



Published in final edited form as:

Ann Am Acad Pol Soc Sci. 2013 January ; 645(1): 222–236. doi:10.1177/0002716212464191.

Where do We Go from Here? Nonresponse and Social Measurement

Douglas S. Massey and

Office of Population Research, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08540, 609-258-4949

Roger Tourangeau

Westat, 1600 Research Boulevard, Rockville, MD 20850, 301-294-2828

Douglas S. Massey: dmassey@princeton.edu; Roger Tourangeau: RogerTourangeau@westat.com

In their systematic assessment of the challenge that survey nonresponse poses to social statistics and social research, the authors of articles in this volume have abundantly highlighted the critical importance of surveys to contemporary society. Table 10.1 lists all of the surveys mentioned by any author as an illustration or by way of example in their contribution. It is by no means an exhaustive listing of surveys in the world today, or even the most important. It simply includes those surveys with which the authors were familiar and turned to for purposes of example or illustration. This admittedly ad hoc listing of surveys includes 22 sponsored by a U.S. federal agency along with 14 others conducted in the United States mainly for research purposes, most with funding from federal granting agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation. In addition the authors mentioned some 19 surveys fielded outside the United States, mostly but not entirely in Europe.

The sheer number and breadth of the surveys listed extemporaneously by the authors indicates the centrality that surveys have assumed in statistical reporting and social science research. Indeed, the 22 surveys conducted by federal agencies are likely responsible for the bulk of publicly reported statistics in the United States, from unemployment rates (Current Population Survey) to poverty rates and receipt of welfare (Survey of Income and Program Participation) to the basic social, demographic, and economic composition of the nation (American Community Survey, American Housing Survey). It is for this reason that we asserted in our opening essay that rising rates of nonresponse constitute a potential threat to national statistics that must be taken seriously.

The list of surveys in Table 10.1 not only suggests their importance to national statistics, but underscores their importance to scientific research, not just in the social and behavioral sciences but in the health and biomedical sciences as well; and not only in the United States but throughout the world. America's General Social Survey and its counterpart across the Atlantic, the European Social Survey, provide the fundamental data to study shifts in social attitudes, political opinions, and societal values and their changing determinants over time. The Panel Study of Income Dynamics, the Health and Retirement Survey, and the Asset and Health Dynamics Survey undergird much economic research on lifetime processes of income, asset accumulation, and intergenerational transfers in the United States. The Survey of Health, Aging, and Retirement plays the same role in Europe, the Survey of Income and

Labor Dynamics does so in Canada, as does the Household Income and Labor Dynamics Survey in Australia. In studies of how neighborhood circumstances condition individual well-being, the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Study, the geocoded version of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, and the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods provide critical data.

A survey of quantitative articles published in the typical social science journal reveals that a large fraction of the papers, often the majority, draw on survey data. Moreover, the U.S. Statistical System as we know it today would cease to exist without surveys. As a result, increases in rates of nonresponse represent a potentially serious threat to the validity of scientific measurement and social research. In closing this volume, we therefore review what we have learned from the authors in this volume and attempt to summarize current knowledge on trends, causes, and consequences of survey nonresponse for statisticians, researchers, and the general public.

DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM

As Brick and Williams note in their contribution, the consensus view among social scientists is that survey nonresponse rates are indeed rising to an alarming extent. As recently as 1979, for example, the Survey of Consumer Attitudes of the University of Michigan boasted a response rate above 70 percent, whereas the current rate is below 40 percent and falling (Curtin, Presser, and Singer 2005). In the four national surveys examined by Brick and Williams, the increase in nonresponse averaged roughly 0.5 percentage points per year since the mid-1990s, and this occurred despite greater efforts and more resources aimed at securing cooperation. Nonresponse rates above 30% are quite common in major national surveys today, and rates above 60% are no longer rare.

Although the decline in response rates has occurred for both telephone surveys and face-to-face interviews, the drop appears to be steeper for phone surveys (Atrosic, Bates, Burt and Silberstein 2001; de Leeuw and de Heer, 2002). Moreover, whatever forces are driving response rates downward, they are not peculiar to the United States. Similar, and in some cases worse, declines in response rates are apparent in Europe (de Leeuw and de Heer 2002; Stoop 2005). It is not clear, however, whether mail surveys are subject to the same trend. The 2010 Census had a somewhat higher mail return rate than did the 2000 Census, although this may simply reflect the greater use of advertising to encourage mail returns or the fact that all households received a short rather than a long form. Whereas mail surveys historically displayed lower response rates than telephone surveys, today they often evince higher response today and are increasingly accepted as a viable alternative to phone surveys (Link, Battaglia, Frankel, Osborn, and Mokdad 2008).

The problem of nonresponse appears to be more serious for cross-sectional than longitudinal surveys. In the six panel surveys examined by Schoeni et al. in their article, none displayed consistent declines. In general, response rates either remained stable at high rates or actually increased. This pattern may reflect the fact that longitudinal surveys rely extensively on financial incentives. Schoeni et al. report that even small increases in payments to respondents yield significant improvements in response rates, and most panels have

increased the size of their incentives over time. In the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, for example, the reward for participation rose from \$20 in 1999 to \$60 in 2009, in constant 1999 dollars. Although the length of the survey also increased from 35 to 75 minutes over the same period, the rise in incentives was faster, yielding an increase from 58 cents to 67 cents per minute of interview time. In addition, respondents were offered additional incentives for assistance in locating other sample members.

CAUSES OF NONRESPONSE

Survey researchers classify the reasons for nonresponse into three basic categories: noncontact, meaning that interviewers or screeners were unable to communicate with a targeted respondent; refusals, in which contact is established but the respondent declines to participate in the survey; and a residual “other” category (too infirm, inability to schedule a time, interviewer problems, etc.). Refusals generally constitute the largest category of nonresponse, followed by noncontact and finally other reasons. Moreover, according to Brick and Williams this ordering has changed little over time, though noncontact may be starting to rise a bit in the U.S. (Tourangeau 2004). Nonetheless, when they examined the National Health Interview Survey from 1997 through 2007, they found that 60%–65% of nonresponse was attributable to refusals, 25%–30% to noncontact, and 5%–10% to other reasons. Likewise, on the National Household Education Survey the respective shares were 75%–85%, 10%–20%, and 5%–10%. When asked for the specific reason why they declined to participate, the top three explanations offered by nonrespondents were: not interested, too busy, and takes too much time. Refusals likely account for the lion’s share of nonresponse because most surveys make use of repeated callbacks until contact is achieved.

In terms of specific respondent characteristics that predict nonresponse, Schoeni et al. report that young people, minorities, males, renters, urban residents, single persons, the poor, and people with fewer social ties and attachments tend consistently to display lower probabilities of participation. The likelihood of responding also varies by context, with Brick and Williams finding that persons living in areas with greater concentrations of young children, higher crime rates, more family households, and shorter average commuting times generally display higher response rates. In the end, they conclude that the increase in nonresponse is driven by powerful generational changes, as younger cohorts increasingly display characteristics associated with low response likelihoods and are less comfortable with communication channels favored by survey researchers---telephone surveys and face-to-face interviews---than with emerging internet and social networking technologies

EFFECTS OF NONRESPONSE

Whatever its causes, whether or not nonresponse biases sample estimates depends not only on the response rate itself but also how different respondents are from nonrespondents. When the rate of non-response is low, the second factor are largely irrelevant. And even if differences between respondents and nonrespondents are great, if very few fail to respond then their absence from the sample will have little effect on estimates. As the rate of nonresponse rises, however, the *potential* for bias increases and differences between those

who do and do not respond become increasingly relevant in determining the degree and nature of any bias.

Historically, researchers have mostly relied on the size of the response rate itself as a rough gauge of the risk of bias, to the point where many scientific journals and statistical agencies required the reporting of response rates and sometimes specified a minimum acceptable value. More recently, however, a statistical formula derived by Bethlehem (2002) revealed that there is no necessary relationship between response rate and degree of bias. Consistent with this theoretical insight, in his article for this volume Peytchev reports that a meta-analysis of studies done on nonresponse bias yield scatterplots that show virtually no relationship between response rates and degree of bias across studies. As Olson explains in her contribution, the Bethlehem formula reveals that bias is inversely related to the response rate (the higher the response rate the lower the bias) but directly related to the covariance or degree of association between the response rate and the survey variable of interest. Even if nonresponse is high, no bias will result unless the likelihood of response is somehow related to the variable under consideration (see also Lessler and Kalsbeek 1992). That correlation is likely to vary from one survey variable to the next so that there will be considerable variation across estimates within the same survey in the level of nonresponse error. In general, such a relationship will exist if the variable is causally related to survey participation or if a third variable is a common cause of both the variable and participation.

The Bethlehem equation has several important implications. First, it is impossible to know a priori whether a high rate of nonresponse will produce bias. Second, to the extent that bias results from nonresponse, it will vary from item to item and, in fact, most of the variation in bias is not across surveys but between items within surveys. Finally, raising response rates does not guarantee a reduction in bias and it is even possible to increase the degree of bias by reducing the rate of nonresponse. Given the emphasis historically placed on achieving high response rates, the latter may seem counterintuitive, but in their contribution Singer and Ye offer a simple example using financial incentives. They point out that if the incentives affect all sample members equally, then they will have no effect on bias; but if they bring into the sample more of those who are already overrepresented, they will increase bias. Only if incentives have the effect of bringing into the sample those who are underrepresented will they have the desired effect of reducing bias and improving the accuracy of estimates.

Drawing on the foregoing insights, investigators have sought to develop better indicators of potential bias that go beyond simple nonresponse rates. In her article, Kreuter describes two such indicators: the R-indicator, which captures imbalances in response propensities between respondents and nonrespondents and measures the similarity between the original sample and the sample respondents; and the FMI (fraction of missing information) indicator, which measures uncertainty about values imputed for nonresponding cases. Both of these indicators require auxiliary information on both the respondents and nonrespondents from outside the survey. In order to assess bias, therefore, one needs additional information from sources such as sampling frames, contact forms, process logs, interviewer observations, administrative files, or geocoded data files.

LIMITING NONRESPONSE

The most effective way of minimizing bias is to maximize the response rate to a survey through improvements in design and implementation. As Schoeni and his colleagues point out in their article, these improvements begin before any contact with respondents is attempted by making sure that address lists are accurate and up-to-date using the U.S. Postal Service's National Change-of-Address System and, for federal surveys at least, relying on the Census Bureau's Master Address File. In panel surveys, mailings sent to all respondents should include a prepaid postcard with a request for address verification and correction. Special respondent websites are increasingly being used to share information of value to survey participants, maintain their interest, and permit online updating of contact information.

Schoeni et al. report on strategies that have proved effective in boosting participation during fieldwork itself, the most important of which is establishing contact with targeted respondents prior to attempting the survey, normally through a letter or email that to the extent possible is tailored to the interests and circumstances of the respondent, explaining why the survey is of interest or relevance to that person or addressing the stated reasons for an earlier refusal. Most surveys require interviewers to attempt repeated callbacks before giving up on a targeted respondent. In panel studies, interviewers also collect names and contact information of friends and relatives of the respondent, people he or she is likely to stay in contact with over time. Many surveys increasingly employ directory assistance and other online data bases to update address lists and refresh the sampling frame. In her article, Kreuter advocates the use of management techniques developed in the quality control literature---such as flow diagrams, scatterplots, Pareto charts, and control charts---to achieve greater efficiency and higher rates of participation.

Researchers can also take steps to maximize response in the design of the questionnaire itself. In general, anything that can be done to reduce the burden to respondents can be expected to improve participation. In addition to the obvious strategy of limiting the number of questions to be asked, whenever possible investigators should make use of administrative data to fill in certain variable fields in advance of the interview and offer respondents a choice of survey mode---telephone interview, personal interview, online survey, or mail survey. The number of items on a survey can also be limited through the use of "matrix" sampling whereby different sets of questions are created and administered to random subsets of respondents so that information is gathered on a larger number of items than would be included in any single respondent's survey. In the absence of self-reported information, proxy reports by knowledgeable others may also be used. In panel studies, the burden may be reduced by reducing the frequency of interviews by spacing out the survey waves. Panel studies also offer the opportunity to attempt re-interviews with respondents who had dropped out of earlier waves.

As a result of increased efforts to minimize with nonresponse, survey costs have risen even as response rates have fallen. For example, the cost per household of the decennial census rose from about \$77 per household in 2000 to about \$111 per household in 2010; and given that these figures are in constant dollars and they represent a cost increase of nearly 50

percent. The Census Bureau does not pay respondents, of course, since participation in the census is required by law. Other surveys, however, increasingly rely on financial incentives to induce participation, and in their contribution Singer and Ye draw on the leverage-salience theory of respondent decision-making to argue that payments are indeed quite useful in recruiting into the sample people who otherwise would not be motivated to respond, in particular those who have little interest in the topic, those who lack altruistic motives for responding, and those with alternative obligations and competing uses for their time.

Their careful review of the literature clearly indicates that incentives increase response rates across all modes of implementation (telephone, face-to-face, mail, and internet); that monetary incentives work better than gifts to promote participation; and that prepaid incentives increase the likelihood of participation more than promised incentives or lotteries. However, there is no good evidence about how large an incentive should be, only that response rates rise at a declining rate as payments increase. Although studies are limited, they generally indicate that incentives have few effects on the quality of responses or the composition of the sample.

In sum, it is clear that response rates can be increased by spending more money, either indirectly by improving the design and implementation of the survey or directly by incentivizing respondents with monetary payments. In this sense, the issue of nonresponse sometimes boils down to a tradeoff between cost and bias and ultimately depends on how much researchers are willing or able to spend in order to minimize the potential for bias inherent in a high rate of nonresponse. Striking this balance is a guessing game, however, for absent auxiliary information, it is impossible to know the degree to which nonresponse will, in fact, bias estimates of means, variances, covariances, or other parameters such as regression coefficients. While access to such additional information allows an assessment of potential bias, however, the assessment must be carried out on an item-by-item basis. Moreover, auxiliary data also open up the possibility of adjusting sample estimates to correct for nonresponse bias, which may be a less expensive alternative than boosting response rates.

ADJUSTING FOR NONRESPONSE

The simplest and most common means of adjusting for bias created by nonresponse is to weight individual cases by the inverse of the response propensity---i.e. the likelihood of survey participation. In this way, cases from subgroups that are less likely to be included in the sample are given relatively more weight in computing the estimated parameter, and the inverse of the response propensity is known as the response propensity weight. The response propensity for any sampled element depends on its characteristics, which of course are not observed for nonrespondents. Therefore response propensities must be estimated, typically using a logistic regression equation to predict the dichotomous outcome of survey participation as a function of auxiliary variables. In her contribution here, Olson lists the characteristics of the ideal auxiliary variables for use in estimating response propensities: non-missing values are available for respondents and nonrespondents; values are measured completely and without error for all cases; the variables are strongly associated with survey

variables of interest as well as the response propensity. Even when such data are available, adjustment is always complicated by the fact that investigators typically have many variables of interest each of which may be biased to a different degree (or not at all) by nonresponse, and by the fact that both item and unit nonresponse are relevant.

In his appraisal of the suitability of administrative data for nonresponse adjustment, Czajka notes that several sources provide excellent coverage of the U.S. population: the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, and files compiled by the Census Bureau. The coverage rate for tax return files and associated information documents (e.g. W2 and 1099 Forms) from the IRS are estimated at 95 to 96 percent, while the SSA's application files provide basic data on age, race, sex, and Hispanic origin. The Census Bureau's Statistical Administrative Records System seeks to create a census-style data base from a variety of federal administration systems, including the SSA and the IRS files as well as data from Medicare, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Selective Service System, and the Indian Health Service.

The most important limitation on the potential use of these administrative systems as data for nonresponse adjustment is legal: federal legislation prohibits the public release of the data (Title 13 of the U.S. Code for the Census Bureau and Title 26 for the Internal Revenue Service). Thus, they are only available for adjustment of data collected by the federal government and can only be done in-house by the Census Bureau or some other authorized agency. Even then, files from the IRS, the SSA, and the Census Bureau have weaknesses; coverage is not perfect as 4%–5% are typically missing; administrative data contain significant measurement error, especially on items that are not central to the agency's mission; and information is generally not available in a timely fashion but at a lag (e.g., tax returns are only filed once a year).

Given restricted access to federal administrative data, survey researchers have turned to the Multi-level Integrated Database Approach. As Smith and Kim explain in their article, MIDA employs multiple databases to collect as much information as possible about the target sample during the initial sampling stage at all levels of aggregation: individual, household, block, tract, Zip Code, county, and even state. The first step is to extract all publicly available information at several levels of aggregation and link it to units on the sampling frame. The Census Bureau, for example, routinely releases public use data on block groups, census tracts, counties, and states. The second step is to enhance the resulting file by linking to units on the sampling frame other available sources data, such as phone directories, credit reports, property records, and voter registration lists as well as information from private vendors such as the Claritas Corporation. The third step is to use the combined information from steps one and two to make matches to units that were not possible with information from a single source. For example, a number from a telephone directory can lead to households in databases where a simple address could not enable a match.

The final step is to process, clean and update the now large amount of paradata on each case and to make the resulting file available routinely to all survey users. If MIDA were to become the norm in the survey research industry, it might produce multiple benefits. It would, of course, facilitate measurement and adjustment for nonresponse. Having access to

comprehensive multilevel data would enable researchers to test representativeness of the respondents across a wide range of variables and facilitate the specification of models to estimate response propensities for use in weighting whenever bias is detected. As Smith and Kim point out, MIDA would also make data collection more efficient and effective, improve interview validation, facilitate the use of GIS technology, and create a much richer database for substantive analysis. The principal concern is the confidentiality of respondents, which would need to be assured through protocols similar to those currently used for the release of geocoded datasets such as the Panel Study of Income Dynamics or the Adolescent Health Survey. An additional worry is the accuracy of the data, which may be inaccurate at its source or simply not characterize the sample person because the data are so highly aggregated. It is important question whether MIDA or auxiliary data more generally will prove to be valuable tools in countering the effects of survey nonresponse.

BEST PRACTICES FOR MANAGING NONRESPONSE

When all is said and done, the good news is that methodological studies generally show that even relatively large changes in response rates do not have much effect on final sample estimates (Keeter, Kennedy, Dimock, Best, and Craighill 2006; Keeter, Miller, Kohut, Groves, and Presser 2000), again demonstrating that nonresponse bias does not depend in any simple way on the nonresponse rate. Despite declining response rates in telephone surveys, election polls still seem to yield accurate predictions of the outcomes of elections. As Schoeni et al. report in their contribution, even cumulative nonresponse across waves of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics failed to have a significant effect on estimates of income, health, consumer spending, or wealth. Although nonresponse biases can at times be large, their magnitude does not vary closely with nonresponse rates (Groves and Peytcheva 2008; Tourangeau, Groves, and Redline 2010).

Still, almost all we know about nonresponse bias involves bias in means and proportions, and while response rates may be flawed as measures of nonresponse bias, they are still widely seen as important indicators of overall survey quality. In addition, high response rates impose an upper bound on the possible impact of nonresponse, most clearly for estimated means and proportions. Thus, for the foreseeable future, survey researchers are likely to use various techniques to boost response rates (or at least stem their decline). These proven methods for increasing response rates include:

- Sending sample members an advance letter describing the purpose of the survey and explaining why it is important;
- Making multiple callbacks or other follow-up efforts to contact sample members;
- Carrying out persuasion (“refusal conversion” in the parlance of survey research) attempts with reluctant members of the sample; and
- Offering small prepaid incentives to encourage participation.

The effectiveness of most of these methods has been clear for at least 30 years (Heberlein and Baumgartner 1978) and recent evidence indicates that they continue to work. Financial incentives continue to be effective, especially prepaid cash incentives, for both mail and interviewer-mediated surveys. Advance letters are likely to be an increasingly important tool

for survey researchers as it becomes harder to reach people by telephone or by knocking on doors. Attrition rates in longitudinal surveys do not seem to have dropped in the same way as response rates to cross-sectional surveys for this reason. Panel surveys can and often do deploy an extensive set of tools for minimizing attrition over the life of a panel; and to date, these efforts often seem encouragingly successful.

An additional tactic used in many surveys involves offering sample members more than one method to respond. Some surveys offer respondents a choice of methods for completing the survey from the outset. Sample members may, for example, be given the option of completing a mail questionnaire or of responding to the survey online. Other surveys use a sequence of modes, beginning with the mail, say, and then following up with mail nonrespondents via telephone or face-to-face contacts. The American Community Survey follows this sequential strategy, starting with mail and ending with face-to-face interviews.

Advance letters, multiple callbacks, refusal conversion, incentives, and multiple modes of data collection are all attempts to raise response rates. Other methods for coping with nonresponse represent attempts to reduce nonresponse bias. One method that has been used (although infrequently) for several decades is two-phase sampling. With a two-phase sample, a subsample of the initial cases is selected during the field period and only those selected for the subsample are retained for further follow-up efforts. The subsampling allows a greater concentration of effort and resources on the remaining sample members; they may be offered larger incentives than the initial sample was, approached by more persuasive interviewers, asked to complete a shorter questionnaire, or approached with some combination of these enticements to get them to respond.

Depending on how effective these second phase efforts are, the researchers may estimate the level of bias using the data from the respondents to the second phase effort (comparing the first phase respondents with the second phase respondents) or they may just combine the data collected during the two phases (giving greater weight to the second phase respondents to compensate for the additional stage of sampling these cases underwent). The ACS uses a two-phase sampling strategy, selecting only one in three of the remaining nonrespondents for the final face-to-face follow-up efforts.

As noted earlier, nonresponse introduces bias into means and proportions only when the response propensities of the sample members are related to their values on survey variables. A consequence of this fact is that, if everyone has the same response propensities, there cannot be any relation between the response propensities and the survey variables and bias is no longer an issue. When the overall response propensities are equal, nonresponse simply functions as an extra stage of random sampling. Thus, one goal of the field effort is (or should be) to equalize response propensities across the sample members. Two-phase sampling is one means of accomplishing this (or at least of reducing the variability in response propensities). The change in protocol during the second phase of the field period raises the response propensities among the initial nonrespondents selected for further follow-up; these initial nonrespondents presumably had low response propensities during the first phase of data collection.

“Responsive design” (Groves and Heeringa 2006) is a more general strategy for retooling the field effort to raise the response propensities among those with low initial propensities. Survey field managers have long attempted to tailor the approach taken with specific members of the sample to reduce the chances that they would become nonrespondents. Responsive design attempts to use paradata (process data on the prior attempts to complete the interview) in place of field manager judgment to tailor the follow-up efforts to specific cases, with the goal of reducing variation across individual cases or subgroups in overall response propensities. Further, response propensities estimated through statistical models can be used in place of interviewer judgment to direct how much effort a given case receives.

After the data have been collected, many surveys adjust the weights for the respondents to compensate for any remaining differences in response propensities across the responding cases. Various weighting schemes can be used (for example, cell-based weighting adjustments or adjustments based on logistic regression models), but almost all of them are based on the principle of increasing the weight given to a respondent by the inverse of his or her estimated response propensity (Kalton and Flores-Cervantes, 2003). Such nonresponse adjustments can reduce nonresponse bias, but, as Little and Vartivarian (2005) demonstrate, they don’t always work; the adjustments can also increase the variance in survey estimates. Still, most survey researchers regard weighting adjustments as a useful, even essential, step to take in addressing nonresponse.

All of these tactics either aim to prevent nonresponse bias by increasing the response rates (or equalizing the response propensities) or to reduce the effects of nonresponse on the estimates by adjusting the case weights. As a final move, researchers may attempt to estimate the level of nonresponse bias that remains. The usual strategies are to compare the respondents and nonrespondents using frame data or data from administrative records; in addition, in some surveys, there are data from preliminary screening interviews that can be used to compare respondents and nonrespondents (Groves and Peytcheva 2008). A final option is to compare the characteristics of the respondents to some external population benchmark, such as figures from the ACS. The Office of Management and Budget’s Standards and Guidelines for Statistical Surveys, issued in 2006, recommend that investigators carry out studies like these to estimate the level of nonresponse bias whenever the response rate for a survey falls below 80 percent (http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/omb/inforeg/statpolicy/standards_stat_surveys.pdf). Clearly, these efforts are useful whenever nonresponse bias is a threat to a survey’s conclusions.

References

- Atrostic BK, Bates Nancy, Burt Geraldine, Silberstein Adriana. Nonresponse in U.S. government household surveys: Consistent measures, recent trends, and new insights. *Journal of Official Statistics*. 2001; 17(2):209–26.
- Curtin, Richard; Presser, Stanley; Singer, Eleanor. Changes in telephone survey nonresponse over the past quarter century. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 2005; 69(1):87–98.
- deLeeuw, Edith; de Heer, W. Trends in household survey nonresponse: A longitudinal and international perspective. In: Groves, Robert M.; Dillman, Don A.; Eltinge, John L.; Little, Roderick JA., editors. *Survey Nonresponse*. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 2002. p. 41-54.

- Groves, Robert M.; Heeringa, Steven G. Responsive design for household surveys: Tools for actively controlling survey errors and costs. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A*. 2006; 169:439–453.
- Groves, Robert M.; Peytcheva, E. The impact of nonresponse rates on nonresponse bias: A meta-analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 2008; 72(2):167–189.
- Heberlein, Thomas A.; Baumgartner, Robert. Factors affecting response rates to mailed questionnaires: A quantitative analysis of the published literature. *American Sociological Review*. 1978; 43(4):447–462.
- Kalton, Graham; Flores-Cervantes, Ismael. Weighting methods. *Journal of Official Statistics*. 2003; 19(2):81–97.
- Keeter, Scott; Kennedy, Courtney; Dimock, Michael; Best, Jonathan; Craighill, Peyton. Gauging the impact of growing nonresponse on estimates from a national RDD telephone survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 2006; 70(5):759–779.
- Keeter, Scott; Miller, Caroline; Kohut, Andrew; Groves, Robert; Presser, Stanley. Consequences of reducing nonresponse in a national telephone survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 2000; 64(2):125–148. [PubMed: 10984330]
- Lessler, Judith; Kalsbeek, William. *Nonsampling Errors in Surveys*. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1992.
- Link, Michael W.; Battaglia, Michael P.; Frankel, Martin R.; Osborn, Larry; Mokdad, Ali H. A comparison of address-based sampling (ABS) versus random digit dialing (RDD) for general population surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 2008; 72(1):6–27.
- Little, Roderick JA.; Vartivarian, Sonya. Does weighting for nonresponse increase the variance of survey means? *Survey Methodology*. 2005; 31(2):161–168.
- Tourangeau, Roger. Survey research and societal change. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2004; 55:775–801.
- Tourangeau, Roger; Groves, Robert M.; Redline, Cleo D. Sensitive topics and reluctant respondents: Demonstrating a link between nonresponse bias and measurement error. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 2010; 74:413–432.

Table 10.1Surveys mentioned in articles published in this volume of the *Annals*.

Name of Survey	Sponsor of Survey
U.S. Government Surveys	
American Community Survey	Bureau of the Census
American Housing Survey	Bureau of the Census
Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey	Centers for Disease Control
Consumer Expenditure Survey	Bureau of Labor Statistics
Current Population Survey	Bureau of the Census
National Assessment of Educational Progress	National Center for Educ. Statistics
National Educational Longitudinal Survey	National Center for Educ. Statistics
National Health Interview Survey	Centers for Disease Control
National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey	Centers for Disease Control
National Household Education Survey	National Center for Educ. Statistics
National Immunization Survey	Centers for Disease Control
National Longitudinal Surveys	Bureau of Labor Statistics
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997	Bureau of Labor Statistics
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979	Bureau of Labor Statistics
National Longitudinal Survey of Women	Bureau of Labor Statistics
National Longitudinal Surveys of Men	Bureau of Labor Statistics
National Medical Care Expenditure Survey	Dept. of Health & Human Services
National Survey of Family Growth	Centers for Disease Control
National Survey on Drug Use and Health	Public Health Service
Residential Energy Consumption Survey	Energy Information Administration
Survey of Consumer Finances	Federal Reserve System
Survey of Income and Program Participation	Bureau of the Census
Survey of Early Child Care and Youth Development	National Institutes of Health-NICHHD
Other U.S. Surveys	
Asset and Health Dynamics Survey of the Oldest Old	University of Michigan
American National Election Study	Stanford and University of Michigan
Fragile Families Survey	Princeton University
General Social Survey	National Opinion Research Center
Health and Retirement Survey	University of Michigan
Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Study	RAND Corporation
Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality	Russell Sage Foundation
National Comorbidity Survey	Harvard University
National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health	University of North Carolina
National Survey of American Life	University of Michigan
New Immigrant Survey	RAND Corporation
Panel Study of Income Dynamics	University of Michigan
Project on Human Dev. in Chicago Neighborhoods	Harvard University
Survey of Consumer Attitudes and Behavior	University of Michigan

Name of Survey	Sponsor of Survey
Non-U.S. Surveys	
British Birth Cohort Studies	Center for Longitudinal Studies
British Crime Survey	British Home Office
British Household Panel Study	University of Essex
British Household Survey	University of Essex
British National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles	National Center for Social Research
British Survey of Social Attitudes	UK Economic & Social Data Service
Dutch Integrated Survey on Household Living Conditions	Statistics Netherlands
Dutch Labor Force Survey	Statistics Netherlands
English Longitudinal Study of Aging	Institute for Fiscal Studies
European Social Survey	European Commission
Family Resources Survey	UK Dept. for Work and Pensions
German Socioeconomic Panel	German Inst. for Economic Research
Household, Income and Labor Dynamics Survey	University of Melbourne
International Assessment of Adult Competencies	OECD
Lifelong Learning Surveys	European Commission
National Health Interview Surveys in Europe	Eurostat
Survey of Health, Aging and Retirement in Europe	Max Planck Institute
Survey of Labor and Income Dynamics	Statistics Canada
Youth Cohort Study of England and Wales	Economic and Social Data Service