

Annenberg Survey of Attitudes on Public Health (ASAPH)

Methods Report for the
Annenberg Public Policy Center
ASAPH National Survey Wave 20

July 2024

Prepared by:
Rachel Askew, Will Bishop, Jennifer Su
SSRS



Project Number: X4006



Table of Contents

Overview	1
Questionnaire Design	1
Sample Design: The SSRS Opinion Panel	1
Data Collection.....	2
Survey Sampling	2
Survey Administration Procedures.....	2
Quality Control Checks	3
Data Processing and Integration	3
Completion Rate/Response Rate.....	3
Weighting Methods	4
Base weight (BW).....	4
Raking	4
Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference	5
Deliverables	6
About SSRS.....	6
Appendix I: Sample Demographics.....	7

Overview

The Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania (APPC) engaged SSRS to conduct the 20th wave of the Annenberg Survey of Attitudes on Public Health (ASAPH) National Survey. The survey focused on perceptions of climate change, food-safety practices, and the two main 2024 U.S. presidential candidates at the time, President Joe Biden and former President Donald Trump, shortly after their June 27th, 2024 presidential debate. Additionally, Wave 20 featured a section introducing a new APPC youth panel, the National Annenberg Survey of Youth, or NASY, to parents of children aged 13 to 22. This survey was conducted via the SSRS Opinion Panel and invited U.S. adults aged 18 and older who completed the ASAPH Wave 1 survey, or who were recruited in ASAPH Wave 9 or the ASAPH Engagement Survey, to participate. Only panelists who previously reported NOT being a member of other U.S. opinion panels were invited. The sample size was $N = 1,961$.

Data collection was conducted from July 11th – July 17th, 2024 on 1,496 respondents including 1,469 respondents in English, and 27 respondents in Spanish. There were 1,465 web respondents and 31 telephone interview respondents. Data were weighted to represent the U.S. residential adult population. This report provides information about the sampling procedures and the methods used to collect, process, and weight data for ASAPH National Survey Wave 20.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was developed by APPC in consultation with the SSRS project team. SSRS reviewed the questionnaire primarily to identify potential problems in the instrument that might increase respondent burden, cause respondents to refuse or terminate the interview, create problems with respondent comprehension, or pose practical challenges for mode-specific administration such as complex skip patterns. The questionnaire was translated into Spanish so respondents could choose to take the survey in English or Spanish based on their preference. Prior to the field period, SSRS programmed the study into its Forsta Plus (formerly known as Conformat) platform that allows data to be collected online or through Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). Extensive checking of the program was conducted to ensure that skip patterns and sample splits followed the design of the questionnaire.

Sample Design: The SSRS Opinion Panel

SSRS Opinion Panel members are recruited randomly based on nationally representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design (including Hawaii and Alaska). ABS respondents are randomly sampled by Marketing Systems Group (MSG) through the U.S. Postal Service's Computerized

Delivery Sequence File (CDS), a regularly updated listing of all known addresses in the U.S. For the SSRS Opinion Panel, known business addresses are excluded from the sample frame.¹

The SSRS Opinion Panel is a multi-mode panel. Internet households participate via web while all non-internet households (including those who have internet but are unwilling to take surveys online) participate via phone.

Data Collection

Survey Sampling

The sample for the ASAPH National Survey Wave 20 consisted of $N=1,961$ SSRS Opinion Panelists who were recruited to the ASAPH panel through the Wave 1, Wave 9 or Engagement surveys and were not members of other U.S. opinion panels. The sample from Wave 1 was stratified by age, gender, race and ethnicity, education, region, party identification and language to ensure adequate representation of each. Sample recruited from Wave 9 or the Engagement Survey were SSRS Opinion Panelists who indicated their educational attainment was a high school degree or less.

Survey Administration Procedures

A “soft launch” inviting a limited number of panelists to participate was conducted on the morning of July 11th, 2024. After checking soft launch data to ensure that all questionnaire content and skip patterns were correct, the remaining sample was released on the afternoon of July 11th, 2024.

Web panelists were emailed an invitation to complete the survey online. The email for each respondent included a unique passcode-embedded link. All web panelists who did not respond to their first invitation received up to four reminder emails, and non-responding web panelists who had opted to receive text messages from the SSRS Opinion Panel received up to two text message reminders.

In appreciation for their participation, web panelists received a \$15 incentive in the form of an electronic gift card. Telephone respondents received a \$15 incentive in the form of a mailed check.

Median survey length was 17.0 minutes online and 31.7 minutes by phone.

¹ Prior to July 2019, the SSRS Opinion Panel was recruited entirely from RDD sample.

Quality Control Checks

For web surveys, the SSRS Opinion Probability Panel’s quality checks were incorporated into the survey. For APPC National Survey Wave 20, SSRS built in three closed-ended trap questions to the web version of the program. This included 1 sincerity check and 2 trap questions which were placed in random places in the survey. Respondents who failed the quality checks were not included in the final data set. This included:

1. Respondents who answered two or more trap questions incorrectly ($n=5$).
2. Respondents with a length of interview (LOI) less than 20% of the overall median LOI² ($n=3$).
3. Respondents who skipped more than 10% of the questions asked³ ($n=2$).

A total of $N=10$ completed surveys were removed (0.7%)⁴ after applying these cleaning standards.

For telephone surveys, interviews were closely monitored by interviewing staff and project staff for quality control. In addition, select recordings were reviewed by supervisors to monitor quality and interviewer procedures.

Data Processing and Integration

Data from web and telephone modes were combined and thoroughly cleaned with a computer validation program written by one of SSRS’s data processing programmers. This program established editing parameters in order to locate any errors, including data that did not follow skip patterns, out of range values, and errors in data field locations. No back-coding or code development was done.

Completion Rate/Response Rate

Table 1 details the survey completion rate for this study.

Table 1: Completion Rate/Response Rate

Touchpoint	Web	Telephone	Overall
Invited to Participate/Total Sample	1,895	66	1,961
Completed ⁵	1,465	31	1,496
Survey Completion Rate	77.3%	47.0%	76.3%

² LOI less than 3.39 minutes.

³ 98.6% of respondents who count as completes answered 100% of questions asked.

⁴ Panelists may fail multiple quality control checks; therefore, the total number of removals may be less than the cumulative number of failed tests.

⁵ Excludes cases removed for quality control reasons.

Weighting Methods

Data were weighted to represent the residential adult population of the United States. The data were weighted by applying a base weight and balancing the demographic profile of the sample to target population parameters.

Base weight (BW)

The final weight for Wave 1 was used as the base weight for the main sample respondents. For low-education respondents added in Wave 9, their final weight from Wave 9 was used as the base weight. For the additional low-education respondents added from the Engagement survey, their final weights from Wave 10 were used as the base weight.

Raking

With the base weight applied, the data were weighted to balance the demographic profile of the sample to the target population parameters.

Missing data in the raking variables were imputed using hot decking. Hot deck imputation replaces the missing values of a respondent randomly with another similar respondent without missing data. Hot decking was done using an SPSS macro detailed in 'Goodbye, Listwise Deletion: Presenting Hot Deck Imputation as an Easy and Effective Tool for Handling Missing Data' (Myers, 2011).

Weighting was accomplished using SPSSINC RAKE, an SPSS extension module that simultaneously balances the distributions of all variables using the GENLOG procedure.

Data were weighted to distributions of: sex by age, sex by education, age by education, race/ethnicity, census region, civic engagement, population density, party ID⁶, voter registration, religious affiliation, and internet use frequency. The main demographic benchmarks were obtained from the 2023 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) of Current Population Survey (CPS)⁷. The civic engagement benchmark was derived from September 2021 CPS Volunteering and Civic Life Supplement data^{8,9}. Population density was derived from the Claritas Pop-Facts Premier 2023¹⁰. The registered voter benchmark is from the 2023 Annual Social and

⁶ The party ID used in weighting was measured in August 2023, at a time that matches the 2023 NPORS data release, not at the time of this survey.

⁷ Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Megan Schouweiler and Michael Westberry. IPUMS CPS: Version 11.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V11.0>

⁸ <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/about/supplemental-surveys.html>

⁹ Civically engaged respondents are defined as those who have volunteered in the past 12 months or who talk to their neighbors daily.

¹⁰ <https://enviroinformatics.com/data/demographic/pop-facts-premier>.

Economic Supplement (ASEC) of Current Population Survey (CPS)'s Voting and Registration Supplement¹¹. The party ID, internet frequency, and religious affiliation benchmarks came from the 2023 NPORS annual dataset released by Pew Research Center¹².

Weights were trimmed at the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on survey-derived estimates.

Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference

Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. SSRS calculates the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response. The total sample design effect for this survey is 1.97.

SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size n , with each case having a weight, w , as:¹³

$$deff = \frac{n \sum w^2}{(\sum w)^2}$$

The survey's margin of error is the largest 95% confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample — the one around 50%. For example, the margin of error for the entire sample for is ± 3.5 percentage points. This means that in 95 out of every 100 samples drawn using the same methodology, estimated proportions based on the entire sample will be no more than 3.5 percentage points away from their true values in the population. Margins of error for subgroups will be larger. It is important to remember that sampling fluctuations are only one possible source of error in a survey estimate. Other sources, such as respondent selection bias, questionnaire wording, and reporting inaccuracy, may contribute additional error of greater or lesser magnitude.

¹¹ Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Megan Schouweiler and Michael Westberry. IPUMS CPS: Version 11.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V11.0>

¹² <https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/fact-sheet/national-public-opinion-reference-survey-npors/> - May 19 to Sept 5, 2023.

¹³ Kish, L. (1992). Weighting for Unequal Pi. *Journal of Official Statistics*, Vol. 8, No.2, 1992, pp. 183-200.

Deliverables

Final deliverables for this study are as follows:

- Weighted SPSS dataset
- Weighted SPSS dataset for Waves 1-20
- Methods Report

About SSRS

SSRS is breaking the mold on what research companies can do. A full-service market and survey research firm, we use the latest data collection best practices and apply cutting-edge survey methodologies backed by insight from our industry-leading team. We have genuine enthusiasm for our work and a shared goal to connect people through research. Our solutions include groundbreaking approaches fit for purpose: the SSRS Opinion Panel, Encipher, SSRS Virtual Insights, the SSRS Text Message panel, and more. Our research areas focus on Health Care and Health Policy, Public Opinion and Policy, Political and Election Polling, Consumer and Lifestyle, and Sports and Entertainment. Visit www.ssrs.com to learn more about how we can work together.

Appendix I: Sample Demographics

Category	Values	Parameter	Unweighted	Weighted
Sex by age	Male 18-24	6.0%	1.1%	3.5%
	Male 25-34	8.8%	7.7%	9.1%
	Male 35-44	8.5%	8.2%	8.9%
	Male 45-54	7.7%	8.4%	8.2%
	Male 55-64	7.8%	8.4%	8.0%
	Male 65+	10.2%	14.8%	9.7%
	Female 18-24	5.8%	1.7%	4.5%
	Female 25-34	8.6%	9.4%	9.4%
	Female 35-44	8.4%	10.4%	9.3%
	Female 45-54	7.8%	8.2%	8.1%
	Female 55-64	8.2%	10.0%	9.1%
	Female 65+	12.2%	11.6%	12.2%
Sex by education	Male HS grad or less	20.0%	8.5%	17.3%
	Male Some college	12.4%	12.2%	12.2%
	Male College grad +	16.5%	27.9%	17.9%
	Female HS grad or less	18.2%	12.3%	17.5%
	Female College grad +	18.9%	23.4%	20.1%
Age by education	18-34 HS grad or less	11.5%	4.7%	9.2%
	18-34 Some college	8.8%	4.2%	8.1%
	18-34 College grad +	8.9%	11.0%	9.2%
	35-54 HS grad or less	10.9%	7.3%	11.4%
	35-54 Some college	7.8%	9.3%	8.5%
	35-54 College grad +	13.7%	18.7%	14.7%
	55+ HS grad or less	15.7%	8.8%	14.2%
	55+ Some college	9.9%	14.4%	10.7%
55+ College grad +	12.8%	21.7%	14.1%	
Race/ethnicity	White non-Hisp	61.3%	66.7%	63.4%
	Black non-Hisp	12.1%	9.5%	11.4%
	Hispanic, US Born	8.4%	8.5%	8.7%
	Hispanic, Foreign Born	9.1%	4.3%	7.9%
	Asian, non-Hisp	6.5%	9.2%	6.0%
	Other non-Hisp	2.6%	1.9%	2.6%

Table continued on next page...

Category	Values	Parameter	Unweighted	Weighted
Census region	Northeast	17.3%	18.7%	18.6%
	Midwest	20.5%	17.9%	19.2%
	South	38.6%	38.1%	37.3%
	West	23.6%	25.4%	24.9%
Civic engagement	Not engaged	73.0%	55.2%	71.1%
	Civically engaged	27.0%	44.8%	28.9%
Population density	1 Lowest 20%	20.0%	17.2%	20.9%
	2	20.0%	20.3%	18.3%
	3	20.0%	22.3%	20.9%
	4	20.0%	21.4%	19.6%
	5 Highest 20%	20.0%	18.9%	20.4%
Party ID (panel)	Rep	29.0%	22.3%	27.7%
	Dem	30.4%	33.7%	31.7%
	Ind/Other	40.7%	44.0%	40.7%
Voter Registration	Registered to vote	74.8%	89.2%	79.1%
	Not registered	25.2%	10.8%	20.9%
Religion	Affiliated	71.0%	71.1%	69.5%
	Not Affiliated	29.0%	28.9%	30.5%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	41.9%	48.5%	42.2%
	Several times a day	44.1%	42.4%	45.6%
	About once a day	5.3%	4.8%	5.4%
	Several times a week	2.8%	2.5%	3.1%
	Less often	2.2%	1.5%	2.4%
	Not an internet user	3.6%	0.3%	1.3%