the course of their visit, they were able to hand over the \$25 incentive in cash. In addition, the interviewer attempted to facilitate the telephone cognitive survey by calling the UWSC CATI Lab and to prepare a specially-trained CATI interviewer to conduct the interview. If the cognitive interview was completed during this visit, the CAPI interviewer was able to hand over an additional \$25 incentive in cash.
- 12). Once the Revisit field effort ended, any respondent who had not yet returned their completed SAQ flowed to the Cognitive telephone interview effort.
- 13). If the respondent had not returned their completed SAQ by the time they completed the cognitive instrument they were reminded to complete it and a fourth SAQ was sent to all respondents who had not returned a completed SAQ.

Non-Response and Refusal Protocol

To enhance study recall and to address possible concerns about legitimacy, interviewers attempted to leave their business card and/or a goodie-bag with non-responsive or reluctant households. The goodie-bag contained the MIDUS Milwaukee brochure, a "Sorry I missed you..." note, and a pack of LifeSavers. If the non-response or reluctance continued, the case was given a "cooling off" period of at least two weeks. Eventually, a CAPI Supervisor would re-assign the case to a different CAPI interviewer. Some attention was paid to re-assigning the case to an interviewer of different race or gender.

SAQ Refusal at the end of the CAPI interview

If the respondent refused the SAQ during the handover at the end of the CAPI interview, the interviewer coded a flag variable 2114 SAQ ONLY REFUSAL to synch to the mail database. The case was then pushed to phase 3, skipping phase 2. Thus, the protocol was as follows:

- These cases **DID NOT** receive the SAQ2 or Reminder Postcard mailings.
- These cases **DID NOT** receive the reminder call.
- These cases **DID** receive the return visit.
- These cases **DID** receive the SAQ reminder in Cog if otherwise eligible.
- These cases **DID** receive the SAQ4 mailing.

SAQ Refusal during the Reminder Call

If the respondent refused to complete the SAQ during the reminder call, the interviewer coded a flag variable 2114 to synch to the mail database. The case was then pushed to phase 4, skipping phase 3. Thus, the protocol was as follows:

- These cases **DID NOT** receive the return visit.
- These cases **DID** receive the SAQ reminder in Cog if otherwise eligible.
- These cases **DID** receive the SAQ4 mailing.

SAQ Refusal during the Return Visit

If the respondent refused to complete the SAQ during the return visit, the interviewer coded a flag variable 2114 SAQ ONLY REFUSAL to synch to the mail database. Thus, the protocol was as follows:

- These cases **DID** receive the SAQ reminder in Cog if otherwise eligible.
- These cases **DID** receive the SAQ4 mailing.

SAQ Refusal during Cog Interview

If during the SAQ reminder in the Cog interview, the respondent refused the SAQ, the interviewer coded a flag variable 2112 KNOWN RESPONDENT REFUSAL to synch to the mail database.

- These cases **DID** receive the SAQ4 mailing.

SAQ Refusal as a Mail Return

If the respondent returned an SAQ in the mail as a refusal (including explicit refusals and blank returns), the UWSC mail and data entry department coded as a refusal. Thus, the protocol was as follows:

- These cases **DID NOT** receive the SAQ2 or Reminder Postcard mailings, if still eligible.
- These cases **DID NOT** receive the reminder call, if still eligible.
- These cases **DID** receive the return visit.
- These cases **DID** receive the SAQ reminder in Cog if otherwise eligible.
- These cases **DID NOT** receive the SAQ4 mailing.

SAQ 4

At the end of the Cognitive interview, the SAQ reminder question allowed the interviewer to trigger an SAQ re-send if the respondent did not express any objections or concerns. This constituted the SAQ4 mailing for those who completed the Cognitive interview and did not object to receiving another copy of the SAQ. Other cases received the SAQ4 mailing according to the protocols described above.

Respondent Incentives

Respondents received an arrival gift when their field interviewer prior to the start of the CAPI interview. This arrival gift was a ceramic large handle coffee mug with the MIDUS logo in a box inside a small MIDUS logo tote. Respondents then received \$50 in cash after completing the CAPI interview. They were then mailed a \$25 check after UWSC received their completed SAQ. Once the Cognitive telephone interview was completed, UWSC mailed an additional \$25 check. The check mailed following the SAQ and Cognitive interview provided the MIDUS Milwaukee toll-free number so that respondents could call if they did not have the ability to cash the check. In those instances, UWSC worked to issue them a USPS money order to be cashed at any USPS location with no fee.

If the SAQ and/or Cognitive telephone interview were completed during a Return Visit, the CAPI interviewer handed over the incentives in cash, on the spot.

In addition to the cash incentives, respondents were given a set of earbuds to use during the ACASI module and to keep as thank you. The earbuds came in a clear plastic case that had the MIDUS logo printed on it along with MIDUS Milwaukee toll-free phone number.

CAPI Interviewer Training

UWSC drew from an existing pool of CAPI interviewers who had worked on previous projects to fill five of the ten interviewer slots for the MIDUS Milwaukee project. The remaining five slots were filled with new hires that had other previous interviewing experience.

Interviewers received 40 hours of training that included basic standards and procedures, field logistics, specific MIDUS issues, and MIDUS Milwaukee instrument training. Interviewers learned how cases would be fielded, how to contact respondents, how to take physical measurements for the health module of the instrument, fieldwork guidelines, and protocol for refusals. They also completed a “start-to-finish certification” of the main CAPI instrument during which they demonstrated mastery of basic interviewing skills, as well as mastery of the MIDUS Milwaukee protocols. Interviewers were given time to practice the interview on their own, and were instructed to complete practice cases before they began to visit actual respondents.

The main CAPI interviewer training for MIDUS Milwaukee took place at UW-Madison’s Pyle Center from June 6 to June 10, 2016. Dr. Barry Radler attended a session of the training, and was helpful in motivating the interviewers and providing them with sufficient background information and talking points for persuading participants. He talked about the previous wave of data collection, the purpose and design of the study, and the goals for the Milwaukee follow-up effort in particular. Dr. Radler also shared information about MIDUS projects 2-5 to help interviewers understand the full MIDUS study and how the portion they would be working on fit in.

On July 12, 2016, UWSC hosted a 2-hour webinar for all interviewers to be trained in the Reminder Call effort. Interviewers were trained on this section of the instrument, protocols for contacting respondents and handling refusals, and were given time to practice these calls. Each interviewer completed a mock call with a field supervisor before they began to call actual respondents.

UWSC invited interviewers to Sterling Hall on July 26, 2016 for an in-person training on the Return Visit effort. Interviewers were trained on this section of the instrument, protocols for assisting with completion of the SAQ, and facilitating the Cognitive Telephone Interview. Interviewers were given time to practice the visit on their own and with volunteers and completed a “certification” to demonstrate mastery of this part of the MKE2 effort.

Interviewer Observation Questions

In order to minimize burden on the respondent while hosting the interviewer in their home, interviewer observation questions were programmed into the CAPI instrument as a separate module that could be completed by the interviewer at a later time.

The interviewer observation items were the same as those asked in 2005. They contained some open-ended items where interviewers stated their observations about the respondent, the household, and the neighborhood where the household was located. While interviewers were trained to be as objective as possible when answering questions on the form, some subjective views may have crept in.

Quality Control

At the beginning of the CAPI interview, respondents were asked for their consent to have the interview recorded. The audio-recordings were used only for quality control conducted by the CAPI Supervisor or a specially-trained UWSC staff member fluent in CAPI interviewing protocols. QC was conducted on approximately 10% of all completed CAPI interviews. Interviewers were provided with timely feedback on their administration of the CAPI interview and their adherence to protocols.

Verification Interviews

UWSC employed “verification interviews” to follow-up on a random selection of at least 10% of each interviewer’s completed cases. A trained specialist at UWSC called respondents to confirm key details about the circumstances of the completed interview, and that the respondent had been treated with the utmost respect and care. These verifications ensured that protocols and procedures apart from what could be heard in the audio recordings were being followed in the field.

Weekly Conference Calls

Interviewers were required to attend a weekly conference call with the Field Supervisors. This provided interviewers with an opportunity to interact with project staff and colleagues as well as to debrief and stay up-to-date with protocol and procedures.

Cognitive Interviewer Training

See separate report prepared by Vicki Lein, dated July 2017.

Data Entry Protocol and Staff Training

Data entry for the MIDUS Milwaukee SAQs began in July 2016. The SAQ booklet was 44-pages long and included various types of formatted questions, making them more complex to enter. Following the previous MIDUS SAQ data entry protocols, each booklet was first reviewed by an “editor” to uncover and resolve any issues that could cause data entry error. Editors were trained on how to resolve the most common problem issues, such as respondents who gave multiple answers, selected answers that fell between actual response categories, or followed skip patterns incorrectly.

Editors and data entry staff underwent 2 hours of MIDUS-specific training to make them familiar with the instrument, train them in the specific protocols set for the project, and give them an opportunity to ask questions about the data entry process. Each booklet was blind double-entered by two different data entry staff members. When a discrepancy between the first pass and the second was found by the computer, the data entry person was alerted to the difference in responses, and they then determined the correct answer (with help from an editor if needed) and then made the correction to the error, either from the first or second pass.

Interim and Final Data Deliveries

Delivery of Contact Information

Historically, UWSC would provide regular deliveries of what was referred to as “The Shell”. This file contained a variety of information needed at IOA, such as respondent contact information, demographic variables, interviewer assessments, call notes, and mailing and completion dates. This provided IOA with information to use in assigning completed cases to other projects.

However, given the still relatively recent development of both the IOA MSQ sample database and the UWSC project operations database (POD), contact information only was delivered in one file at the end of the MKE2 field period. While still referred to as the “Shell” delivery, this MKE2 file did not contain other information such as demographic variables, interviewer assessments, etc.

Delivery of Interim Data Files

In July 2016, less than one month after production calling began, UWSC delivered an interim data set of the first 58 cases to complete the CAPI interview, so that IOA staff could review and be sure all variables were being asked correctly. In late July 2016, interim SAQ data for the first 50 cases data entered was delivered. Cognitive interview data for the MKE2 effort was delivered on a regular basis to researchers at Brandeis during the field period.

Final Data Deliveries

Final data delivery for the Milwaukee CAPI data took place in March 2017. The final SAQ data was delivered in June 2017. These deliveries consisted of 394 CAPI cases and 327 SAQs. Final data delivery for MKE2 Cognitive interview effort occurred in July 2017.

Response Rates

Table 1. Response Rates Across Data Collection Phases

Type of Sample	Main CAPI Survey	SAQ Survey	Cognitive Survey
MKE2	78.6%	84.1%	84.8%

Above response rates reported as AAPOR 1 calculation.

309 respondents participated in all three phases (CAPI, SAQ, Cognitive)

18 respondents participated in CAPI and SAQ but not Cognitive

21 respondents participated in CAPI and Cognitive but not SAQ

41 respondents participated in CAPI only

The UWSC completed a total of 389 interviews and 5 partial interviews: 362 in-person, and 27 by telephone.

The overall raw response rate for the survey is 75% (389 completes / 518 cases fielded).

Table 2 includes the sample disposition for all sample members by category.

AAPOR Response Rates 1 and 2 are reported below. A detailed summary of the contact outcomes is available in Table 3.

Table 2. Overall Sample Disposition (N=518)

Final Disposition	Cases
Completed Interview (Category 1)	389
Partial Interview (Category 1)	5
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)	38
Unknown Eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)	63
Not Eligible (Category 4)	23
Totals	518

AAPOR Response Rate 1

of completed interviews

$((\text{Complete interviews} + \text{Partial interviews}) + (\text{Eligible, non-interview}) + (\text{Unknown Eligibility, non-interview}))$

389

$(389 + 5 + 38 + 63 = 495)$

$389 / 495 = 78.6\%$

AAPOR Response Rate 2

of completed interviews + # of partial interviews

$$\frac{389 + 5}{((\text{Complete interviews} + \text{Partial interviews}) + (\text{Eligible, non-interview}) + (\text{Unknown Eligibility, non-interview}))}$$

389 + 5

$$(389 + 5 + 38 + 63 = 495)$$

394/ 495 = 79.6%

Table 3. Contact Dispositions by Specific Outcome

Final Disposition	AAPOR Code	Cases
Interview (Category 1)		
Complete	1110	389
Partial Complete	1200	5
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)		
Household-level refusal	2111	2
Respondent refusal	2112	28
Physically / Mentally Unable to Interview	2320	7
Incarcerated	4520	1
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)		
Unable to reach	3170	63
Not eligible (Category 4)		
Deceased	2310 & 2311	21
Out of Sample (Interviewed ineligible person at baseline)	4100	2
TOTAL		518

Table 4. Number of Refusals to Audio Recording for QC Purposes Consent Item

Item	# of Refusals
Recording interview	44

Table 5. Final Disposition for MIDUS MKE2 SAQ Phase

SAQ Disposition Code	SAQ Disposition Description	SAQ Survey Overall (N=389)
1100	Completed SAQ	327
2112-2113; 2360	Refusal	2
2310	Deceased	0
2320	Physically Unable	1
3300	No Good Address	0
Blank / No code	No Response	59
	AAPOR 1 Response Rate	84.1%

Table 6. Final Disposition for MIDUS MKE2 Cognitive Interview Phase

AAPOR Code	Code description	Frequency	Percent
1100	Complete	329	84.4
1200	Usable partial	1	0.3
2111	Refusal, household	6	1.5
2112	Refusal, respondent	5	1.3
2120	Breakoff	1	0.3
2210	Never available	42	10.8
2302	No good phone	2	0.5
2320	Cognitive or physically unable	3	0.8
4100	Ineligible	1	0.3
Total		390	100.0
	AAPOR 1 Response Rate		84.4%

Report compiled by:

Kerryann DiLoreto, Karen Zoladz, Vicki Lein, and Griselle Sanchez
 University of Wisconsin Survey Center
 475 North Charter Avenue
 Sterling Hall Rm. 4414
 Madison, WI 53706
 Tel: 608-265-6598