

March 2010

# Community Advantage Panel Survey Year 4 Data Collection

## Final Report

Prepared for

**University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**  
Center for Community Capital  
1700 Martin Luther King Blvd., Suite 129—Campus Box 3452  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3452

Prepared by

**Barbara Bibb**  
**Brian Burke**  
**Kathleen A. Considine**  
**Brian Evans**  
**Laura Flicker**

RTI International  
3040 Cornwallis Road  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

RTI Project Numbers 0210719.001.004 and  
0210730.001.001



RTI Project Numbers 0210719.001.004 and  
0210730.001.001

# Community Advantage Panel Survey Year 4 Data Collection

## Final Report

March 2010

Prepared for

**University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**  
Center for Community Capital  
1700 Martin Luther King Blvd., Suite 129 – Campus Box 3452  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3452

Prepared by

**Barbara Bibb**  
**Brian Burke**  
**Kathleen A. Considine**  
**Brian Evans**  
**Laura Flicker**

RTI International  
Survey and Computing Sciences  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

---

RTI International is a trade name of Research Triangle Institute.



# Contents

---

Section	Page
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>2. Sample Design</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Year 4 UNC Renters Study—Telephone Interviews .....	2-1
2.2 Year 4 UNC Owners Study—Telephone Interviews.....	2-1
<b>3. Instrumentation</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Questionnaire Development.....	3-1
3.2 Spanish Translation.....	3-2
3.3 Cognitive Testing .....	3-2
3.4 Instrument Finalization .....	3-3
3.5 Programming and System Development .....	3-3
3.5.1 Blaise Instrument Development and Testing.....	3-3
3.5.2 The Survey Control System .....	3-3
<b>4. Tracing Report for Renters and Owners</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1 Tracing Activities for Renters .....	4-1
4.1.1 Batch Tracing .....	4-1
4.1.2 Locator Mailing.....	4-1
4.1.3 Interactive Tracing .....	4-1
4.1.4 Field Tracing.....	4-3
4.2 Tracing Activities for Owners .....	4-4
4.2.1 Batch Tracing .....	4-4
4.2.2 Locator Mailing.....	4-4
4.2.3 Interactive Tracing .....	4-4
4.2.4 Field Tracing.....	4-5
<b>5. Data Collection Methods</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1 Telephone Interviewer Training.....	5-1
5.1.1 Renters Study Training.....	5-1
5.1.2 Owners Study Training.....	5-1
5.2 Interviewing.....	5-2
5.3 Monitoring and Quality Circle Meetings .....	5-2
5.4 Refusal Conversion.....	5-3
5.5 Data Collection Challenges and Resolutions.....	5-3

5.6	Data Collection Results .....	5-3
5.6.1	UNC Renters Study .....	5-3
5.6.2	UNC Owners Study .....	5-6
5.7	Plans for Future Years.....	5-7
<b>6.</b>	<b>Project Management</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1	RTI Comprehensive Assumption of Year 4 Data Collection Responsibilities for the UNC Owners Study.....	6-1
6.2	Implementation of Work Efforts on a Consolidated Public-Use Data Set.....	6-2
<b>7.</b>	<b>Data Files and Documentation</b>	<b>7-1</b>
7.1	Data Extraction.....	7-1
7.2	Interim Data Delivery .....	7-1
7.3	Final Data Delivery.....	7-2
7.4	User Manual .....	7-2
<b>8.</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>8-1</b>

# Tables

---

<b>Number</b>	<b>Page</b>
2-1. Renters Panel Distribution by Metropolitan Statistical Area .....	2-2
2-2. Owners Panel Distribution by Metropolitan Statistical Area.....	2-3
4-1. Year 4 Tracing Operations Unit Tracing Results for Renters.....	4-3
4-2. Year 4 Tracing Operations Unit Tracing Results for Owners .....	4-6
5-1. Data Collection Results for Years 1 Through 4 (Renters).....	5-4
5-2. Completed Interviews, by Metropolitan Statistical Area (Renters) .....	5-5
5-3. Telephone Survey Data Collection Results for Year 4 (Owners).....	5-7
5-4. Completed Interviews, by Metropolitan Statistical Area (Owners) .....	5-8



# 1. INTRODUCTION

The Community Advantage Panel Survey (CAPS), which comprises two subsamples (the UNC Owners Study and the UNC Renters Study), is a longitudinal study designed to assess the economic and social impacts of homeownership on low- to moderate-income homeowners and renters, as well as to assess how homeowners and renters differ from each other. The study is funded by the Ford Foundation and overseen by the Center for Community Capital at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The UNC Owners Study was originally planned to include six telephone interviews and two in-home interviews. The Survey Research Unit at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-SRU) conducted the first 4 years of telephone interviews for the UNC Owners Study (through 2006), and RTI International (RTI) is conducting the two in-home interviews and the final 2 years of telephone data collection for the UNC Owners Study (Years 4 and 5). A subset of the UNC Owners Study participants was selected and a panel of low- to moderate-income renters was matched to this subset of owners. The matched renters (the UNC Renters Study) were living in the same Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as the owners subset as of 2004. The UNC Renters Study began one year after the start of the UNC Owners Study and was originally planned as a 5-year study. RTI was charged with conducting both in-home interviews and the three telephone interviews for the UNC Renters Study.

This report describes results from the 2007 (survey Year 4) of data collection for both samples for CAPS. In 2007 RTI conducted telephone data collection for all of the renter and owner respondents previously interviewed, less hard refusals who were removed from the sample because they no longer wished to participate in the survey. The data were collected via computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) instruments based on prior-year instruments to which new modules were added as necessary to collect desired data.

The remainder of this report details the design, instrumentation, tracing plan, data collection methods, project management, and creation of data files and documentation for the CATI surveys conducted for the Year 4 UNC Renters and Owners Studies.



## 2. SAMPLE DESIGN

In establishing the UNC Owners Study, the Center for Community Capital at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CCC) selected a panel of low- and moderate-income owners throughout the United States whose loans were held by Self Help. UNC-CCC selected these owners with the goal of interviewing them over a span of 6 years. RTI selected and developed a matching panel of low- and moderate-income renters (the UNC Renters Study) to be interviewed over a 5-year period. The first year, or baseline year, for the owners sample is labeled *Year 0* for data collection purposes. All subsequent years for both owners and renters follow the same numbering of years. This section details the Year 4 sample design for both owners and renters.

The population from which this panel was drawn is mobile. During the course of the study, panel members may have moved in and out of home ownership, some more than once. The designations *renter* and *owner* refer to the panel member's status during the baseline interview when they first enrolled in the study, which is Year 0 for owners and Year 1 for renters; thus, the designation of *renter* or *owner* does not necessarily indicate the respondent's current status but rather his or her status upon first joining the panel.

### 2.1 Year 4 UNC Renters Study—Telephone Interviews

Year 3 of the UNC Renters Study produced 970 completed telephone interviews. All renters who had completed an in-home interview during Year 2 were included in the pool of eligible sample members for Year 4. In 2006 RTI also completed interviews with a soft-refusal sample of renters who had not completed an interview in Year 2. An additional 77 renter interviews were completed as part of the soft-refusal survey. Because a respondent could have missed either the Year 3 or the Year 4 renter interview and still have been eligible for the survey, RTI included all nonrespondents from Year 3 who were not ineligible and had not refused further participation in the study. As a result, the starting sample for Year 4 of the UNC Renters Study comprised 1,217 cases (Table 2-1).

### 2.2 Year 4 UNC Owners Study—Telephone Interviews

Year 3 of the UNC Owners Study conducted by UNC-SRU produced 2,118 completed telephone interviews. As was true for renters, all owners who completed an in-home interview during Year 2 were included in the pool of eligible sample members for Year 4. In 2006 RTI also completed interviews with a soft-refusal sample of owners who had not completed an interview in Year 2. An additional 262 owner interviews were completed as part of the soft-refusal survey. Because a respondent may have missed the Year 3 or Year 4 owner interview and still been eligible for the survey, RTI included all nonrespondents from Year 3 who were eligible and had not refused further participation. As a result, the starting sample for Year 4 of the UNC Owners Study originally comprised 2,596 cases but was later expanded to include an additional 588 cases (Table 2-2).

**Table 2-1. Renters Panel Distribution by Metropolitan Statistical Area**

<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</b>	<b>MSA No.</b>	<b>Total Renters</b>	<b>Spanish-Speaking Renters</b>
Albuquerque, NM	01	17	0
Atlanta, GA	03	31	6
Bloomington-Normal, IL	04	7	0
Charlotte–Gastonia–Rock Hill, NC-SC	06	98	13
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI	07	43	5
Columbia, SC	10	18	1
Dallas–Fort Worth, TX	12	17	4
Dayton-Springfield, OH	13	11	0
Detroit–Ann Arbor–Flint, MI	14	20	0
Enid, OK	15	23	0
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR	16	38	12
Greensboro–Winston-Salem–High Point, NC	18	82	9
Greenville, NC	19	18	0
Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	20	27	2
Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC	21	26	4
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX	22	21	4
Las Vegas, NV-AZ	25	16	0
Lima, OH	26	11	0
Los Angeles–Riverside–Orange County, CA	27	31	18
Miami–Fort Lauderdale, FL	29	13	1
Minneapolis–St. Paul, MN-WI	30	27	0
Oklahoma City, OK	33	108	3
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	36	45	10
Raleigh–Durham–Chapel Hill, NC	38	159	27
Rocky Mount, NC	41	29	0
Toledo, OH	44	49	1
Tucson, AZ	45	33	9
Tulsa, OK	46	139	10
Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV	47	53	3
West Palm Beach–Boca Raton, FL	48	3	0
Youngstown-Warren, OH	50	4	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,217</b>	<b>142</b>

**Table 2-2. Owners Panel Distribution by Metropolitan Statistical Area**

<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</b>	<b>MSA No.</b>	<b>Total Owners</b>	<b>Spanish-Speaking Owners</b>
Albuquerque, NM	01	35	6
Asheville, NC	02	26	0
Atlanta, GA	03	69	5
Bloomington-Normal, IL	04	56	0
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA	05	19	1
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	06	115	7
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI	07	94	10
Cincinnati-Hamilton, OH	08	50	0
Cleveland, OH	09	68	0
Columbia, SC	10	36	0
Columbus, OH	11	35	0
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	12	43	14
Dayton-Springfield, OH	13	52	0
Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, MI	14	77	4
Enid, OK	15	40	4
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR	16	81	36
Green Bay, WI	17	12	1
Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, NC	18	103	3
Greenville, NC	19	78	2
Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	20	69	2
Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC	21	82	6
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX	22	39	22
Jackson, MS	23	81	0
Kansas City, MS	24	27	4
Las Vegas, NV-AZ	25	30	11
Lima, OH	26	50	0
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA	27	96	48
Memphis, TN	28	41	0
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL	29	26	9
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	30	42	8

(continued)

**Table 2-2. Owners Panel Distribution by Metropolitan Statistical Area (continued)**

<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</b>	<b>MSA No.</b>	<b>Owners</b>	<b>Spanish-Speaking Owners</b>
New York City–Northern New Jersey–Long Island, NY	31	19	0
Norfolk–Virginia Beach–Newport News, VA	32	24	0
Oklahoma City, OK	33	136	8
Peoria-Perkins, IL	34	28	0
Philadelphia–Wilmington–Atlantic City, DE-NJ-PA	35	10	2
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	36	62	42
Pittsburgh, PA	37	32	0
Raleigh–Durham–Chapel Hill, NC	38	257	8
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	39	21	0
Roanoke, VA	40	22	0
Rocky Mount, NC	41	149	5
San Francisco–Oakland–San Jose CA	42	47	17
Tampa–St. Petersburg–Clearwater, FL	43	25	1
Toledo, OH	44	173	3
Tucson, AZ	45	39	28
Tulsa, OK	46	217	3
Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV	47	135	14
West Palm Beach–Boca Raton, FL	48	22	9
Wilmington, NC	49	53	0
Youngstown-Warren, OH	50	40	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,183</b>	<b>344</b>

### 3. INSTRUMENTATION

RTI collaborated closely with the Center for Community Capital at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CCC) staff in researching published measurement scales, drafting new questions, pretesting questions with test subjects, and designing a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) instrument that captured the information of interest to the study sponsors. The survey development process involved iterative drafts and incremental changes to questions, response options, and computer specifications describing ranges, skips, and follow-up questions for *don't know* responses. The various instrumentation steps taken, as well as their approximate completion times, are described in the following sections.

#### 3.1 Questionnaire Development

Work on the Year 4 Renters instrument began in November 2006, when UNC-CCC delivered new survey questions to RTI that addressed health issues, including medical conditions, health insurance coverage, and out-of-pocket costs for medical care. These items were eventually combined into a single Health Issues module. Another new module, Credit Scores, was developed to assess respondents' knowledge about credit scores and to collect self-reported Federal Insurance Contributions Act scores, if known. Two more modules, Housing Payments and Home Improvements, were drafted by early 2007.

Cognitive interviews were conducted with low-income volunteers recruited from the general public in Washington, District of Columbia, and Raleigh-Durham, North Carolina. Pretesting helped to identify ambiguously worded questions, redundancies, poorly specified response options, and past events that the average respondent would likely find difficult to recall. RTI suggested revisions to the instrument; UNC-CCC then made decisions about which suggestions to adopt.

The CATI instrument was initially released for testing in April 2007. At that time, the newly added modules were available only in English. Spanish-language updates were added to the program during the next month, and a fully integrated bilingual instrument was ready in May 2007. Because of the expected duration of the phone interview, the Home Improvements module was not adopted in Year 4 but was reserved for possible administration in Year 5.

Data collection for the UNC Renter Study began on June 18, 2007, and data collection for the UNC Owners Study began on July 11, 2007. Shortly after the start of data collection, UNC-CCC and RTI decided to clarify a question about out-of-pocket medical expenses by adding a financial threshold calculated as 6.5% of income. This was the final change to the CATI instrument in Year 4.

### 3.2 Spanish Translation

Translation of the Year 4 instrument into Spanish occurred between February and May 2007. A language methodologist from RTI's survey methodology program completed the initial translation, and another language methodologist reviewed it independently. The language methodologists collaborated to resolve any differences that were found between the two reviews and (if necessary) to solicit clarification from the instrumentation task leader. The language methodologists' findings from the completed cognitive interviews were used to inform the translation approaches (e.g., this information was used in describing major appliances in the Home Improvements module). The primary translator was responsible for testing the Spanish-language CATI instrument, which was programmed only after cognitive testing had been completed.

### 3.3 Cognitive Testing

In February and March 2007 RTI conducted cognitive interviews in English and Spanish to pretest the four proposed modules (Health Issues, Credit Scores, Housing Payments, and Home Improvements) and the new social networks questions that would constitute the Social Capital module for Year 4.

Eighteen cognitive interviews were conducted with low-income homeowners to determine how well the questions were understood and could be answered. Volunteers called a dedicated recruitment line and were screened into the pretest if they had made renovations to their current or former homes, had incurred out-of-pocket medical expenses exceeding \$500, or had lost pay or income because of an illness or injury to self or a family member.

Eight of the 18 interviews were conducted in Washington, District of Columbia. Four interviews were conducted in Spanish by language methodologists using their own translations of questions and follow-up questions, or *probes*. The interviews were completed over 12 days; on March 20, 2007, RTI staff debriefed UNC-CCC about the findings and recommended question changes.

The assigned survey methodologist met individually with volunteers in a private office on RTI's main campus in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, or at the Rockville, Maryland, office. The methodologist read survey questions and response options aloud, recorded responses, and asked scripted and ad hoc probes. The survey methodologist encouraged participants to ask for clarification if they had difficulty understanding any question or response option.

Each methodologist recorded notes on a hard-copy protocol containing the questions and probes. A summary report and debriefing was provided to UNC-CCC on March 20, 2007, to review observations and suggest wording changes.

### **3.4 Instrument Finalization**

In accordance with feedback from the cognitive interviews and demonstration interviews with UNC-CCC staff, the 2007 survey questions, response options, and interviewer instructions were finalized so that the data collection instrument could be programmed. The modules were programmed and tested on a flow basis by UNC-CCC and RTI staff in the subsequent 2 months. Soon after data collection began, UNC-CCC and RTI decided to clarify a question asking how respondents paid for out-of-pocket medical expenses.

### **3.5 Programming and System Development**

#### ***3.5.1 Blaise Instrument Development and Testing***

After the questionnaire content was approved by UNC-CCC, a survey methodologist wrote the specifications for a computer program that would implement the questionnaire as a CATI instrument and that was to be programmed with the use of the Blaise computer language. RTI uses Blaise as the platform for telephone and personal interviews. The software has some attractive features, including its ability to allow interviewers to resume a partially completed interview at a later time. Blaise removes inappropriate responses that occur when the wrong path in the questionnaire is followed and the interviewer must revert to a gateway question to revise the response. RTI uses a batch system that efficiently imports, exports, and recodes data, allowing the creation of up-to-date reports that are accessible to clients provided with a username and password.

The development and maintenance of accurate programming specifications are critical to the computer-assisted interviewing (CAI) development process. As with other such surveys, RTI's instrumentation task leader prepared specifications to guide both the programming and the testing operations. Programmers, instrumentation team members, and other testers used the specifications throughout the development process to gauge the accuracy of the interview program item-by-item. Content changes entailed revised documentation, programming changes, and retesting.

RTI staff referred to several sets of documentation, including CAI specifications and mock interview scenarios and scripts, to test program functionality. Programmers and testers conducted a thorough test of each question to verify that the program conformed to the questionnaire specifications. Testing involved checking numeric ranges or allowed response options for questions and confirming the resulting path. As part of this testing, the wording of questions and response options, consistency and range checks, and other features of each question were verified. Detected errors were documented and provided to the programmers. After the errors were corrected, the test was repeated.

#### ***3.5.2 The Survey Control System***

RTI implemented a Survey Control System (SCS) to monitor the respondents. The SCS operates as the hub of the project, monitoring events for each case. This event-driven

system guides a case (i.e., status of each study participant), from the time it enters the system, through the various subsystems (e.g., mailouts, tracing, de-duplication) to the point of completion at the time of data delivery. All events are defined and lead from one process to another. The logging of all events for a case produces a traceable history, allowing the flow of data—from the start of data collection through the creation of data files suitable for analysis and delivery—to be monitored. As a case moves through the system, events are assigned to that case to indicate its status and availability for subsequent processing by other steps in the system.

The SCS for Year 4 was initialized with respondent contact information from former years of data collection. The SCS generated mail merge files for the lead-letter mailout and kept track of cases that were released to CATI. Lead letters were mailed before interviewing began; these letters alerted the respondents that an interviewer would be contacting them. The return of lead letters alerted project staff that the respondent had relocated. Addresses in the SCS were updated to maintain the most current available respondent information. For each respondent, the SCS was updated with the results of any tracing operations performed by RTI's Tracing Operations (TOPS) unit. Once interviewing was completed, final status codes and all known contact information resulting from interviewing were loaded into the control system. These control system data will be used to form the base control system for future data collection efforts.

## **4. TRACING REPORT FOR RENTERS AND OWNERS**

### **4.1 Tracing Activities for Renters**

Tracing and panel maintenance activities were completed across various components of the renters and owners samples. *Tracing* is the locating of respondents either before or during data collection. Various methods were employed to trace survey participants. RTI completed batch, interactive, and field tracing as part of its contract with the Center for Community Capital at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CCC). The results of these tracing activities are presented in the following subsections.

#### ***4.1.1 Batch Tracing***

*Batch tracing* is considered one of the least costly methods of updating respondent contact information and of generating additional information that can be used in the more traditional interactive tracing methods. RTI uses several vendors for batch tracing; the choice of a specific vendor depends on what information is required.

RTI used Lorton Data as the batch vendor in Year 4. A file containing 1,217 renter records was prepared and submitted to Lorton Data for batch tracing. We received updated addresses for 90 of these cases and updated phone numbers for 662. We received both address and phone number updates for an additional 66 cases. In total, we received updated contact information for 818 unique cases. This updated contact information was used to update the preload file for each case.

#### ***4.1.2 Locator Mailing***

Address and name updates obtained from batch tracing were incorporated into the master locator file in preparation for the locator mailing of April 2007. RTI mailed 1,217 locator letters informing respondents about Year 4 of the UNC Renters Study and, in case intended or planned moves might result in change of address, asking them to update their records. A number of respondents completed postcards and returned them to RTI with updated contact information. Alternatively, some respondents called the toll-free telephone number to provide updated contact information. For survey participants who did not respond to the locator mailing, RTI assumed that the address information in the locator file was correct. The letters that were returned undelivered, together with any of the records without a telephone number, constituted the first set of cases submitted to RTI's Tracing Operations (TOPS) unit for in-house tracing.

#### ***4.1.3 Interactive Tracing***

Three categories of cases were submitted to TOPS for in-house tracing: (1) cases in which the lead letter was returned to RTI undelivered, (2) cases with contact information suspected to be inaccurate, and (3) some cases that were missing current telephone numbers. Tracing was conducted continually throughout the data collection period for panel

members whose contact information was determined to be inaccurate. Much information on panel members had also already been assembled from tracing in previous survey years. The initial Year 4 submission to TOPS comprised those cases whose lead letter was returned undelivered, plus those cases for which batch tracing did not return a telephone number.

Throughout data collection, TOPS received cases for which contact information was determined to be incorrect. During Year 4 of data collection, TOPS traced cases for up to 2 hours per case. At the end of data collection in December 2007, TOPS had traced a total of 333 cases with unique IDs; however, some cases were traced multiple times in TOPS, bringing the total number of cases imported and exported from TOPS to 344 (Table 4-1). Table 4-1 shows that tracing resulted in a locate rate of 73.6%, which is slightly exaggerated because some of these cases were traced and located in less than 5 minutes. A locate rate of more than 65.0% is considered excellent for a highly mobile population. A telephone number was returned for most of the located cases, and these numbers were forwarded to RTI's Call Center so that these cases could be worked. A total of 27 other cases were assigned codes 7010 and 7046, were located by address only, and were subsequently forwarded to field tracing.

"Not located" codes were assigned in two different situations. "Not located level of effort expired" indicates that tracers were unable to locate the subject in the budgeted amount of time; 89 cases were coded as "not located level of effort expired." "Not located leads exhausted" indicates that all possible leads were pursued but that no new contact information was generated through the leads; 2 cases were coded as "not located leads exhausted." All cases that were finalized as "not located" were submitted to field tracing.

During the final couple of weeks of data collection, 38 cases that had not been contacted in computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) were sent to TOPS for an additional 15 minutes of tracing. This additional tracing was done in an attempt to confirm that the telephone number being called was correct. TOPS was able to confirm the validity of phone numbers for 34 cases in these additional 15 minutes of interactive tracing.

In October 2007, for administrative reasons, RTI temporarily stopped tracing renters. Interactive tracing for renters resumed in late November 2007.

**Table 4-1. Year 4 Tracing Operations Unit Tracing Results for Renters**

<b>TOPS Code</b>	<b>Description of Code</b>	<b>Number of Cases</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
7010	Located address only	11	4.4
7020	Located phone only	9	3.6
7030	Located address and phone	18	7.1
7045	Located unconfirmed	16	6.3
7046	Located unconfirmed no phone	17	6.7
7047	Located unconfirmed phone obtained	20	7.9
7060	Located out of the country	1	0.4
7070	Located but deceased	8	3.2
7085	Located incarcerated	2	0.8
7090	Located but refused to participate	7	2.8
7092	Located confirmed phone only	16	6.3
7093	Located confirmed address only	6	2.4
7501	Located confirmed preloaded address and preloaded phone	7	2.8
7502	Located confirmed preloaded address and new phone	61	24.1
7503	Located confirmed new address and preloaded phone	5	2.0
7504	Located confirmed new address and new phone	49	19.4
	<b>Total located cases</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>73.6</b>
8010	Not located level of effort expired	89	97.8
8020	Not located leads exhausted	2	2.2
	<b>Total not located cases</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>26.5</b>
	<b>Total traced by TOPS</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: TOPS = Tracing Operations.

#### **4.1.4 Field Tracing**

UNC-CCC contracted RTI to field trace any renters who were unreachable by phone (i.e., unlocatable renters). The goal of this tracing work was to locate and complete as many interviews with unlocatable renters as possible. The success of any longitudinal study depends on interviewing as many panel members as possible for each year of the study. To achieve this goal, RTI hired 16 field interviewers to visit the homes of unlocatable renters to try to persuade these renters to call RTI's Call Center to complete a 45-minute telephone interview. RTI field traced a total of 124 renters. RTI field interviewers successfully traced and completed 45 renter interviews. When the field interviewer visited the home, he or she paid a \$50 cash incentive to the household member who completed the telephone interview.

Unlocatable renters were field traced between September 1, 2007, and December 20, 2007. Before field tracing, RTI generated and mailed lead letters on UNC-CCC's letterhead to all sampled addresses to notify renters that a field interviewer might visit their homes because RTI had been unable to reach them by phone. The lead letters provided RTI's toll-free number and hours of operation so that renters could opt to call into the Call Center before a field interviewer visited.

## **4.2 Tracing Activities for Owners**

Interactive tracing and field tracing for UNC Owners Study Year 4 were conducted by TOPS and field tracers. Year 4 was also the first year in which telephone interviews for owners were conducted by RTI's Call Center. Because RTI conducted tracing and data collection for both owner and renter samples, the same procedures were used to locate members of both samples.

### **4.2.1 Batch Tracing**

The owners sample was traced according to the same batch tracing procedures used for the renters sample. The same tracing vendor, Lorton Data, was also used.

A file containing 3,184 records was prepared and submitted to Lorton Data for batch tracing. We received updates to addresses for 204 of these cases. We received updated telephone numbers for 1,800 cases. We received both address and telephone number updates for an additional 101 cases. In total, we received updated contact information for 2,105 unique cases. This updated contact information for each case was used to update the preload file.

### **4.2.2 Locator Mailing**

Address and name updates from batch tracing were incorporated into the master locator file in preparation for the locator mailing of May 2007. RTI mailed 3,184 locator letters informing respondents about Year 4 of the UNC Owners Study and, in case intended or planned moves might result in change of address, asking them to update their records. A number of respondents completed the postcards and returned them to RTI with updated contact information. Alternatively, respondents called the toll-free telephone number to update their contact information. For survey participants who did not respond to the locator mailing, RTI assumed that the address information in the locator file was correct. The letters that were returned undelivered, together with any of the records without a telephone number, constituted the first set of cases that were submitted to RTI's TOPS for in-house tracing.

### **4.2.3 Interactive Tracing**

As with the renters sample, three categories of cases were submitted to TOPS for in-house tracing: (1) cases in which the lead letter was returned to RTI undelivered, (2) cases with contact information suspected to be inaccurate, and (3) some cases that were missing

current telephone numbers. Tracing was conducted continually throughout the data collection period for panel members whose contact information was determined to be inaccurate. The initial submission to TOPS comprised those cases in which lead letters were returned undelivered, plus those cases for which batch tracing did not return a phone number.

Throughout data collection, TOPS received cases for which locating information was determined to be incorrect. As with renters, TOPS traced owner cases for 2 hours per case. At the end of data collection in December 2007, TOPS had traced a total of 858 cases with unique IDs; however, some cases were traced multiple times in TOPS, bringing the total number of cases imported and exported from TOPS to 901 (Table 4-2). Table 4-2 shows that tracing resulted in a locate rate of 88.2%, which is slightly exaggerated because some of the cases were traced and located within 5 minutes. A total of 102 other cases were assigned codes 7010, 7046, and 7505; were located by address only; and were subsequently forwarded to field tracing.

Two types of cases could not be located by TOPS. "Not located level of effort expired" indicates that tracers were unable to locate the sample member in the budgeted amount of time; 105 cases were coded as "not located level of effort expired." "Not located leads exhausted" indicates that all possible leads were pursued but that no new contact information was generated through the leads; one case was coded as "not located leads exhausted."

During the last couple of weeks of data collection, 194 owners who had not been contacted in CATI were sent to TOPS for an additional 15 minutes of tracing. This additional tracing was done in an attempt to confirm that the phone number being called was correct. TOPS was able to confirm the validity of phone numbers for 115 cases in these additional 15 minutes of interactive tracing.

#### **4.2.4 Field Tracing**

UNC-CCC contracted RTI to field trace owners whom UNC-CCC had been unable to reach by telephone (i.e., unlocatable owners). For these unlocatable owners, TOPS was unable to locate new telephone numbers or addresses. The goal was then to locate and complete as many interviews as possible with unlocatable owners. RTI used the same field interviewers who traced the renters' sample to trace the owners' sample and field traced a total of 409 owners. Field tracing efforts for the owners led to the completion of 134 additional interviews.

**Table 4-2. Year 4 Tracing Operations Unit Tracing Results for Owners**

<b>TOPS Code</b>	<b>Description of Code</b>	<b>Number of Cases</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
7010	Located address only	17	2.1
7020	Located telephone only	15	1.9
7030	Located address and phone	60	7.6
7039	Located but ineligible	1	0.1
7045	Located unconfirmed	58	7.3
7046	Located unconfirmed—no phone	83	10.4
7047	Located unconfirmed phone obtained	195	24.5
7060	Located out of country	4	0.5
7070	Located deceased	10	1.3
7090	Located but refused	25	3.1
7092	Located confirmed phone only	20	2.5
7093	Located confirmed address only	35	4.4
7110	Located incapacitated	1	0.1
7401	Located interview completed in field	3	0.4
7501	Located confirmed preloaded address and number	49	6.2
7502	Located confirmed preloaded address new phone	140	17.6
7503	Located new address, confirmed preload tel number	4	0.5
7504	Located confirmed new address new number	73	9.2
7505	Located confirmed preloaded address	2	0.3
	<b>Total located</b>	<b>795</b>	<b>88.2</b>
8010	Not located level of effort expired	105	99.1
8020	Not located leads exhausted	1	0.9
	<b>Total not located</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>11.8</b>
	<b>Total traced in TOPS</b>	<b>901</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: TOPS = Tracing Operations.

## 5. DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Data collection for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) Renters and Owners Studies Year 4 consisted of three essential steps: *locating* (carrying out the necessary steps to locate the household), *contacting* (identifying the correct panel member), and *interviewing* (persuading the panel member to cooperate and take part in the study). This section describes the results of data collection and evaluates the effectiveness of the data collection procedures used in locating, contacting, and interviewing panel members.

### 5.1 Telephone Interviewer Training

Separate training sessions were conducted for the UNC Renters Study and the UNC Owners Study. All of the interviewers were trained for and worked on both studies.

#### 5.1.1 Renters Study Training

Training for the telephone interviewers for the UNC Renters Study Year 4 occurred in Raleigh, North Carolina, on June 17, 2007. A total of 10 interviewers were trained in a period of 6 hours. The trainers used a combination of lectures, role-playing exercises, question-and-answer sessions, demonstration and practice interviews, and a discussion of how to avoid refusals. The demonstration and practice interviews focused on procedures for particular situations that the interviewers were expected to encounter. Interviewers were also taught techniques for minimizing attrition. At the end of training, all telephone interviewers were certified for data collection once they successfully completed a certification interview. Project staff evaluated the interviewers while the interviewers conducted full-length interviews in pairs. During the practice interview, interviewers were required to respond verbally to the five questions that survey respondents ask most frequently.

In addition to completing the 6-hour training session, the three bilingual interviewers had to complete a 2-hour training session with a language specialist. The bilingual training session covered translation issues and involved practice interviews in Spanish. All bilingual interviewers who were trained during this initial session also conducted English-language interviews.

#### 5.1.2 Owners Study Training

Training for the telephone interviewers for the UNC Owners Study Year 4 occurred in Raleigh, North Carolina, on July 10, 2007. A total of 10 interviewers were trained in a period of 4 hours. Training for the UNC Owners Study was comparable to that for the UNC Renters Study. The main difference in the training was that the demonstration and practice interviews were focused on specific situations that the interviewers were expected to encounter while interviewing the owners. English and bilingual interviewers were evaluated and certified as they had been when trained for UNC Renters Study.

## 5.2 Interviewing

The computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) interview for Year 4 of the UNC Renters and Owners Studies lasted approximately 45 minutes. The Year 4 survey specifications contain detailed information about what questions were administered. Data collection for renters began on June 18, 2007; it began for owners on July 11, 2007. Data collection for both samples ended on December 21, 2007.

The average number of hours per completed interview was 1.7 hours. The UNC Renters Study produced completed interviews with 903 respondents. Of the 903 interviews, 78 were conducted in Spanish. The UNC Owners Study produced completed interviews with 2,079 respondents. Of the 2,079 interviews, 166 were conducted in Spanish. Once production began, the summary status reports for both studies were made available to RTI project staff and the Center for Community Capital at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The reports were categorized by sample and displayed case results by Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and language of interview.

## 5.3 Monitoring and Quality Circle Meetings

RTI project staff implemented quality control (QC) procedures during the telephone data collection period to maximize data quality. The first QC measure was implemented during the interviewer training sessions. The trainers and telephone supervisor observed each interviewer's performance during the session and ensured that extra attention and help were given to those interviewers who had a problem with a procedure or question specification. Interviewers were not allowed to begin work on the project unless they had performed satisfactorily during the training. Before beginning work on the project, each interviewer was certified by project staff. Certification included successfully completing the training session, correctly answering (verbally) the five most frequently asked questions, participating in paired mock interviews, and completing individual practice with the questionnaire and front-end procedures.

The second QC measure—silent audio and visual monitoring of each interviewer's work—was implemented during the telephone data collection period. Telephone supervisors and other project staff used RTI's computerized silent audio and visual monitoring system to unobtrusively listen and view a sample of calls made by all telephone interviewers. Monitoring was conducted throughout data collection. The QC supervisor assigned each monitoring session a score based on what the supervisor observed. Depending on how the interviewer scored, corrective actions (including retraining) were taken when necessary.

Finally, RTI project staff actively monitored production levels and the distribution of cases across the event and status codes. Quality circle meetings were also held to discuss data collection issues. These sessions built rapport among interviewers and technical staff and assisted in refining the instrument; the sessions also provided ongoing refusal conversion training for the staff.

## 5.4 Refusal Conversion

Refusal conversion procedures were used to gain cooperation from individuals who initially refused to participate in the studies. Each case coded as a refusal by the interviewer was carefully reviewed to ensure that all refusals were coded correctly. After the review process, each refusal case was coded and referred to refusal conversion specialists who were selected from among those interviewers most skilled at obtaining cooperation. These specialists were trained in refusal conversion techniques tailored to the study; the training emphasized how to gain cooperation, overcome objections, address the concerns of gatekeepers, and encourage participation. All respondents engaged in refusal conversion received an additional \$25 incentive, for a total incentive of \$75 for completing the interview. RTI refusal converters were able to convert 28 initial refusals for the UNC Renters Study and 87 initial refusals for the UNC Owners Study.

## 5.5 Data Collection Challenges and Resolutions

The most difficult challenge faced by RTI during the data collection period was locating and contacting sample members. RTI developed numerous procedures to address these challenges, especially toward the end of the data collection period. Some of these procedures included adjusting staffing schedules so that respondents would be called at times when they would be most likely to complete an interview, conducting additional QC meetings and training to motivate interviewing staff, reviewing information about the time of day when the last interview was completed, reviewing the record of calls for each case to ensure that calls were made during all possible calling times, and reviewing specific cases to identify potential challenges.

In addition, data collection for the UNC Renters Study was suspended for administrative reasons on October 11, 2007. Data collection resumed on November 8, 2007. Because of this delay, the data collection period was extended until December 21, 2007.

## 5.6 Data Collection Results

### 5.6.1 UNC Renters Study

A total of 1,217 renter cases were eligible for Year 4 of UNC Renters Study. Of the 1,217 eligible renter cases, 903 renters completed interviews, yielding a renter data collection response rate of 76.0%. Of the 903 completed renter interviews, 78 (9.0%) were conducted in Spanish. We report detailed results of the renter data collection effort, including the results for Years 1-3 (Table 5-1).

Cases for which no interview was completed included renters who had moved out of the interviewing area or country. For these cases, RTI was unable to find a new telephone number or find the renter during field tracing. A total of 246 cases could not be contacted. RTI also coded 26 cases as ineligible (deceased) for the UNC Renters Study Year 4 interview. Telephone interviewers were able to confirm the status of deceased cases

through spouses and relatives. RTI also finalized 29 refusals. Reasons for refusals ranged from disinterest in the study to discontinued desire to participate. A total of 13 cases were coded as noninterviews, or cases in which interviewers learned that the respondent was incarcerated, institutionalized, or incapable of completing the interview.

**Table 5-1. Data Collection Results for Years 1 Through 4 (Renters)**

Data Collection	Number
<b>Year 1 telephone survey (October 2003–April 2004)</b>	
Beginning panel	15,935
Out of scope (business numbers, not a rental, too much income, etc.)	7,035
Final noncontact (no contact, no answering machine reached)	2,104
Final noninterview (out of country, incapable, final refusals, etc.)	5,145
Completed interviews	1,651
Completed Spanish-language interviews	192 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Year 2 in-home survey (March 2005–October 2005)</b>	
Beginning panel (118 cases removed from sample due to age and income requirements)	1,533
Unable to contact (renter moved out of interviewing area, no one home after repeated attempts, renter moved out of country)	268
Ineligible (deceased)	12
Refusals	81
Noninterviews (incarcerated, institutionalized, incapable, access denied, etc.)	14
Total eligible cases	1,521
Total completed interviews	1,158
Total Spanish-language interviews	108 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Year 3 telephone survey (May 2006–December 2006)</b>	
Beginning panel	1,158
Unable to contact	104
Ineligible (deceased)	11
Refusals	43
Noninterviews (incarcerated, institutionalized, incapable, etc.)	30
Total eligible cases	1,147
Total completed interviews	970
Total Spanish-language interviews	88 <sup>c</sup>

(continued)

**Table 5-1. Data Collection Results for Years 1 Through 4 (Renters) (continued)**

<b>Data Collection</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>Year 4 telephone survey (June 2007–December 2007)</b>	
Beginning panel	1,217
Unable to contact	246
Ineligible (deceased)	15
Ineligible (removed by UNC-CCC)	11
Refusals	29
Noninterviews (incarcerated, institutionalized, incapable, etc.)	13
Total eligible cases	1,178
Total completed interviews	903
Total Spanish-language interviews	78 <sup>d</sup>

Note: Overall response rate for each year were as follows: Year 2 = 76.0%, Year 3 = 85.0%, and Year 4 = 76.0%.

<sup>a</sup> 11.6% of the completed cases.

<sup>b</sup> 9.0% of the completed cases.

<sup>c</sup> 9.0% of the completed cases.

<sup>d</sup> 8.6% of the completed cases.

Among MSAs, Youngstown-Warren, Ohio, had the highest interview completion rate for renters: 100.0% (Table 5-2); Lima, Ohio, and Tucson, Arizona, had the lowest at 45.0%.

**Table 5-2. Completed Interviews, by Metropolitan Statistical Area (Renters)**

<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</b>	<b>MSA No.</b>	<b>Renters (n)</b>	<b>Completed Interviews (%)</b>
Albuquerque, NM	01	17	15 (88%)
Atlanta, GA	03	31	25 (81%)
Bloomington-Normal, IL	04	7	6 (86%)
Charlotte–Gastonia–Rock Hill, NC-SC	06	98	70 (71%)
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI	07	43	33 (77%)
Columbia, SC	10	18	11 (61%)
Dallas–Fort Worth, TX	12	17	15 (88%)
Dayton-Springfield, OH	13	11	8 (73%)
Detroit–Ann Arbor–Flint, MI	14	20	16 (80%)
Enid, OK	15	23	16 (70%)
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR	16	38	24 (63%)
Greensboro–Winston-Salem–High Point, NC	18	82	63 (77%)
Greenville, NC	19	18	15 (83%)

(continued)

**Table 5-2. Completed Interviews, by Metropolitan Statistical Area (Renters)  
(continued)**

<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</b>	<b>MSA No.</b>	<b>Renters (n)</b>	<b>Completed Interviews (%)</b>
Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	20	27	22 (81%)
Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC	21	26	19 (73%)
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX	22	21	12 (57%)
Las Vegas, NV-AZ	25	16	8 (50%)
Lima, OH	26	11	5 (45%)
Los Angeles–Riverside–Orange County, CA	27	31	20 (65%)
Miami–Fort Lauderdale, FL	29	13	9 (69%)
Minneapolis–St. Paul, MN-WI	30	27	18 (67%)
Oklahoma City, OK	33	108	84 (78%)
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	36	45	35 (78%)
Raleigh–Durham–Chapel Hill, NC	38	159	127 (80%)
Rocky Mount, NC	41	29	20 (69%)
Toledo, OH	44	49	43 (88%)
Tucson, AZ	45	33	15 (45%)
Tulsa, OK	46	139	106 (76%)
Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV	47	53	37 (70%)
West Palm Beach–Boca Raton, FL	48	3	2 (67%)
Youngstown-Warren, OH	50	4	4 (100%)
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,217</b>	<b>903 (74%)<sup>a</sup></b>

<sup>a</sup>This response rate does not exclude ineligible.

### **5.6.2 UNC Owners Study**

A total of 3,183 cases were eligible for Year 4 of the UNC Owners Study. Of the 3,183 eligible owners, 2,079 completed interviews, yielding an owner response rate of 72.0% (Table 5-3). Of the 2,079 completed owner interviews, 166 (8.0%) were conducted in Spanish.

Cases were classified as “unable to contact” if the respondent had moved out of the interviewing area or country. In these cases, RTI was unable to find a new telephone number or find the owner during field tracing. A total of 629 cases were designated as “unable to contact.”

RTI coded 304 cases as “ineligible” for the UNC Owners Study Year 4 interviews. “Ineligible” cases for owners comprised both deceased respondents and 283 initial Year 4 eligibles who were later removed from the interview pool because they had completed few prior interviews and were deemed unlikely to complete the current interview.

**Table 5-3. Telephone Survey Data Collection Results for Year 4 (Owners)**

Data Collection	Number
Beginning panel	3,183
Unable to contact	629
Ineligible (deceased)	304
Refusals	144
Noninterviews (incarcerated, institutionalized, incapable, etc.)	28
Total eligible cases	2,852
Total completed interviews	2,079
Total Spanish-language interviews	166

Notes: Telephone surveys for Year 4 were conducted from July to December 2007, with a response rate of 72.0%. Because data collections for Years 1 through 3 were conducted by the Survey Research Unit at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and not all results are available to RTI, only Year 4 results are reported here.

Telephone interviewers were able to confirm the status of “ineligible (deceased)” cases through spouses and relatives of cases that UNC-CCC added into the sample for this year of data collection, even though these cases had not participated in 2 or more prior years of data collection.

Cases for which no interview was completed included 144 that RTI finalized as “refusals.” Refusal reasons included disinterest in the study and an unwillingness to continue participating. A total of 28 cases were coded as “noninterviews,” and in these cases interviewers learned that the respondent was incarcerated, institutionalized, or otherwise incapable of completing the interview.

Among MSAs, Youngstown-Warren, Ohio, had the highest completion rate at 94.0% (Table 5-4). Phoenix-Mesa, Arizona, had the lowest completion rate at 49.0%.

## 5.7 Plans for Future Years

RTI will conduct Year 5 of the UNC Renters and Owners Studies in 2008. Most of the renter interviews and about one half of the owner interviews will be completed in person, while the remaining renter and owner interviews will be completed via telephone. RTI will attempt to interview all those respondents who completed the Year 4 telephone interview in 2007, as well as selected nonrespondents. Data collection is scheduled to begin in July 2008.

**Table 5-4. Completed Interviews, by Metropolitan Statistical Area (Owners)**

<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</b>	<b>MSA No.</b>	<b>Owners (n)</b>	<b>Completed Interviews (%)</b>
Albuquerque, NM	01	35	27 (82%)
Asheville, NC	02	26	18 (78%)
Atlanta, GA	03	69	48 (77%)
Bloomington-Normal, IL	04	56	42 (81%)
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA	05	19	12 (71%)
Charlotte–Gastonia–Rock Hill, NC-SC	06	115	67 (66%)
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI	07	94	60 (75%)
Cincinnati-Hamilton, OH	08	50	27 (63%)
Cleveland, OH	09	68	50 (77%)
Columbia, SC	10	36	21 (62%)
Columbus, OH	11	35	23 (68%)
Dallas–Fort Worth, TX	12	43	24 (63%)
Dayton-Springfield, OH	13	52	35 (73%)
Detroit–Ann Arbor–Flint, MI	14	77	54 (73%)
Enid, OK	15	40	28 (74%)
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR	16	81	52 (68%)
Green Bay, WI	17	12	8 (73%)
Greensboro–Winston-Salem–High Point, NC	18	103	66 (74%)
Greenville, NC	19	78	51 (71%)
Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	20	69	52 (84%)
Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC	21	82	65 (88%)
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX	22	39	19 (59%)
Jackson, MS	23	81	38 (60%)
Kansas City, MS	24	27	18 (75%)
Las Vegas, NV-AZ	25	30	18 (67%)
Lima, OH	26	50	38 (78%)
Los Angeles–Riverside–Orange County, CA	27	96	59 (69%)
Memphis, TN	28	41	20 (57%)
Miami–Fort Lauderdale, FL	29	26	14 (58%)
Minneapolis–St. Paul, MN-WI	30	42	29 (76%)
New York City–Northern New Jersey–Long Island, NY	31	19	12 (67%)
Norfolk–Virginia Beach–Newport News, VA	32	24	18 (78%)

(continued)

**Table 5-4. Completed Interviews, by Metropolitan Statistical Area (Owners)  
(continued)**

<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</b>	<b>MSA No.</b>	<b>Owners (n)</b>	<b>Completed Interviews (%)</b>
Oklahoma City, OK	33	136	94(71%)
Peoria-Perkins, IL	34	28	16(70%)
Philadelphia–Wilmington–Atlantic City, DE-NJ-PA	35	10	5(83%)
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	36	62	26(49%)
Pittsburgh, PA	37	32	20(67%)
Raleigh–Durham–Chapel Hill, NC	38	257	186(78%)
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	39	21	15(79%)
Roanoke, VA	40	22	15(75%)
Rocky Mount, NC	41	149	103(77%)
San Francisco–Oakland–San Jose, CA	42	47	30(71%)
Tampa–St. Petersburg–Clearwater, FL	43	25	13(57%)
Toledo, OH	44	173	115(70%)
Tucson, AZ	45	39	18(56%)
Tulsa, OK	46	217	146(74%)
Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV	47	135	84(69%)
West Palm Beach–Boca Raton, FL	48	22	14(74%)
Wilmington, NC	49	53	34(76%)
Youngstown-Warren, OH	50	40	32(94%)
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,183</b>	<b>2,079(65%)<sup>a</sup></b>

<sup>a</sup>This response rate does not exclude ineligible.



## 6. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

During this project, RTI understood that effective project management and technical excellence were equally crucial for providing high-quality products that fulfilled contractual obligations within the established budget and schedule. To this end, RTI followed policies and procedures put in place to ensure that project performance was at the level expected by the Center for Community Capital at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CCC). Continuous communications via telephone and e-mail allowed UNC-CCC to provide feedback on RTI's technical accomplishments and modify work plans or budgets as necessary.

On January 16, 2007, project staff from UNC-CCC and RTI attended an annual review meeting that covered results from the prior year (2006) and plans for the upcoming year, calendar year 2007. During this meeting, the pending deliverables and project schedule were also reviewed. This meeting was the first of many in-person and telephone meetings between UNC-CCC and RTI. RTI understood that clear lines of authority and communication were critical to ensure rapid response, efficient operation, maintenance of high-quality standards, and an overall successful project.

During the Year 4 UNC Renters and Owners Studies, RTI submitted monthly progress reports with the corresponding invoices to keep UNC-CCC apprised of the project's status in terms of both work accomplished and finances.

RTI worked closely with UNC-CCC through regularly scheduled weekly conference calls and on-site meetings (as needed), which were attended by all of the RTI task leaders and the associate project director and project director. These opportunities for communication were critical to addressing project challenges. Two specific challenges are discussed below.

### **6.1 RTI Comprehensive Assumption of Year 4 Data Collection Responsibilities for the UNC Owners Study**

RTI assumed the data collection efforts for Year 4 of the UNC Owners Study from the Survey Research Unit at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-SRU) in early 2007. UNC-SRU had completed the computer-assisted telephone interviewing for this sample for the first four data collection cycles. RTI worked closely with UNC-CCC and UNC-SRU to review prior instruments, identified the cases to be interviewed, completed advance tracing on these panel members, and implemented the required preload variables for these owner cases. After detailed discussions and planning, UNC-CCC and RTI decided to implement a sample comprising 3,184 owners in 2007. This sample of eligibles included 2,596 owners from UNC-SRU who had completed interviews in 2006 and 588 cases that had not completed an interview in that prior year. RTI worked all of these cases and ultimately completed 2,079 owner interviews in 2007, or 97.8% of the interviews (2,126) completed by UNC-SRU in 2006.

## **6.2 Implementation of Work Efforts on a Consolidated Public-Use Data Set**

It was projected that the total number of data sets associated with the UNC Renters and Owners Studies at the end of the study would be 15 (6 years of UNC Owners Study data, 5 years of UNC Renters Study data, 2 years of in-person RTI Owners Study data, an Owners Study movers data set, and a Soft Refusal Panel consisting of both renters and owners data sets). RTI was approached and agreed to condense all of the collected data into one public-use data set. UNC-CCC and RTI worked together to plan and estimate the cost of this effort and successfully worked with the Ford Foundation to obtain funding for this endeavor. The result of this effort will be a public-use data set, together with corresponding documentation, that will be in consolidated format that researchers should find easier to use.

This collaborative approach to project management led to the successful completion of data collection by RTI and maintained both the UNC Renters and Owners Studies sample sizes at the desired levels.

## 7. DATA FILES AND DOCUMENTATION

The data files for the 2007 data collection were collected with a follow-up computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) instrument. This data collection was the fifth contact for owners and the fourth contact for renters. The data were collected with a single CATI instrument, and the final data files were divided by original sample, one for owners and one for renters.

Data files and documentation consisted of four primary activities:

- interim data delivery—delivery of preliminary data sets to the Center for Community Capital at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CCC) for review and comments;
- codebook work—preparation and delivery of preliminary and, ultimately, final codebooks for the renters data set and the owners data set to UNC-CCC for review and comments;
- final data delivery; and
- user manual production—creation of a manual containing the full text of the interview instrument, with skip pattern and path specifications, the name and description of the corresponding variables in the SAS data set, and descriptions of the calculations of derived variables.

This section provides a detailed description of all of the previously mentioned data files and documentation work in the 2007 data collection efforts.

### 7.1 Data Extraction

The instrument for the CATI portion of the study was programmed with the use of Blaise, a survey processing system. Data collected by the CATI program was stored in the proprietary Blaise database. Blaise tools were used to extract the data from the Blaise database to a flat text file. Additional Blaise tools were used to create the SAS code necessary to read the flat text file and produce SAS data sets. The final data delivery files were created as a system of files and programs—Access databases, SAS code, and the SAS data sets. Variables were renamed, labeled, and manipulated to produce a codebook to accompany each data set. Each codebook included either a frequency count of the valid variable values (discrete variables) or a mean and standard deviation (continuous variables). Derived variables were generated per client specifications.

### 7.2 Interim Data Delivery

A preliminary data set was delivered to UNC-CCC for review and comment. This combined data set included both renter and owner cases. This delivery was made on July 20, 2007, and contained data for the 762 interviews that had been completed by that date. The data set was created by a direct pull from the Blaise database, which was manipulated by SAS to produce a SAS data set.

### 7.3 Final Data Delivery

Data sets and codebooks were delivered to UNC-CCC for review and comments. Two data sets, one for each sample, were delivered on January 10, 2008. The owners' data set contained 2,079 cases, and the renters' data set contained 903 cases.

Preliminary codebooks for the renters and owners sample data sets were also delivered to UNC-CCC for review and comments. These codebooks showed the name of each variable and a brief description of the variable. For discrete variables (e.g., gender), the codebooks showed the frequency of each response. For continuous variables (e.g., monthly rent), the codebooks showed the mean and standard deviation of each response. The codebooks also showed the unweighted frequency of "don't know" and "refused" responses for all variables.

Each variable was given a label (brief description) that appears in any listings generated by SAS procedures (e.g., proc contents and proc freq). Variables whose values were codes were linked with SAS formats so that the codes could easily be interpreted. For example, if the possible responses and codes were "Male = 1" and "Female = 2," the SAS format caused the "Male" and "Female" designations to be printed instead of "1" and "2." Frequencies of categorical items are included in the codebook for the final data set of completed UNC Renters and Owners Studies interviews.

### 7.4 User Manual

In addition to the codebook for the final data set, RTI prepared a user manual that contains the following information:

- the full text of the interview instrument, which reflects skip patterns, path specifications, and the names of the corresponding variables in the SAS data set;
- a list of the variables that had been renamed to ensure consistency of data across years of data collection; and
- a description of how derived variables were calculated.

## 8. CONCLUSION

Several significant events occurred in 2007 concerning the UNC Renters and Owners Studies, including (1) the transfer of data-collection responsibility for the UNC Owners Study from the Survey Research Unit at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) to RTI, (2) a designed inclusion of many previous noninterview cases in an attempt to maximize the panel completion size, and (3) a UNC Renters Study administrative work stoppage of 29 days. The Year 4 UNC Renters Study and the Year 4 UNC Owners Study panel retention successes in 2007 can be attributed in large part to changes and enhancements that RTI made in conjunction with the Center for Community Capital at UNC to the original data collection procedures so as to overcome barriers as they were encountered. These changes and enhancements have been defined in this report and will inform future data collection. Panel retention continues to be the most significant challenge encountered in the UNC Renters and Owners Studies.