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## Introduction

- Declining response rates a problem for survey research
- Mixed mode surveys can facilitate response rates
- Two or more modes of data collection
- Can reach people who would not respond to other modes
- Can provide less costly way for collecting data


## Introduction (cont'd)

- Different modes can provide different participatory experiences
- e.g. self-administered surveys provide greater perceived anonymity than interviewer administered
- May affect likelihood of providing socially desirable responses
- Need to evaluate how the use of several modes may affect estimates of health outcomes and behaviors


## Existing Literature

- Mail vs. Telephone:
- Mail Respondents
- Higher overall prevalence of drinking ${ }^{1}$
- Higher overall prevalence of binge drinking ${ }^{1}$
- More likely to report recent alcohol use ${ }^{2}$
- More likely to report recent binge drinking²
- More likely to report illicit drug use in the last year ${ }^{2}$
${ }^{1}$ Gmel (2000)
${ }^{2}$ Beebe et al. (2000)


## Existing Literature - Cigarette Smoking

- Computer vs. Paper and Pencil (Youth) ${ }^{1}$
- Computer respondents more likely to report smoking whole cigarettes before age 13
- No mode effect on:
- Lifetime or current cigarette use, quit attempts, or purchased cigarettes in store/gas station
- CAPI vs. CATI Responders²
- Randomized participants to CATI or CAPI from list of telephone numbers
- No overall mode effect
- White respondents 12-29 years less likely to report smoking in CATI compared to CAPI
${ }^{1}$ Brener et al. (2006)
${ }^{2}$ St-Pierre \& Beland (2004)


## Our Objective

- Explore in-person vs. telephone mode effects in nationally representative data


## Methods

- Tobacco Use Supplement of 2001/02 Current Population Survey (TUS-CPS)
- Pooled data from June, November 2001; February 2002
- Self-reported data from adults (18+)
- Area probability sample
- Rotating Sample
- In sample 4 months, out 8 months, in 4 months
$-1^{\text {st }}$ and $5^{\text {th }}$ month-in-sample interviewed in person
$-2^{\text {nd }}$ thru $4^{\text {th }}$ and $6^{\text {th }}$ thru $8^{\text {th }}$ month-in-sample interviewed by telephone
- 1995 estimated about $15 \%$ self select to be in-person


## Methods

- Mixed Mode: Face-to-Face and Telephone
- N=184,559
- In-person = 34.5\% $(63,675)$
- Telephone = 65.5\% $(120,884)$
- Response Rates:
- June 2001: 61.2\%
- November 2001: 64.8\%
- February 2002: 66.1\%
- Data weighted with self-response weights


## Smoking Prevalence - Crude Differences

|  | In-Person | 95\%CI | Telephone | 95\%CI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| Male* | 26.2\% | 0.7 | 21.7\% | 0.5 |
| Female* | 20.7\% | 0.5 | 17.7\% | 0.3 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24* | 28.5\% | 1.4 | 23.8\% | 1.0 |
| 25-44* | 26.5\% | 0.7 | 22.5\% | 0.5 |
| 45-64* | 24.1\% | 0.6 | 19.9\% | 0.5 |
| 65+* | 9.6\% | 0.6 | 8.8\% | 0.5 |
| Race |  |  |  |  |
| White* | 25.0\% | 0.5 | 20.7\% | 0.4 |
| Black* | 24.1\% | 1.3 | 18.5\% | 0.9 |
| Asian | 13.2\% | 1.6 | 11.5\% | 1.1 |
| Hispanic* | 17.0\% | 1.1 | 14.4\% | 1.0 |
| Other | 34.1\% | 5.8 | 30.8\% | 4.2 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |
| <HS* | < $28.1 \%$ | 1.1 | 23.8\% | 0.8 |
| HS/GED* | 28.4\% | 0.7 | $25.6 \%$ | 0.5 |
| Some College* | 24.1\% | 0.9 | 20.5\% | 0.5 |
| College Degree* | 10.8\% | 0.6 | 9.9\% | 0.4 |
| Total* | 23.4\% | 0.5 | 19.6\% | 0.3 |
| *p<. 05 |  |  |  |  |

## Demographics by Mode

|  | In-Person | Telephone |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Gender* |  |  |
| Male | $48.8 \%$ | $47.8 \%$ |
| Female | $51.2 \%$ | $52.2 \%$ |
| Age* |  |  |
| $18-24$ | $44.6 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ |
| $25-44$ | $28.8 \%$ | $39.8 \%$ |
| $45-64$ | $15.9 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ |
| $65+$ |  |  |
| Race* | $66.2 \%$ | $75.9 \%$ |
| White | $14.6 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ |
| Black | $4.0 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| Asian | $14.2 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |
| Hispanic | $1.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Other | $24.6 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ |
| Education* | $30.5 \%$ | $29.0 \%$ |
| <HS | $24.2 \%$ | $26.6 \%$ |
| HS/GED | $20.7 \%$ | $25.9 \%$ |
| Some College |  |  |
| College Degree |  |  |
| *CHISQ p<.05 |  |  |

## Adjusted Odds of Smoking

|  | Odds of Smoking | $95 \% \mathbf{C l}$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Mode |  |  |
| In-person | 1.21 | $1.18,1.25$ |
| Telephone | Referent | -- |
| Gender | 1.32 | $1.28,1.35$ |
| Male | Referent | -- |
| Female |  |  |
| Age | Referent | -- |
| $18-24$ | 1.16 | $1.10,1.21$ |
| $25-44$ | 0.90 | $0.86,0.95$ |
| $45-64$ | 0.26 | $0.24,0.27$ |
| $65+$ |  |  |
| Race | Referent | -- |
| White | 0.71 | $0.67,0.74$ |
| Black | 0.52 | $0.47,0.57$ |
| Asian | 0.40 | $0.37,0.42$ |
| Hispanic | 1.27 | $1.05,1.52$ |
| Other | 4.79 | $4.50,5.11$ |
| Education | 3.73 | $3.57,3.90$ |
| <HS | 2.59 | $2.47,2.72$ |
| HS/GED | Referent | -- |
| Some College |  |  |
| College Degree |  |  |

## Crude and Adjusted Odds of Cigarette Smoking by Survey Mode



Note: Telephone is referent group; AOR adjusts for gender, age, race, education

## Hypothetical Effect of Increasing Telephone Respondents in Sample (assumes no real behavior change)



## Conclusion

- Results suggest an overall mode effect for self-reported smoking among adults
- Need for analyzing mode effects for subgroups
- Continuous need to analyze effects for various mode combinations and health behaviors
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