



International Health Policy Survey 2016 Methodology Report

Methods report prepared by

Robyn Rapoport, Luis Tipan, & Erin Czyzewicz
SSRS
53 West Baltimore Pike
Suite 300
Media, PA 19063



Table of Contents

OVERVIEW.....	3
SAMPLING METHODS	5
Sample Generation by Country.....	6
Household and Respondent Selection.....	10
DATA COLLECTION	10
Questionnaire Review, Translations and Cultural Adaptations.....	10
Programming and Testing.....	11
Pretesting.....	11
Completed Interviews.....	13
Training Materials and Interviewer Training	14
Call Rule, Contact Attempts, Refusal Avoidance and Conversion Strategies	15
Weekly Reports.....	17
Final Counts.....	17
Data Processing and Integration.....	33
RESPONSE RATES	34
WEIGHTING.....	41
Overview by Country	41
Detailed Weighting Procedures by Country	44
Australia	44
Canada	48
France	55
Germany	57
The Netherlands	59
New Zealand	61
Norway	63
Sweden	65
Switzerland	67
The United Kingdom	69
The United States.....	72
Design Effect and Margin of Sampling Error.....	74
DELIVERABLES	75

OVERVIEW

The Commonwealth Fund (the Fund) is a private foundation dedicated to promoting a health care system that achieves better access, improved quality, and greater efficiency, with a focus on society's most vulnerable groups. As part of its mission, the Fund has been conducting the International Health Policy (IHP) Survey in 11 countries for more than a decade. In a triennial cycle, the IHP survey targets different populations, including physicians, older adults, and the general adult population.

The Commonwealth Fund contracted with SSRS to manage data collection and data integration for the 2016 IHP survey conducted among adults in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand (NZ), Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom (UK), and the United States (US). SSRS fielded the survey in the US and Canada. SSRS's fielding partner, European Fieldwork Group (EFG) fielded the survey in Australia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the UK. SSRS's fielding partners, Norstat, fielded the survey in Norway, and Advanced Market Research (AMR), fielded the survey in France and Germany. Switzerland contracted with the LINK Institut (LINK) to field the survey in Switzerland. Sweden contracted with Institutet för kvalitetsindikatorer AB (Indikator) to manage the data collection process and field the instrument in Sweden.

The study was conducted via landline and mobile telephone in each country with a nationally representative sample of respondents, age 18 and older. Switzerland also offered an online option. Fieldwork took place between March 1 and June 22, 2016.

The 2016 study was designed to explore and collect reliable health-related data for the following topics:

- Patient's access to primary and preventive care, including promptness of attention, such as availability of same-day appointment
- Patient's relationship with regular doctor/GP, including experience with coordination of health care
- Patient's use of and experience with specialists
- Patient's experience with care in the hospital & emergency room
- Health care coverage, affordability of care, experience with administrative/financial burdens, and out-of-pocket costs
- Experiences with prescription medication and medical errors
- Patient's overall health and medical conditions
- Behavioral factors affecting health and social context
- Overall views of the health care system

Table 1, below, outlines the total number of interviews conducted in each country:

TABLE 1: Total Number of Interviews Conducted in Each Country

	Total Interviews
Australia	5248
Canada	4547
France	1103
Germany	1000
Netherlands	1227
New Zealand	1000
Norway	1093
Sweden	7124
Switzerland	1520
UK	1000
US	2001

This report is organized into five sections. The first section discusses the sample design. The next section describes data collection and fielding. The final three sections address the response rate to the survey, weighting procedures, and project deliverables.

SAMPLING METHODS

Survey coverage refers to the extent to which the sample frame for a survey includes all members of the target population. A survey design with a gap in coverage raises the possibility of bias if the individuals missing from the sample frame (e.g., households without telephones) differ from those in the sample frame. For all countries included in IHP 2017, efforts have been made to ensure a representative and diverse sample that covers the target population – adults, ages 18 and older.

Notably, cell phone-only households are increasing throughout the world. In the United States, for instance, according to the January to June National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), 48.3% of households were estimated to be cell phone-only in the first half of 2015 (Blumberg & Luke, 2015), as compared to 20.2% in 2008. Although in some European countries, the share of adults in living in households answering only cell phones is still somewhat smaller than the U.S., this share is rapidly increasing in many countries. Moreover, even in countries where the cell phone only share is relatively low, it is important to conduct interviews via cell phone since phone usage patterns show that that cell phone usage is increasing in dual use households throughout the world.

For IHP 2016, the Fund and its partner countries chose to include larger portions of interviews conducted on cell phones in the sampled population than in past years to increase the likelihood of reaching a representative sample of the cell phone only/mostly populations that tend to be younger and more transient.

An overlapping-frame telephone design was used for the US, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, France, the Netherlands, the UK, Norway, and Germany. This means that those respondents whose household answers both landlines and cellphone phones had a higher likelihood of selection – an issue that was addressed in weighting. The overlapping-frame approach allowed reaching respondents who receive most of their calls on cell phones, and are far less likely to be reached on a landline. As a result, the overlapping design produced a more nationally representative sample of respondents, age 18 and older, which reduced the design effect associated with post-stratification weighting corrections.

Switzerland used an individual sample of adults, 18+ drawn by the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (SFSO), using a nationwide population registry. Respondents in Switzerland could complete the survey online or by telephone. For Sweden landline and cell phone sample for individuals 18 and older was drawn from the PAR registry.

TABLE 2: Total Interviews by Sampling Frame

	Landline	LL (%)	Cell phone	CELL (%)	Web	WEB (%)	Total
Australia	3,052	58%	2,196	42%	-	-	5,248
Canada	3,317	73%	1,230	27%	-	-	4,547
France	763	69%	340	31%	-	-	1,103
Germany	636	64%	364	36%	-	-	1,000
Netherlands	783	64%	444	36%	-	-	1,227
New Zealand	646	65%	354	35%	-	-	1,000
Norway	277	25%	816	75%	-	-	1,093
Sweden	2,697	38%	4,427	62%	-	-	7,124
Switzerland	119	8%	99	7%	1,302	86%	1,520
United Kingdom	656	66%	344	34%	-	-	1,000
United States	800	40%	1,201	60%	-	-	2,001

Sample Generation by Country

Australia

In Australia, the landline and cell phone RDD sample was drawn by Sample Solutions Europe (SSE). The generation of the landline sample frame was based on the phone number blocks used in the telephone numbering plan provided by the Australian Communications and Media Authority. The random digit length N is set up for each of the different blocks. This means there is always a starting block for each region and division within Australia followed by a random allocation of numbers of two to four unknown numbers. This leads to a more efficient usage of higher populated numbering blocks. The landline sample for the main Australia sample was stratified by Australia's seven regions to ensure geographic representativeness. Cell phone sampling in Australia was based on number blocks consisting of three- or four-digit exchanges (varying by cell phone provider). The SSE cell phone sample maintained an equal probability of selection method (epsem) approach by accounting for the effect of the differences in the size of the cell phone number-blocks. SSE also uses an electronic number verification procedure to filter out invalid phone numbers to improve sample efficiency.

To allow for region-specific analysis, the final sample for Australia included oversamples of (1) the Victoria population to complete a total of 1,000 interviews and (2) the New South Wales population, by Primary Health Network (PHN) in order to complete at least 350 interview in each PHN.

Canada

Sampling in Canada was done through SM Research, a company founded in 1976 and now is merged into Environics Analytics (EA). EA's sampling method begins with numbers produced by selecting the first eight digits of known exchange banks (also called NPA-NXX-Banks) and then randomly generating the last two digits to form the RDD frame. RDD samples can then be randomly generated from the frame. To improve efficiency, NPA-NXXs considered "not-in-service" and listed business numbers are removed. This RDD design covers more than 95% of in-service landline/cellphone numbers.

Germany and France

The RDD sample was generated by Sample Solutions. For each country, the generation of the landline RDD frame was based on the phone number blocks used in the telephone numbering plan using pre-codes by region and stratified by provider distribution. On the basis of the numbering plan, Sample Answers developed a probabilistic design for pulling “seed” blocks from which actual phone numbers were generated. For the mobile phone RDD sample, it is not possible to identify pre-codes by region; however, the phone numbers were randomly generated similar to the landline sample. Wherever possible the landline and cell phone numbers were pulsed to remove inactive numbers.

The Netherlands

SSE provided landline and cell phone sample for the Netherlands. The RDD landline framework in the Netherlands is based on the national numbering plan provided by the Onafhankelijke Post en Telecommunicatie Autoriteit (OPTA). On the basis of the numbering plan, SSE utilized a probabilistic design for pulling “seed” blocks from which actual phone numbers were generated by adding a random three-digit number. The landline sample was stratified to ensure adequate representation of each of the 12 provinces. For the Netherlands, randomly generated landline numbers were also screened against business phone numbers and the Do-Not-Call register (note: this procedure is presently available for the Netherlands but not for other European countries). For the mobile phone RDD sample, the numbering plan provided gives information about the prefixes of the various providers; however, it leaves up to six unknowns. The RDD sample was pulsed in order to achieve higher strike rates. The cell phone sample was also stratified based upon the provider distribution within the Netherlands. Using a standardized procedure, the landline and mobile RDD sample were pulsed in order to improve productivity.

New Zealand

SSE provided landline and cell phone sample for New Zealand. Landline sample in New Zealand was based on the numbering plan provided by Telecom of New Zealand. The landline sample was stratified by New Zealand’s 16 regions. Number blocks are four-digits long throughout the country, so no adjustments to block-size are required. SSE utilizes electronic verification to filter out a large number of non-working numbers. Using a standardized procedure, the landline RDD sample was pulsed in order to improve productivity. Cell phone sampling in New Zealand was based on number blocks consisting of two- or three-digit exchanges (varying by cell phone provider). The SSE cell phone sample maintained an epsem approach by accounting for the effect of the differences in the size of the cell phone number-blocks.

Norway

In Norway landline and cell phones was drawn by Norstat using Bisnode. Approximately 82% of the population was covered by this sample. The 18% of the population that was not covered in the sample are comprised of people:

- 1) With secret phone numbers¹
- 2) Who do not have some identifying information attached to their number (e.g., age, gender, region, etc.)
- 3) Who have put themselves on a “no-call” list for marketing, surveys, and sales calls and/or elected to be excluded from the phone directory

Due to Norwegian legislation, Norstat does not have access to these numbers when conducting surveys. The sample is drawn proportionately so that a higher population density is associated with more numbers in the sampling base and a larger portion of the numbers in the drawn sample.²

Sweden

The sample frame consisted of the Swedish national registry of phone numbers, listed in the database PAR Konsument. This registry contains all registered and active private phone numbers for approximately 39% of the adult population in Sweden; in total 3,027,650 individuals age 18 or older. The registry is administered by Bisnode PAR. The definition of ‘private’ corresponds to the number being registered using a Swedish personnummer (social security number) in contrast to numbers registered using organisationsnummer (organizational registry code) which is used by businesses, institutions and government.

The stratification followed the same outline as was done in IHP 2013. In order to allow for geographical comparisons, the sample was stratified based on county councils. The sample was also stratified according to number type (landline/cell phone). This model corresponded to 42 strata.

The strata size was determined based on requirements for national geographical comparisons. For international comparisons only 2,400 interviews were necessary, but to be able to compare county councils the targeted number of interviews was set to 7,000. Larger samples were drawn for the three largest county councils. Within each stratum a simple random sample was drawn. Quotas were used to ensure the targeted number of interviews per strata.

Switzerland

The sample source corresponded to data from the registry per the Federal Statistical Office (FSO), provided by the Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH). A principal and a reserve sample was provided; the reserve sample was not activated. All selected persons received an invitation letter to complete survey online or by telephone. Non-responders received a reminder letter.

Reminder telephone calls were also made for sample with an available telephone number. Out of the sample provided, 56% of the sample contained a telephone number. An additional phone number search, conducted by LINK, resulted in a total of 68% of the sample with a phone number. If requested, an e-mail with a direct link to the web questionnaire was sent out during the telephone contact. At any

¹ Approximately 1.25 % of the Norwegian population has a secret number

² SSRS tracked the distribution of interviews across demographics throughout field and noticed that older respondents were disproportionately completing the survey. This was adjusted in further sample releases via an age-flag in the sample that allowed to control for this at sample management level. An age distribution weighting adjustment was also incorporated.

time during the fieldwork period, respondents had the possibility to ask for a telephone interview (appointment) using a toll free telephone number provided for respondents.

United Kingdom

SSE provided landline and cell phone sample for the UK using the number blocks provided by the Federal Office of Communications (Ofcom). SSE identified the different phone number blocks for each region and division within the UK. In order to obtain an epiem sample, a random-digit length (N=3) was used to generate the sample. For the mobile sample, SSE based its stratification on the numbering plan, which gives information about the prefixes of the various providers (leaving up to five unknowns). Using a standardized procedure, the landline and mobile RDD samples were pulsed in order to improve productivity.

United States

The sample used for the US portion of the study combined a dual-frame landline and cell phone RDD sample design. Utilizing a Marketing Systems Group (MSG) proprietary sample generation program, SSRS generated the sample for the US. MSG is not only one of the survey research industry's largest statistical sampling companies, but also the preferred supplier to social science researchers, and governmental organizations such as the US Census Bureau and the Centers for Disease Control. During generation, the RDD sample was prepared using MSG's proprietary GENESYS IDplus procedure, which not only limits sample to non-zero-banks, but also identifies and eliminates approximately 90% of all non-working and business numbers. Additionally, the entire sample was run against a database of known cell phone blocks (NPA-NXX-B) as well as those numbers ported from landline to wireless, whereupon identified cellphone numbers as part of the RDD landline frame were flagged in order not to be dialed.

The standard GENESYS RDD methodology produced a strict single-stage, epiem sample of residential telephone numbers. In other words, the GENESYS RDD sample ensured an equal and known probability of selection for every residential telephone number in the sample frame. GENESYS RDD samples achieve their statistical efficiency through a structured database in combination with single-stage sampling procedures, which ensure geographic representativeness and increase the homogeneity within the implicit strata created by the GENESYS sampling procedures.

Following procedures similar to those used for the landline sample, SSRS generated a list of cell phone telephone numbers in random fashion. The cell phone sample was prepared using MSG's proprietary Cell-Wins procedure that screens out inactive cell phone numbers with an approximately 95% accuracy rate. This increases the productivity of cell phone sample for reasons identical to those mentioned above for landline IDplus. Through this procedure, MSG removed 10,060 landline and 26,919 cell phone pieces of sample designated as inactive.

Household and Respondent Selection

For all of the countries except for Switzerland, the respondent, age 18 or older, was selected using a hybrid of the Westat selection method of respondent selection for the landline frame.³ This within-household selection procedure reduces the bias created when the person responding to the survey is the one more likely to answer the phone or be present at the time of the call. A modified version of this within-household selection procedure was used in Norway where the interview continued with the adult already on the phone if the adult asked for was not at home or available.⁴ In the other countries (Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, the UK, and the US), a callback was set up to reach the originally selected respondent. Cell phones are considered individual devices rather than belonging to a household, and therefore the person answering the cell phone was the one who was interviewed. In Switzerland, respondents were targeted via the registry per the Federal Statistical Office (FSO).

DATA COLLECTION

In the fall and winter of 2015, the IHP 2016 questionnaire was developed and revised. Prior to the field period, the study was programmed into SSRS's Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system. Each of the international partners administering interviews also programmed the survey into their respective interviewing software. In Switzerland, respondents were recruited via postal mail and invited to participate in an online or phone version of the survey; outbound reminder calls were made later in the field period to complete the phone survey (for sample with available phone numbers). All countries other than Switzerland employed a phone-only methodology. SSRS pretested the US version of the instrument in mid-January, 2016. Other-country pretests were conducted in February and March, 2016. Interviews were conducted between March 1 and June 22, 2016.

Questionnaire Review, Translations and Cultural Adaptations

In the fall and winter of 2015, SSRS reviewed several iterations of the instrument developed by the Fund and its international partners and provided feedback about question wording, order, clarity, logic/programming, and other issues related to questionnaire quality.

Upon approval from The Commonwealth Fund research team, new and revised questions were translated into Canadian-French, Spanish, German, Dutch, French, Norwegian, Swedish, Swiss-Italian, Swiss-French and Swiss-German. SSRS's partner, Cetra translated the Canadian-French and Spanish instruments. EFG translated the instrument into Dutch for the Netherlands. Norstat translated the instrument into Norwegian. The LINK Institut translated the Swiss-Italian, Swiss-German, and Swiss-French instruments. Indikator translated the Swedish instrument.

The translated documents were reviewed by the Fund's international partners for both new and previously translated questions to confirm that they were comprehensible, meaningful for respondents

³ See Lavrakas (2010) for an extended description of the benefits of using this method to enhance the likelihood of achieving a representative within-household sample.

⁴ This procedure was utilized in Norway to conform to the standard of practice in that country for telephone interviews.

and comparable to the English-language versions of each question. Throughout the translation process, efforts were made to ensure that the question meaning of the translated questions would not deviate from the unified questionnaire or disrupt trend.

Programming and Testing

Prior to the field period, the survey was programmed into SSRS's CATI system. Each of the international partners administering interviews also programmed the survey into their respective survey software. Extensive checking of the programs was conducted to assure that skip patterns followed the design of the questionnaire. The computer-assisted instruments were tested to ensure that all of the language inserts were working properly. Members of the SSRS team tested the US and Canadian versions of the instrument as well as the instruments fielded by EFG, AMR and Norstat. The Swiss-German pretest version was reviewed by the SSRS team to ensure the web format met industry standards. Each of the other-country survey providers also conducted extensive testing of their instruments.

Prior to the beginning of fieldwork random data were generated for USA and Canada to confirm that skip patterns were working correctly. At the beginning of the field period, SSRS requested preliminary SPSS files from each of the international partners to confirm that all skip instructions and variables were working as intended.

Pretesting

In mid-January, SSRS pretested the survey in the US and provided a memo to the Fund with information about potential areas of confusion in the instrument/with specific questions, recommendations and observations related to new/highly-modified questions and questions asked in past IHP surveys, and areas of focus for future interviewer training. Following the US pretest, minor adjustments were made to the questionnaire and some interviewer notes were added for all countries.

In February and March, 2016, pretest interviews were conducted in all countries except Sweden. Table 3 provides a summary of the number of pretest interviews conducted in each country. The SSRS team reviewed pretest recordings for Canada (both English and French Canadian), the UK, Australia, New Zealand and France. Pretest feedback was also provided by EFG, AMR, Norstat, and LINK.

TABLE 3: Summary of Pretest Interviews by Country

	Pretest Conducted	Language(s) Pretest Conducted in	Dates Pretests Conducted	# of Pretests
Australia	Yes	English	2/25/16-2/26/16	10
Canada	Yes	English, French	2/16/16-2/24/16	15
France	Yes	French	3/8/16-3/10/16	10
Germany	Yes	German	3/8/16-3/10/16	10
New Zealand	Yes	English	2/25/16-2/26/16	10
Netherlands	Yes	Dutch	3/4/16-3/8/16	10
Norway	Yes	Norwegian	3/10/16-3/11/16	9
Sweden	No	NA	NA	NA
Switzerland	Yes	German	2/11/16	10
United Kingdom	Yes	English	2/23/16-2/24/16	10
United States	Yes	English	1/12/16	19

SSRS provided memos to the Fund for each country pretest. These memos included observations about new/modified questions, feedback based on confusion related to some translations, recommendations for improvements to the instrument and areas of focus for future interviewer training.

A selection of the observations and changes made based on the pretest process is summarized below:

- Adding a “Not applicable” response option to questions where respondents indicated the questions was not applicable to them (e.g., Q1110)
- Adding interviewer notes to questions where additional clarification was needed (e.g., Q1140)
- Minor translation edits to both new and existing questions⁵
- Insight into questions that may be nonstandard for some country respondents as the questions are less applicable/meaningful in that country (e.g., Q1150 in Norway, Q1505 in the Netherlands)
- Potentially problematic worded questions (e.g., Q1226)
- Insight into specific healthcare services that exists in specific countries that may affect how respondents answer questions (i.e., "huisartspost" in the Netherlands)
- Identifying questions that are sensitive/too personal and may result in high non-response (e.g., Q1811a4 and Q1860 in Germany)

A list of all changes made based on pretests completed in the US and other countries is available and can be provided upon request.

⁵ Existing question translation modifications were only made if they were deemed necessary by the country partners.

Completed Interviews

Field period

Interviews were conducted from March through May 2016 for the main sample and most oversample interviews. Interviews in Victoria were completed in June 2016. The field times varied by country and are specified in Table 4 below.

TABLE 4: Field Period Per country

	Field Period
Australia	3/21/2016 - 6/22/2016
Canada	3/2/2016 - 5/19/2016
France	3/11/2016 – 5/20/2016
Germany	3/11/2016 – 5/14/2016
New Zealand	3/18/2016 - 5/13/2016
Netherlands	3/18/2016 - 5/28/2016
Norway	3/17/2016 - 5/22/2016
Sweden	3/12/2016 - 5/16/2016
Switzerland	3/15/2016 - 5/3/2016
United Kingdom	3/8/2016 - 5/13/2016
United States	3/1/2016 - 5/18/2016

Survey Length and Language of Interview

Table 5 outlines the language/s and length of interview for each country in the 2016 IHP survey.

TABLE 5: Language/s and Length of Interview per Country

	Language(s)	Average length in minutes
Australia	English	21
Canada (Quebec)	English, French	20
France	French	25
Germany	German	22
New Zealand	English	19
Netherlands	Dutch	19
Norway	Norwegian	18
Sweden	Swedish	21
Switzerland	German, French, Italian	24 (phone), 25 (web)
United Kingdom	English	17
United States	English, Spanish	20

Training Materials and Interviewer Training

Prior to the start of the study, interviewers received both written materials on the survey and formal training for conducting the survey. SSRS's project team and its international partners briefed and trained interviewers on the issues specific to the study, explaining the study's overall objectives, specific procedures, and questionnaire content. Similarly, Indikator and the LINK Institut managed the briefing and interviewer training in Sweden and Switzerland respectively.

The written materials provided and reviewed prior to the beginning of the field period included:

1. An English-language annotated questionnaire with question by question instructions for interviewers.
2. A list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) and the appropriate responses to those questions was provided. Additionally, the FAQs were tailored for items that were country-specific, namely the sponsoring organization and contact information.
3. Information about the goals of the study, potential obstacles to be overcome in getting good answers to particular questions, and respondent problems that could be anticipated ahead of time as well as strategies for addressing them.

Interviewer training was conducted prior to the pretest and immediately before the survey was officially launched. Call center supervisors and interviewers were walked through each question in the questionnaire. Interviewers were given instructions to help them maximize response rates and ensure accurate data collection. They were instructed to encourage participation by emphasizing the importance of the project and to reassure respondents that the information they provided was confidential.

Monitoring at EFG, AMR and Norstat

In addition to the pre-launch briefings provided by the EFG and AMR staff, members of the SSRS project team visited EFG and AMR in order to provide direct oversight of the fieldwork process. EFG and AMR carried detailed briefings at the start and during the field period. Training procedures included role-playing methodology – assuming interviewer and respondent roles -- in order to become comfortable with the CATI script. Supervisors conducted live monitoring and also reviewed a selection of recorded interviews. The supervisors also debriefed interviewers as a group and/or individually, as needed, during the fieldwork.

Similarly, Norstat briefed interviewers on all issues related to this study, including the introduction, probing, how to handle any misunderstandings, and ensuring that the instructions are being followed. Supervisors monitored fieldwork and provided feedback to the interviewers. Survey-specific issues were addressed as required, and an overall assessment of the interviewers' performance was made.

SSRS Project Team Monitoring

The SSRS project teams monitored and listened to recordings of interviews in the US (English and Spanish) and Canada (English and French Canadian) throughout the field period and provided feedback,

when necessary, to ensure that best practices were being followed. The SSRS team listened to a random selection of recordings in Australia, New Zealand, and the UK. SSRS's partner, Cetra, reviewed recordings for Germany, the Netherlands, and Norway. Where necessary, SSRS provided corrective to the project teams at EFG, AMR and Norstat.

Call Rule, Contact Attempts, Refusal Avoidance and Conversion Strategies

SSRS and each of the international partners carried out several strategies to maximize survey response by minimizing non-response and maximizing refusal conversion. The survey fielding enacted the following best-practice procedures.

USA and Canada

- For freshly loaded sample, the call rule included one initial call plus nine callbacks. After six call attempts, unresolved numbers were set aside to “rest.” After that rest period, additional calls were made to reach the ten calls average.
- Sample was released in batches to ensure that it would be worked effectively.
- To increase the probability of completing an interview, a differential call rule was established that required that call attempts be initiated at different times of day and different days of the week.
- Power (assisted manual) dialing of all sample in Canada and landline sample in the US. All US cellphone sample was manually dialed as is required by law.
- Specially-trained interviewers were utilized to attempt refusal conversions, following a rest period of at least seven to ten days.
- Respondents were permitted to schedule call-back times.
- Interviews were completed in English and Spanish in the US.
- A Quebec-specific program was staffed with bilingual interviewers in order to accommodate the high incidence of French-speakers in Quebec.

Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom and the Netherlands

- Similar to the call rule procedure carried for the United States and Canada, a differential call rule was established in which call attempts were implemented at different times of day and different days of the week. The maximum was set at nine attempts with a rest period of one week after each interval of three call attempts.
- Sample was released in batches to ensure that it would be worked effectively.
- Refusals were called back after a two-week rest period.

France and Germany

- Sample was released in batches to ensure that it would be worked effectively.
- A differential call rule was established in which call attempts were implemented at different times of day and different days of the week. The maximum was set at nine attempts with a rest period after 5 call attempts.

- In France refusals were called back after a seven-day rest period by senior and experienced interviewers. In Germany, due to data protection laws, refusals conversion attempts were not implemented.

Norway

- A differential call rule was employed in which times of the day and days of the week were varied, for a total of initial plus nine callbacks.
- Sample was released in batches to ensure that it would be worked effectively.

Sweden

- A differential call rule was established to ensure a good spread of call attempts within a week period as well as within times of day.
- Nine contact attempts were made to bolster a high response rate.
- To minimize refusals efficiently handling of scheduled callbacks was encouraged. Indikator abides by the ethical rules for conducting surveys outlined by the Swedish Ethical Council for Market Research, which do not permit making callbacks to respondents who indicate their unwillingness to participate in the survey.

Switzerland

- In Switzerland, respondents were recruited via postal mail and invited to participate in an online or phone version of the survey.
- In an effort to boost response rate, outbound calls (for sample with available phone numbers) were initiated approximately five weeks after the first mailing was sent to the full sample field.
- Up to 10 call attempts were made on the reminder calls.
- To maximize response rates, Link implemented a strategy that allowed respondents to request the link to the online survey to be shared with them via email.
- An email address and toll free telephone number for questions was provided to respondents.

TABLE 6: Switzerland Contact Schedule

Contact	Timing/Dates*	Description
1	3/14/2016	First postal mailing to full sample, including: - A cover letter (describing the nature of the survey and its objectives) - A web link and unique passcode - An email address and a toll-free telephone number for questions
2	3/15/2016	Telephone line for inbound calls was activated.
3	3/31/2016	Second postal mailing to the outstanding active sample, including: - A reminder letter (describing the nature of the survey and its objectives) - A web link and unique passcode - An email address and a toll-free telephone number for questions
4	4/19/2016	Outbound calling inviting respondents to participate in the telephone interview and as a reminder to the outstanding active sample was initiated. If requested, an email with the link to the online survey was provided.
5	as of 04/26/2016	A reminder email was sent to respondents who requested an email with the link to the online survey.
6	5/3/2016	End of fieldwork

Weekly Reports

Prior to the field, SSRS provide reporting data and disposition reporting templates to EFG, AMR, Norstat, LINK, and Indikator. On a weekly basis, SSRS reviewed the status of data collection and provided feedback regarding the distribution of completes (e.g., in cases where the interviews were overly skewed toward older respondents), field progress, and dispositions. Based on this feedback, SSRS was able to monitor sample productivity and provide guidance on how to best handle the sample available, when to load fresh sample, and thereby boost response rates.

Bi-weekly and Periodic Updates

Throughout the field period, SSRS provided the Fund with bi-weekly updates with key information tracking overall progress in each country. These reports, designed to provide snapshot information of key variables of interest, included tables for completes per sample type by gender, age, region, and language of interview (where relevant). Along with the bi-weekly data reports, SSRS provided a narrative regarding field progress and reported on any field-related concerns.

In early May, SSRS provided each international partner with an interim status update on data collection, including an up-to-date distribution of interviews by gender, age, region, and language of interview.

Final Counts

Tables 7 to 18 below show final counts per country by gender, age, region, and language of interview, where relevant.

TABLE 7: Final Counts Australia – Main Sample

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 18-24	14	2%	31%	31	8%	69%	45	5%
Male / 25-34	37	6%	44%	48	13%	56%	85	9%
Male / 35-49	83	13%	56%	66	17%	44%	149	15%
Male / 50-64	88	14%	70%	37	10%	30%	125	13%
Male / 65+	74	12%	78%	21	5%	22%	95	10%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	2	0%	67%	1	0%	33%	3	0%
Male Total	298	48%	59%	204	53%	41%	502	50%
Female / 18-24	11	2%	29%	27	7%	71%	38	4%
Female / 25-34	50	8%	53%	44	11%	47%	94	9%
Female / 35-49	82	13%	62%	50	13%	38%	132	13%
Female / 50-64	88	14%	66%	46	12%	34%	134	13%
Female / 65+	86	14%	87%	13	3%	13%	99	10%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Female Total	318	52%	64%	180	47%	36%	498	50%
TOTAL	616		62%	384		38%	1000	

REGION	LANDLINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
NSW	216	35%	64%	119	31%	36%	335	34%
Victoria	152	25%	60%	100	26%	40%	252	25%
Queensland	139	23%	66%	72	19%	34%	211	21%
Western Australia	45	7%	55%	37	10%	45%	82	8%
South Australia	41	7%	53%	37	10%	47%	78	8%
Tasmania	12	2%	50%	12	3%	50%	24	2%
Australian Capital Territory	6	1%	75%	2	1%	25%	8	1%
Northern Territory	5	1%	50%	5	1%	50%	10	1%
TOTAL	616	100%	62%	384	100%	38%	1000	100%

TABLE 8: Final Counts Australia – New South Wales Oversample

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 18-24	81	4%	57%	62	4%	43%	143	4%
Male / 25-34	181	9%	66%	95	6%	34%	276	8%
Male / 35-49	285	14%	55%	229	15%	45%	514	15%
Male / 50-64	200	10%	51%	192	13%	49%	392	11%
Male / 65+	162	8%	53%	142	9%	47%	304	9%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	13	1%	50%	13	1%	50%	26	1%
Male Total	922	46%	56%	733	49%	44%	1655	47%
Female / 18-24	70	3%	63%	42	3%	38%	112	3%
Female / 25-34	217	11%	65%	119	8%	35%	336	10%
Female / 35-49	307	15%	61%	197	13%	39%	504	14%
Female / 50-64	262	13%	56%	207	14%	44%	469	13%
Female / 65+	215	11%	54%	184	12%	46%	399	11%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	9	0%	36%	16	1%	64%	25	1%
Female Total	1080	54%	59%	765	51%	41%	1845	53%
TOTAL	2002		57%	1498		43%	3500	

TABLE 9: Final Counts Australia – Victoria Oversample

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 18-24	13	3%	38%	21	7%	62%	34	5%
Male / 25-34	45	10%	58%	33	11%	42%	78	10%
Male / 35-49	66	15%	53%	58	18%	47%	124	17%
Male / 50-64	57	13%	63%	34	11%	37%	91	12%
Male / 65+	39	9%	75%	13	4%	25%	52	7%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	3	1%	100%	0	0%	0%	3	0%
Male Total	223	51%	58%	159	51%	42%	382	51%
Female / 18-24	17	4%	43%	23	7%	58%	40	5%
Female / 25-34	33	8%	43%	43	14%	57%	76	10%
Female / 35-49	47	11%	51%	46	15%	49%	93	12%
Female / 50-64	60	14%	69%	27	9%	31%	87	12%
Female / 65+	50	12%	76%	16	5%	24%	66	9%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	4	1%	100%	0	0%	0%	4	1%
Female Total	211	49%	58%	155	49%	42%	366	49%
TOTAL	434		58%	314		42%	748	

REGION	LANDLINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Lodden Mallee	72	17%	63%	42	13%	37%	114	15%
Barwon-South Western	40	9%	62%	25	8%	38%	65	9%
Hume	31	7%	61%	20	6%	39%	51	7%
Grampians	33	8%	75%	11	4%	25%	44	6%
Gippsland	79	18%	82%	17	5%	18%	96	13%
North & West Metropolitan	61	14%	49%	63	20%	51%	124	17%
Southern Metropolitan	64	15%	69%	29	9%	31%	93	12%
Eastern Metropolitan	54	12%	61%	34	11%	39%	88	12%
Victoria region missing	0	0%	0%	73	23%	0%	73	10%
TOTAL	434	100%	58%	314	100%	42%	748	100%

TABLE 9: Final Counts Canada

GENDER / AGE	LAND-LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELL-PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	23	1%	21%	86	7%	79%	109	2%
Male / 25-34	48	1%	24%	149	12%	76%	197	4%
Male / 35-49	242	7%	59%	166	13%	41%	408	9%
Male / 50-64	414	12%	71%	169	14%	29%	583	13%
Male / 65+	450	14%	85%	77	6%	15%	527	12%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	20	1%	74%	7	1%	26%	27	1%
Male Total	1197	36%	65%	654	53%	35%	1851	41%
Female / 18-24	28	1%	32%	60	5%	68%	88	2%
Female / 25-34	117	4%	47%	132	11%	53%	249	5%
Female / 35-49	352	11%	67%	173	14%	33%	525	12%
Female / 50-64	762	23%	85%	137	11%	15%	899	20%
Female / 65+	814	25%	93%	61	5%	7%	875	19%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	47	1%	78%	13	1%	22%	60	1%
Female Total	2120	64%	79%	576	47%	21%	2696	59%
TOTAL	3317		73%	1230		27%	4547	

LANGUAGE	LAND-LINE	Language (%)	Landline (%)	CELL-PHONE	Language (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Language (%)
ENGLISH	2604	79%	72%	996	81%	28%	3600	79%
FRENCH	713	21%	75%	234	19%	25%	947	21%
TOTAL	3317	100%	73%	1230	100%	27%	4547	100%

TABLE 9 cont'd: Final Counts Canada

REGION	LAND-LINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELL-PHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Newfoundland and Labrador	177	5%	70%	76	6%	30%	253	6%
Prince Edward Island	172	5%	69%	79	6%	31%	251	6%
Nova Scotia	184	6%	73%	69	6%	27%	253	6%
New Brunswick	192	6%	76%	59	5%	24%	251	6%
Quebec	741	22%	74%	261	21%	26%	1002	22%
Ontario	1119	34%	75%	381	31%	25%	1500	33%
Manitoba	201	6%	79%	54	4%	21%	255	6%
Saskatchewan	170	5%	68%	81	7%	32%	251	6%
Alberta	177	5%	65%	94	8%	35%	271	6%
British Columbia	183	6%	72%	71	6%	28%	254	6%
Yukon	0	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	1	0%
Northwest Territories	0	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	1	0%
Nunavut	1	0%	25%	3	0%	75%	4	0%
TOTAL	3317	100%	73%	1230	100%	27%	4547	100%

TABLE 10: Final Counts France

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	29	4%	44%	37	11%	56%	66	6%
Male / 25-34	50	7%	60%	33	10%	40%	83	8%
Male / 35-49	88	12%	62%	53	16%	38%	141	13%
Male / 50-64	98	13%	77%	29	9%	23%	127	12%
Male / 65+	91	12%	84%	17	5%	16%	108	10%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Male Total	357	47%	68%	169	50%	32%	526	48%
Female / 18-24	43	6%	61%	28	8%	39%	71	6%
Female / 25-34	58	8%	59%	41	12%	41%	99	9%
Female / 35-49	100	13%	65%	53	16%	35%	153	14%
Female / 50-64	101	13%	74%	35	10%	26%	136	12%
Female / 65+	102	13%	88%	14	4%	12%	116	11%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	2	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	2	0%
Female Total	406	53%	70%	171	50%	30%	577	52%
TOTAL	763		69%	340		31%	1103	

TABLE 10 cont'd: Final Counts France

REGION	LANDLINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Alsace, Champagne- Ardenne, Lorraine	70	9%	68%	33	10%	32%	103	9%
Aquitaine Limousin Poitou- Charentes	71	9%	73%	26	8%	27%	97	9%
Auvergne-Rhône- Alpes	99	13%	63%	58	17%	37%	157	14%
Bourgogne, Franche-Comté	27	4%	69%	12	4%	31%	39	4%
Bretagne	41	5%	66%	21	6%	34%	62	6%
Centre, Val de Loire	33	4%	69%	15	4%	31%	48	4%
Corse	10	1%	91%	1	0%	9%	11	1%
Île-de-France	120	16%	72%	47	14%	28%	167	15%
Languedoc- Roussillon, Midi- Pyrénées	79	10%	72%	30	9%	28%	109	10%
Nord-Pas-de- Calais, Picardie	63	8%	68%	30	9%	32%	93	8%
Normandie	36	5%	75%	12	4%	25%	48	4%
Pays de la Loire	51	7%	78%	14	4%	22%	65	6%
Provence-Alpes, Côte-d'Azur	63	8%	62%	39	11%	38%	102	9%
Refused to answer	0	0%	0%	2	1%	100%	2	0%
TOTAL	763	100%	69%	340	100%	31%	1103	100%

TABLE 11: Final Counts Germany

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 18-24	28	4%	47%	32	9%	53%	60	6%
Male / 25-34	41	6%	50%	41	11%	50%	82	8%
Male / 35-49	79	12%	62%	48	13%	38%	127	13%
Male / 50-64	81	13%	66%	41	11%	34%	122	12%
Male / 65+	85	13%	83%	17	5%	17%	102	10%
Male Total	314	49%	64%	179	49%	36%	493	49%
Female / 18-24	22	3%	41%	32	9%	59%	54	5%
Female / 25-34	35	6%	45%	43	12%	55%	78	8%
Female / 35-49	75	12%	58%	55	15%	42%	130	13%
Female / 50-64	82	13%	68%	38	10%	32%	120	12%
Female / 65+	108	17%	86%	17	5%	14%	125	13%
Female Total	322	51%	64%	185	51%	36%	507	51%
TOTAL	636		64%	364		36%	1000	

REGION	LANDLINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Schleswig-Holstein	29	5%	64%	16	4%	36%	45	5%
Hamburg	9	1%	23%	30	8%	77%	39	4%
Bremen	6	1%	32%	13	4%	68%	19	2%
Niedersachsen	72	11%	77%	21	6%	23%	93	9%
Nordrhein-Westfalen	142	22%	66%	74	20%	34%	216	22%
Rheinland-Pfalz	24	4%	51%	23	6%	49%	47	5%
Saarland	6	1%	43%	8	2%	57%	14	1%
Hessen	39	6%	62%	24	7%	38%	63	6%
Baden-Württemberg	91	14%	76%	29	8%	24%	120	12%
Bayern	101	16%	75%	34	9%	25%	135	14%
Berlin	25	4%	68%	12	3%	32%	37	4%
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	13	2%	42%	18	5%	58%	31	3%
Brandenburg	23	4%	62%	14	4%	38%	37	4%
Sachsen-Anhalt	15	2%	48%	16	4%	52%	31	3%
Thüringen	18	3%	53%	16	4%	47%	34	3%
Sachsen	23	4%	59%	16	4%	41%	39	4%
TOTAL	636	100%	64%	364	100%	36%	1000	100%

TABLE 12: Final Counts Netherlands

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 18-24	56	7%	71%	23	5%	29%	79	6%
Male / 25-34	86	11%	70%	36	8%	30%	122	10%
Male / 35-49	81	10%	58%	59	13%	42%	140	11%
Male / 50-64	86	11%	56%	67	15%	44%	153	12%
Male / 65+	80	10%	65%	44	10%	35%	124	10%
Male Total	389	50%	63%	229	52%	37%	618	50%
Female / 18-24	21	3%	53%	19	4%	48%	40	3%
Female / 25-34	33	4%	46%	38	9%	54%	71	6%
Female / 35-49	110	14%	60%	73	16%	40%	183	15%
Female / 50-64	105	13%	67%	52	12%	33%	157	13%
Female / 65+	125	16%	79%	33	7%	21%	158	13%
Female Total	394	50%	65%	215	48%	35%	609	50%
TOTAL	783		64%	444		36%	1227	

REGION	LANDLINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Drenthe	29	4%	81%	7	2%	19%	36	3%
Flevoland	18	2%	55%	15	3%	45%	33	3%
Friesland	37	5%	67%	18	4%	33%	55	4%
Gelderland	103	13%	64%	57	13%	36%	160	13%
Groningen	29	4%	71%	12	3%	29%	41	3%
Limburg	74	9%	79%	20	5%	21%	94	8%
Noord-Brabant	128	16%	66%	66	15%	34%	194	16%
Noord-Holland	106	14%	64%	60	14%	36%	166	14%
Overijssel	67	9%	74%	24	5%	26%	91	7%
Utrecht	52	7%	55%	42	9%	45%	94	8%
Zeeland	16	2%	59%	11	2%	41%	27	2%
Zuid-Holland	124	16%	55%	103	23%	45%	227	19%
Refused to answer	0	0%	0%	9	2%	100%	9	1%
TOTAL	783	100%	64%	444	100%	36%	1227	100%

TABLE 13: Final Counts New Zealand

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender/A ge (%)
Male / 18-24	21	3%	36%	38	11%	64%	59	6%
Male / 25-34	28	4%	33%	56	16%	67%	84	8%
Male / 35-49	72	11%	60%	48	14%	40%	120	12%
Male / 50-64	75	12%	73%	28	8%	27%	103	10%
Male / 65+	74	11%	81%	17	5%	19%	91	9%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	3	0%	60%	2	1%	40%	5	1%
Male Total	273	42%	59%	189	53%	41%	462	46%
Female / 18-24	19	3%	59%	13	4%	41%	32	3%
Female / 25-34	37	6%	48%	40	11%	52%	77	8%
Female / 35-49	113	17%	69%	51	14%	31%	164	16%
Female / 50-64	112	17%	72%	43	12%	28%	155	16%
Female / 65+	88	14%	85%	15	4%	15%	103	10%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	4	1%	57%	3	1%	43%	7	1%
Female Total	373	58%	69%	165	47%	31%	538	54%
TOTAL	646		65%	354		35%	1000	

REGION	LANDLINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Auckland	124	19%	42%	171	48%	58%	295	30%
North	166	26%	65%	89	25%	35%	255	26%
Central	125	19%	76%	39	11%	24%	164	16%
South	231	36%	83%	49	14%	18%	280	28%
Don't know/Refused	0	0%	0%	6	2%	100%	6	1%
TOTAL	646	100%	65%	354	100%	35%	1000	100%

TABLE 14: Final Counts Norway

GENDER / AGE	LAND-LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELL-PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 18-24	2	1%	5%	36	4%	95%	38	3%
Male / 25-34	0	0%	0%	55	7%	100%	55	5%
Male / 35-49	12	4%	14%	75	9%	86%	87	8%
Male / 50-64	35	13%	22%	127	16%	78%	162	15%
Male / 65+	60	22%	39%	93	11%	61%	153	14%
Male Total	109	39%	22%	386	47%	78%	495	45%
Female / 18-24	4	1%	12%	29	4%	88%	33	3%
Female / 25-34	3	1%	5%	52	6%	95%	55	5%
Female / 35-49	14	5%	11%	109	13%	89%	123	11%
Female / 50-64	55	20%	32%	118	14%	68%	173	16%
Female / 65+	91	33%	43%	120	15%	57%	211	19%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	33%	2	0%	67%	3	0%
Female Total	168	61%	28%	430	53%	72%	598	55%
TOTAL	277		25%	816		75%	1093	

REGION	LAND-LINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELL-PHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Østfold	12	4%	20%	49	6%	80%	61	6%
Akershus	32	12%	26%	89	11%	74%	121	11%
Oslo	46	17%	33%	93	11%	67%	139	13%
Hedmark	7	3%	18%	31	4%	82%	38	3%
Oppland	12	4%	27%	33	4%	73%	45	4%
Buskerud	16	6%	29%	40	5%	71%	56	5%
Vestfold	10	4%	22%	36	4%	78%	46	4%
Telemark	9	3%	25%	27	3%	75%	36	3%
Aust-Agder	4	1%	17%	19	2%	83%	23	2%
Vest-Agder	11	4%	28%	29	4%	73%	40	4%
Rogaland	18	6%	18%	82	10%	82%	100	9%
Hordaland	44	16%	40%	66	8%	60%	110	10%
Sogn og Fjordane	7	3%	33%	14	2%	67%	21	2%
Møre og Romsdal	14	5%	24%	44	5%	76%	58	5%
Sør-Trøndelag	8	3%	13%	56	7%	88%	64	6%
Nord-Trøndelag	7	3%	22%	25	3%	78%	32	3%
Nordland	11	4%	22%	40	5%	78%	51	5%
Troms	9	3%	24%	29	4%	76%	38	3%
Finnmark-Finnmárku	0	0%	0%	14	2%	100%	14	1%
TOTAL	277	100%	25%	816	100%	75%	1093	100%

TABLE 15: Final Counts Sweden

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	13	0%	7%	175	4%	93%	188	3%
Male / 25-34	29	1%	8%	337	8%	92%	366	5%
Male / 35-49	101	4%	22%	364	8%	78%	465	7%
Male / 50-64	193	7%	31%	439	10%	69%	632	9%
Male / 65+	693	26%	40%	1029	23%	60%	1722	24%
Male Total	1029	38%	31%	2344	53%	69%	3373	47%
Female / 18-24	16	1%	10%	139	3%	90%	155	2%
Female / 25-34	34	1%	14%	208	5%	86%	242	3%
Female / 35-49	144	5%	29%	352	8%	71%	496	7%
Female / 50-64	270	10%	38%	445	10%	62%	715	10%
Female / 65+	1204	45%	56%	939	21%	44%	2143	30%
Female Total	1668	62%	44%	2083	47%	56%	3751	53%
TOTAL	2697		38%	4427		62%	7124	

REGION	LANDLINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Stockholm	226	5%	38%	374	8%	62%	600	8%
Uppsala	120	3%	40%	180	4%	60%	300	4%
Södermanland	120	3%	40%	180	4%	60%	300	4%
Östergötland	112	3%	36%	200	5%	64%	312	4%
Jönköping	120	3%	40%	180	4%	60%	300	4%
Kronoberg	116	3%	36%	203	5%	64%	319	4%
Kalmar	119	3%	38%	193	4%	62%	312	4%
Gotland	74	2%	36%	132	3%	64%	206	3%
Blekinge	120	3%	40%	183	4%	60%	303	4%
Skåne	220	5%	40%	330	7%	60%	550	8%
Halland	120	3%	36%	210	5%	64%	330	5%
Västra Götaland	201	5%	34%	391	9%	66%	592	8%
Värmland	120	3%	40%	180	4%	60%	300	4%
Örebro	103	2%	34%	197	4%	66%	300	4%
Västmanland	120	3%	40%	180	4%	60%	300	4%
Dalarna	120	3%	40%	180	4%	60%	300	4%
Gävleborg	109	2%	36%	191	4%	64%	300	4%
Västernorrland	120	3%	40%	180	4%	60%	300	4%
Jämtland	120	3%	40%	180	4%	60%	300	4%
Västerbotten	107	2%	36%	193	4%	64%	300	4%
Norrbottn	110	2%	37%	190	4%	63%	300	4%
TOTAL	2697	100%	38%	4427	100%	62%	7124	100%

TABLE 16: Final Counts Switzerland

GENDER / AGE	LAND-LINE	Gender / Age (%)	CELL-PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	TOTAL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	WEB	Gender / Age (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	4	3%	2	2%	6	3%	51	4%	57	4%
Male / 25-34	1	1%	3	3%	4	2%	104	8%	108	7%
Male / 35-49	5	4%	5	5%	10	5%	196	15%	206	14%
Male / 50-64	11	9%	10	10%	21	10%	192	15%	213	14%
Male / 65+	33	28%	15	15%	48	22%	121	9%	169	11%
Male Total	54	45%	35	35%	89	41%	664	51%	753	50%
Female / 18-24	4	3%	2	2%	6	3%	65	5%	71	5%
Female / 25-34	0	0%	5	5%	5	2%	98	8%	103	7%
Female / 35-49	6	5%	9	9%	15	7%	186	14%	201	13%
Female / 50-64	15	13%	22	22%	37	17%	191	15%	228	15%
Female / 65+	40	34%	26	26%	66	30%	98	8%	164	11%
Female Total	65	55%	64	65%	129	59%	638	49%	767	50%
TOTAL	119		99		218		1302		1520	

LANGUAGE	LAND-LINE	Gender / Age (%)	CELL-PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	TOTAL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	WEB	Gender / Age (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
GERMAN	53	45%	14	14%	67	31%	759	58%	826	54%
FRENCH	64	54%	18	18%	82	38%	319	25%	401	26%
ITALIAN	2	2%	67	68%	69	32%	224	17%	293	19%
TOTAL	119	100%	99	100%	218	100%	1302	100%	1520	100%

TABLE 16 cont'd: Final Counts Switzerland

REGION	LAND-LINE	Gender / Age (%)	CELL-PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	TOTAL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	WEB	Gender / Age (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Zurich	17	14%	1	1%	18	8%	187	14%	205	13%
Bern	9	8%	0	0%	9	4%	126	10%	135	9%
Luzern	6	5%	1	1%	7	3%	50	4%	57	4%
Uri	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	6	0%	7	0%
Schwyz	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	22	2%	22	1%
Obwalden	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	3	0%
Nidwalden	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	1%	8	1%
Glarus	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	7	1%	8	1%
Zug	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	18	1%	18	1%
Fribourg	11	9%	1	1%	12	6%	52	4%	64	4%
Solothurn	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%	31	2%	32	2%
Basel-Stadt	3	3%	1	1%	4	2%	23	2%	27	2%
Basel-Landschaft	5	4%	0	0%	5	2%	41	3%	46	3%
Schaffhausen	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9	1%	9	1%
Appenzell Ausserrhoden	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	8	1%	9	1%
Appenzell Innerrhoden	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%
St. Gallen	4	3%	3	3%	7	3%	52	4%	59	4%
Graubunden	0	0%	3	3%	3	1%	35	3%	38	3%
Aargau	5	4%	0	0%	5	2%	84	6%	89	6%
Thurgau	2	2%	2	2%	4	2%	28	2%	32	2%
Ticino	0	0%	71	72%	71	33%	225	17%	296	19%
Vaud	20	17%	7	7%	27	12%	141	11%	168	11%
Valais	6	5%	4	4%	10	5%	47	4%	57	4%
Neuchatel	7	6%	1	1%	8	4%	29	2%	37	2%
Geneva	15	13%	2	2%	17	8%	52	4%	69	5%
Jura	5	4%	1	1%	6	3%	18	1%	24	2%
TOTAL	119	100%	99	100%	218	100%	1302	100%	1520	100%

TABLE 17: Final Counts United Kingdom

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	20	3%	27%	54	16%	73%	74	7%
Male / 25-34	40	6%	43%	54	16%	57%	94	9%
Male / 35-49	73	11%	63%	43	13%	37%	116	12%
Male / 50-64	58	9%	56%	45	13%	44%	103	10%
Male / 65+	69	11%	78%	19	6%	22%	88	9%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	4	1%	50%	4	1%	50%	8	1%
Male Total	264	40%	55%	219	64%	45%	483	48%
Female / 18-24	15	2%	45%	18	5%	55%	33	3%
Female / 25-34	56	9%	70%	24	7%	30%	80	8%
Female / 35-49	107	16%	76%	34	10%	24%	141	14%
Female / 50-64	91	14%	72%	36	10%	28%	127	13%
Female / 65+	119	18%	92%	11	3%	8%	130	13%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	4	1%	67%	2	1%	33%	6	1%
Female Total	392	60%	76%	125	36%	24%	517	52%
TOTAL	656		66%	344		34%	1000	

REGION	LANDLINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Northeast	38	6%	73%	14	4%	27%	52	5%
Yorks & Humber	41	6%	68%	19	6%	32%	60	6%
East Midlands	52	8%	63%	31	9%	37%	83	8%
Eastern	33	5%	72%	13	4%	28%	46	5%
London	57	9%	40%	85	25%	60%	142	14%
South East	128	20%	77%	39	11%	23%	167	17%
South West	79	12%	77%	24	7%	23%	103	10%
West Midlands	48	7%	59%	33	10%	41%	81	8%
North West	70	11%	72%	27	8%	28%	97	10%
Wales	26	4%	65%	14	4%	35%	40	4%
Scotland	74	11%	71%	30	9%	29%	104	10%
Northern Ireland	10	2%	63%	6	2%	38%	16	2%
Refused to answer	0	0%	0%	9	3%	100%	9	1%
TOTAL	656	100%	66%	344	100%	34%	1000	100%

TABLE 18: Final Counts United States

GENDER / AGE	LANDLINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	5	1%	6%	78	6%	94%	83	4%
Male / 25-34	8	1%	5%	139	12%	95%	147	7%
Male / 35-49	48	6%	26%	138	11%	74%	186	9%
Male / 50-64	93	12%	37%	158	13%	63%	251	13%
Male / 65+	145	18%	61%	93	8%	39%	238	12%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	2	0%	11%	17	1%	89%	19	1%
Male Total	301	38%	33%	623	52%	67%	924	46%
Female / 18-24	2	0%	3%	62	5%	97%	64	3%
Female / 25-34	20	3%	18%	91	8%	82%	111	6%
Female / 35-49	64	8%	31%	140	12%	69%	204	10%
Female / 50-64	151	19%	50%	152	13%	50%	303	15%
Female / 65+	245	31%	70%	107	9%	30%	352	18%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	17	2%	40%	26	2%	60%	43	2%
Female Total	499	62%	46%	578	48%	54%	1077	54%
TOTAL	800		40%	1201		60%	2001	

LANGUAGE	LANDLINE	Language (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Language (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Language (%)
ENGLISH	795	99%	41%	1139	95%	59%	1934	97%
SPANISH	5	1%	7%	62	5%	93%	67	3%
TOTAL	800	100%	40%	1201	100%	60%	2001	100%

REGION	LANDLINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELLPHONE	Region (%)	Cellphone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
North East	157	20%	43%	205	17%	57%	362	18%
North Central	215	27%	46%	253	21%	54%	468	23%
South	286	36%	37%	478	40%	63%	764	38%
West	142	18%	35%	265	22%	65%	407	20%
TOTAL	800	100%	40%	1201	100%	60%	2001	100%

Data Processing and Integration

In order to facilitate an efficient data integration process across countries, SSRS developed a standardized data map to be utilized by all the international partners when structuring their data in ASCII format. Once the integrated data were compiled, an independent checking of all variables was carried out to ensure that all variables were accurately constructed. Raw data were also run against clean data and reviewed as a further verification of valid codes and skip patterns. Country-specific data processing procedures carried out by SSRS and each of the international partners are described below. As described in the Data Memo provided to all partners in August, 2016, additional quality control checks were performed on the final data, as needed. The memo included a description of checks for internal data consistency, trending, and modal differences (for Switzerland).

USA and Canada

Data file preparation began soon after the study entered the field. Data were checked using multiple methods including a “data cleaning” procedure in which data processors recreated CATI skips pattern instructions in order to ensure that all variables were created correctly and had the appropriate number of cases. This procedure involved a check of raw data by a program that consisted of instructions derived from the skip patterns designated on the questionnaire. The program confirmed that data were consistent with the definitions of codes and ranges and matched the appropriate bases of all questions. In addition, the project director conducted an independent check to confirm that all variables were created correctly, had the correct number of cases, and were coded according to specifications. Lastly, raw data were run against clean data and reviewed as a further verification of valid codes and skip patterns.

Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom, and the Netherlands

An interim data check of the skip pattern and filter logics was performed at 10%, 50% and 100% of the completed interviews by EFG’s research team. These data were also checked by SSRS’s back-end data processor and the SSRS team using the generated ASCII data file created according to the data map and the data cleaning and quality check procedure described above.

France and Germany

Data processing and preparation was handled by the data manager and the data processing (DP) team. Data was cleaned and skip patterns were reviewed in order to ensure that all variables were created correctly and the counts matched our CATI system. Data integrity checks were performed by the data team. Independent checking of the SPSS variables was made by the data manager, project and field managers. A senior data analyst finalized the checking ensuring that all cases were coded according to the specifications and aligned in the appropriate columns (for the ASCII file). These data were also checked by SSRS’s back-end data processor and the SSRS team using the generated ASCII data file created according to the data map and the data cleaning and quality check procedure described above.

Norway

The survey programming was implemented by a senior programmer with over ten years of experience at Norstat. The CATI programming was further checked by a project manager and a field manager. Finally, a senior programmer checked all of the SPSS variables. These data were also checked by SSRS's back-end data processor and the SSRS team using the generated ASCII data file created according to the data map and the data cleaning and quality check procedure described above.

Sweden

The data processing procedure was outlined and tested in with preliminary data in April. After feedback from SSRS regarding the output format of the ASCII-file the procedure was updated and finalized. When the field period was closed all remaining data were checked. The following procedures were performed:

- Cleaning of the variables from the CATI-system, server and registry
- The following variables were added from the registry: Q617, Q665
- The following variables were included: Q500, Q600, Q600a, Q630, Q742, Q743, Q750,
- Calculation of interview length based on time stamps
- Independent control in SPSS and Excel for the created variables
- ASCII-conversion of the data-file

These data were also checked by SSRS's back-end data processor and the SSRS team using the generated ASCII data file created according to the data map and the data cleaning and quality check procedure described above.

Switzerland

Data control checks by the project manager were carried out on preliminary and final data by the LINK Institut.

These data were also checked by SSRS's back-end data processor and the SSRS team using the generated ASCII data file created according to the data map and the data cleaning and quality check procedure described above.

RESPONSE RATES

The response rates for this study (shown in Tables 19-23 below) were calculated using AAPOR's RR3. The detailed summary table for Switzerland is shown at the end of this section as Switzerland used an address/registry based design.

TABLE 19: Response Rates by Country by Frame

	Landline	Cell phone	Total
Australia	23.7%	27.8%	25.4%
Canada	23.1%	16.9%	21.4%
France	24.5%	26.8%	25.2%
Germany	27.0%	26.6%	26.9%
Netherlands	32.4%	32.4%	32.4%
New Zealand	35.2%	23.4%	31.1%
Norway	10.6%	11.0%	10.9%
Sweden	17.6%	16.4%	16.9%
Switzerland	N/A	N/A	46.9%
United Kingdom	26.1%	13.9%	21.9%
United States	19.4%	17.2%	18.1%

TABLE 20: Landline Response Rates by Country

	Australia	Canada	France	Germany	Netherlands
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)					
Complete	3052	3317	763	636	783
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)					
Refusal and breakoff	5744	5847	1657	1244	1206
Break off	0	1416	0	0	0
Answering machine	0	1189	0	0	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	6	71	0	0	1
Language problem	91	604	0	0	36
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)					
Always busy	1616	190	0	0	145
No answer	2029	2525	713	512	127
Answering machine-don't know if household	1654	1339	0	0	241
Call blocking	0	20	0	0	0
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	0	93	0	0	0
No screener completed	0	20	0	0	0
Deleted interview	0		0	0	0
Not eligible (Category 4)					
Fax/data line	381	798	16	26	77
Non-working number	2097	13512	24	53	983
Business, government office, other organizations	480	903	28	79	319
No eligible respondent	0	223	0	0	0
Quota filled	0	0	0	0	0
Deleted interview	0	2	0	0	82
Total phone numbers used	17150	32069	3201	2550	4000
Response Rate 3	23.7%	23.1%	24.5%	27.0%	32.4%

TABLE 20 Cont'd: Landline Response Rates by Country

	New Zealand	Norway	Sweden	United Kingdom	United States
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)					
Complete	646	277	2697	656	800
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)					
Refusal and breakoff	1013	1565	4436	1114	1875
Break off	0	77	669	0	349
Answering machine	0	0	239	255	469
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	3	0	741	3	21
Language problem	9	0	338	22	116
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)					
Always busy	51	0	124	151	879
No answer	83	848	8083	274	2685
Answering machine-don't know if household	185	0	0	218	1281
Call blocking	0	0	0	0	17
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	0	0	0	0	58
No screener completed	0	0	92	0	28
Deleted interview	0	0	0		
Not eligible (Category 4)					
Fax/data line	31	0	0	68	997
Non-working number	1456	39	3080	593	35682
Business, government office, other organizations	123	0	0	146	600
No eligible respondent	0	65	6	0	72
Quota filled	0	307	0	0	0
Deleted interview	0	0	0	0	1
Total phone numbers used	3600	3178	20505	3500	45929
Response Rate 3	35.2%	10.6%	17.6%	26.1%	19.4%

TABLE 21: Cellphone Response Rates by Country

	Australia	Canada	France	Germany	Netherlands
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)					
Complete	2196	1230	340	364	444
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)					
Refusal and breakoff	662	320	82	681	154
Break off	444	551	211	18	71
Answering machine	0	138	0	0	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	1	4	0	0	0
Language problem	0	25	0	0	0
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)					
Always busy	979	213	0	0	79
No answer	935	2052	21	218	65
Answering machine-don't know if household	1327	2302	88	71	68
Call blocking	0	3	0	0	0
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	2331	5128	568	32	515
No screener completed	0	32	0	0	0
Deleted interview	0		0	0	0
Not eligible (Category 4)					
Fax/data line	25	46	0	4	8
Non-working number	2199	22378	22	12	471
Business, government office, other organizations	200	573	0	19	84
No eligible respondent	1	594	41	31	0
Quota filled	0	0	0	0	0
Deleted interview	0	0	0	0	41
Total phone numbers used	11300	35588	1373	1450	2000
Response Rate 3	27.8%	16.9%	26.8%	26.6%	32.4%

TABLE 21 Cont'd: Cellphone Response Rates by Country

	New Zealand	Norway	Sweden	United Kingdom	United States
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)					
Complete	354	816	4427	344	1201
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)					
Refusal and breakoff	119	0	6271	329	488
Break off	75	813	1200	343	689
Answering machine	0	0	2954	0	55
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	0	226	0	11
Language problem	0	0	397	0	32
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)					
Always busy	76	0	835	273	87
No answer	59	3049	11516	261	716
Answering machine-don't know if household	193	0	0	290	4760
Call blocking	0	0	0	0	89
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	747	4677	0	875	4193
No screener completed	0	0	94	0	3
Deleted interview	0	1	0		
Not eligible (Category 4)					
Fax/data line	26	0	0	18	81
Non-working number	567	151	1244	751	13282
Business, government office, other organizations	84	0	0	14	542
No eligible respondent	0	491	90	2	923
Quota filled	0	403	0	0	0
Deleted interview	0	0	0	0	0
Total phone numbers used	2300	10401	29254	3500	27152
Response Rate 3	23.4%	11.0%	16.4%	13.9%	17.2%

TABLE 22: Total Response Rates by Country

	Australia	Canada	France	Germany	Netherlands
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)					
Complete	5248	4547	1103	1000	1227
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)					
Refusal and breakoff	6406	6167	1739	1925	1360
Break off	444	1967	211	18	71
Answering machine	0	1327	0	0	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	7	75	0	0	1
Language problem	91	629	0	0	36
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)					
Always busy	2595	403	0	0	224
No answer	2964	4577	734	730	192
Answering machine-don't know if household	2981	3641	88	71	309
Call blocking	0	23	0	0	0
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	2331	5221	568	32	515
No screener completed	0	52	0	0	0
Deleted interview	0	0	0	0	0
Not eligible (Category 4)					
Fax/data line	406	844	16	30	85
Non-working number	4296	31313	46	65	1454
Business, government office, other organizations	680	1476	28	98	403
No eligible respondent	1	5394	41	31	0
Quota filled	0	0	0	0	0
Deleted interview	0	2	0	0	123
Total phone numbers used	28450	67657	4574	4000	6000
Response Rate 3	25.4%	21.4%	25.2%	26.9%	32.4%

TABLE 22 Cont'd: Total Response Rates by Country

	New Zealand	Norway	Sweden	United Kingdom	United States
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)					
Complete	1000	1093	7124	1000	2001
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)					
Refusal and breakoff	1132	1565	10707	1443	2363
Break off	75	890	1869	343	1038
Answering machine	0	0	3193	255	524
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	3	0	967	3	32
Language problem	9	0	735	22	148
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)					
Always busy	127	0	959	424	966
No answer	142	3897	19599	535	3401
Answering machine-don't know if household	378	0	0	508	6041
Call blocking	0	0	0	0	106
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	747	4677	0	875	4251
No screener completed	0	0	186	0	31
Deleted interview	0	1	0	0	0
Not eligible (Category 4)					
Fax/data line	57	0	0	86	1078
Non-working number	2023	190	4324	1344	45563
Business, government office, other organizations	207	0	0	160	1142
No eligible respondent	0	556	96	2	4396
Quota filled	0	710	0	0	0
Deleted interview	0	0	0	0	1
Total phone numbers used	5900	13579	49759	7000	73081
Response Rate 3	31.1%	10.9%	16.9%	21.9%	18.1%

TABLE 23: Total Response Rate for Switzerland

Switzerland	
Total records	3282
Ineligibles ⁶	38
Valid sample	3244
Completes	1520
Response Rate	46.9%

⁶ Corresponds to cases that were categorized as (a) not a household, (b) not age 18+, (c) bad address, (d) deceased respondent, and (e) cases where it is confirmed that neither postal address nor their phone number is working.

WEIGHTING

Data from each country were weighted to ensure the final outcome was representative of the adult population. The weighting procedure accounted for the sample design and probability of selection, as well as systematic non-response across known population parameters. To the extent possible, the weighting procedure replicated the 2013 weighting protocol.⁷

Overview by Country

Australia

Survey data for Australia were weighted by region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, urban status (major city or not), within New South Wales, Victoria, and the rest of Australia. The total sample for Australia was also weighted by phone status (cell phone only or not) and the New South Wales sample was weighted by Primary Health Networks (PHNs). Data were weighted to reflect the demographic composition according to the following sources:

- Gender, age, region, educational attainment, and urban-status were generated using the Australian Bureau of Statistics TableBuilder function, based on 2014 Census data.
- Educational attainment was generated using the Australian Bureau of Statistics TableBuilder function, based on the 2015 Census data. Because data are available only for 15 to 74 year olds, adjustments were made to remove the 15 to 17 year olds and include the 75 plus year olds in the population estimates.
- Phone-status was originally derived from the Australia Communications and Media Authority's Communications Report 2010–11 Series Report 2. Because the weighted estimate of phone-status after post-stratification of the above variables, was off by more than +/-5% of the original estimate, phone-status was further post-stratified using a projected estimate based off of ITU 2014 mobile usage subscriptions.
- PHN for New South Wales was derived using a Postal Area 2011 to Primary Health Networks 2015 report from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- The over-representation of NSW and Victoria in the overall Australian data.

Canada

Survey data for Canada were weighted by age-by-gender, educational attainment, and phone-status (cell phone only or not) within each of the ten largest provinces (Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia). Data were weighted for knowledge of official language within Quebec and Canada as a whole. Additionally, data were then weighted to reflect Canada's overall geographic distribution, by provinces and territories.

⁷ In all countries except the US, Canada, and the UK, information for cell phone only population estimates is no longer being updated. For these countries, SSRS reviewed the natural fall out of cell phone only status and its relationship to the projected cell phone only status estimated by SSRS using the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) 2014 mobile usage subscription as a proxy. Where there is a difference by more than +/- 5% from the projected estimate, a weighting adjustment has been made to smooth out potential bias, if any.

- Population parameters were derived from the Canada 2011 Census.
- Phone status was derived from the 2013 Residential Telephone Service Survey (RTSS), for Canada as a whole and for all ten provinces in particular. For each geographic unit, the cell-phone only percentage indicated in the data was a projected estimate based off of ITU 2014 mobile usage subscriptions.

France

Survey data for France were weighted by region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, and phone status (cell phone only or not) to reflect the demographic composition according to the following sources:

- Gender and age are based on the 2016 French Census conducted by the Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE).
- Region is based on 2012 data from the INSEE.
- Education was based on data from the 2014 INSEE's Employment Survey for the age 15 plus segment of the population.
- Phone use was based on the 2011 European Social Survey (ESS) and further projected based off of ITU 2014 mobile usage subscriptions.

Germany

Survey data for Germany were weighted by region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, and household size to reflect the demographic composition based on Statistisches Bundesamt 2014 data.

The Netherlands

Survey data for The Netherlands were weighted by region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment to reflect the demographic composition according to the following sources:

- Region was based on Statistics Netherland's 2013 Population.
- Gender and age were based on Statistics Netherland's 2015 Population.
- Education was based on Statistics Netherland's 2015 and extrapolated to include just those 18 years or older.

New Zealand

Survey data for New Zealand were weighted by region (in four groups), age-by-gender, and educational attainment to reflect the demographic composition based on data from the 2013 Census of Population and Dwellings, provided to SSRS by Statistics New Zealand.

Norway

Survey data for Norway were weighted by region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment, to reflect the demographic composition according to the following sources:

- Gender, age and region were based on Statistic Norway's tabulation for "Population by Age, Sex, Marital Status and Citizenship, 1 January 2016."

- Education was based on Statistics Norway’s tabulation for “Population 16 Years and Over, by Level of Education, Gender and Age” for 2014.⁸

Sweden

Survey data for Sweden were weighted by region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment, to reflect the demographic composition according to the following sources:

- Gender, age, and region were based on Statistics Sweden’s 2015 Population.
- Education was based on Statistic Sweden’s tabulation of “Population 16 to 95+ Years of Age by Region, Level of Education, Age and Sex,” for 2014, excluding 16 and 17 year olds.

Switzerland

Survey data for Switzerland were weighted by region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment to reflect the demographic composition according to the sources identified below. Additionally, data were weighted to represent the proportion of respondents with and without a phone number in the Swedish registry by linguistic region (German, French, and Italian speaking).

- Phone number match to the registry by linguistic region from the official figures from the Statistic Office for the adult population in the Swiss Registry.
- Gender, age, and region (Canton) from Statistics Switzerland data for 2015.
- Education from Statistics Switzerland 2014.

United Kingdom

Survey data for the UK were weighted by region, age-by-gender, and phone status (cell phone only or not) to reflect the demographic composition according to the following sources:

- Gender, age and region were based on the 2014 Censuses for England and Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland.
- Education for England and Wales is based off the Qualifications Gained Data for the 2014 Neighborhood Statistics; for Scotland data and for Northern Ireland the data were derived from 2011 Census data.
- Phone status was derived from Q1 2015 Communications Market Report by Ofcom for UK as a whole. The cell-phone only percentage indicated in the data was increased by a factor demonstrated by the change in growth in mobile subscriptions from ITU-D (ITU) telecommunications indicators for 2015 to account for the likely change over the time elapsed since data collection.

⁸ Estimates were adjusted to account for the fact that the total were for the 16 and older population, rather than 18 or older. Since the 16 to 17 year old population is almost exclusively “high school or less,” its inclusion in the estimates is likely to inflate the estimated share of the population at that educational attainment level. To address this, the overall share of 16 and 17 year olds within the 16 to 19 year old was estimated and those cases removed from the estimated population totals.

United States

Survey data for the United States were weighted by Census region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, number of adults in the household, race/ethnicity, insurance status (insured vs. not insured) and phone status (cell phone only, landline only, dual user) to reflect the demographic composition according to the following sources:

- Gender, age, region, education, race/ethnicity, insurance status and household size were based on the 2015 U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) March supplement.
- Phone status was based on the July-December 2015 estimates from the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS).

Detailed Weighting Procedures by Country ⁹

Australia

The weighting procedure for Australia needed to address several issues:

1. The over-representation of New South Wales in the overall Australian data.
2. The over-representation of Victoria in the overall Australian data.
3. The need to accurately represent the overall Australian adult population as well as the overall adult New South Wales and Victoria populations for province-specific analyses.
4. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a. The number of adults in the household, since in households reached by landline only one adult was selected, respondents living in multiple-adult households had a lower probability of selection.
 - b. The types of phone selected respondents answer: respondents whose households answer both landlines and cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those answering just one mode.
5. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

- 1&2. The NSW, Victoria, and all remaining Australia data were weighted separately, so that each of these subsamples (NSW, Victoria, other) accurately represented the population.
3. To address concerns about probability of selection:
 - a. Within Household Correction (WHC): Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with 2 or more adults received a weight of 2. Those living in single adult households, received a weight of 1. Since no selection was done in cell phone households, the probability of selection there was 1.
 - b. Dual-Usage Correction (DUC): Adults answering both landlines and cell phones received a weight of 0.5. Those answering only a single mode, received a weight of 1.
4. The sample was weighted to balance the number of completed interviews by Primary Health Network (PHN) in New South Wales. This weight was calculated as the percent of the

⁹ Missing data for gender, age and other variables were imputed using a Hot Deck procedure prior to raking.

population living in each PHN divided by the percentage of completed interviews attained in each PHN.

5. A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC X (PHN (for NSW) or 1 (for all other provinces)).
6. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, each subsample (NSW, Victoria, other) underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near zero. Tables 24 and 25 below compare the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for NSW, and Australia as a whole.

Parameters used for the Australian sample were state, age-by-gender, educational attainment, urban status (major city or not) and phone status (cell phone only or not).

Population parameters were derived from the following sources:

- Gender, age, and region were generated using the Australian Bureau of Statistics TableBuilder function, based on the 2014 Census data.
 - Educational attainment was generated using the Australian Bureau of Statistics TableBuilder function, based on the 2015 Census data. Because data are available only for 15 to 74 year olds, adjustments were made to remove the 15 to 17 year olds and include the 75 plus year olds in the population estimates.
 - Urban-status was generated using the Australian Bureau of Statistics TableBuilder function, based on the 2011 Census data
 - Within Victoria, Health Region was included in the post-stratification. This estimate was calculated as the percent of the population living in each health region divided by the percentage of completed interviews attained in each region. These were also collapsed further into rural and three urban areas.
 - Phone-status was originally derived from the Australia Communications and Media Authority's Communications Report 2010–11 Series Report 2. Because the weighted estimate of phone-status, after post-stratification of the above variables, was off by more than +/-5% of the original estimate, phone-status was further adjusted within the post-stratification using a projected estimate based off of ITU 2014 mobile usage subscriptions since there are no more updates of the original estimate.
7. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.
 8. Geographic representation: In the final weighting step, the NSW and Victoria weights were decreased and the remaining weights increased so that the share of NSW and Victoria responses reflect the share of NSW and Victoria among Australian adults and the share of other states likewise reflect their share of the adult population.

TABLE 24: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for total Australia and Australia Excluding NSW and Victoria

	AUS Total- Unweighted	AUS Total -Weighted	AUS Total - Adults	Non-NSW/VIC- Unweighted	Non- NSW/VIC - Weighted	Non- NSW/VIC - Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 18-24	4%	7%	6%	4%	8%	6%
Male 25-34	9%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Male 35-49	15%	14%	13%	15%	14%	13%
Male 50-64	12%	11%	12%	14%	11%	12%
Male 65+	9%	8%	9%	10%	7%	9%
Female 18-24	4%	7%	6%	3%	7%	6%
Female 25-34	10%	10%	9%	7%	10%	9%
Female 35-49	14%	13%	13%	14%	13%	13%
Female 50-64	13%	11%	12%	13%	11%	12%
Female 65+	11%	9%	10%	10%	8%	10%
Education						
High School or Less	33%	47%	47%	39%	49%	48%
Some Post-Secondary	26%	27%	28%	21%	29%	29%
University Degree or more	41%	26%	25%	40%	23%	23%
Urban Status						
Major City	58%	71%	70%	53%	70%	68%
Not Major City	42%	29%	30%	47%	30%	32%
Phone Status						
Cell Phone Only	8%	29%	29%	-	-	-
Region/Strata						
NSW	73%	32%	32%	-	-	-
Victoria	19%	25%	25%	-	-	-
Queensland	4%	19%	20%	51%	45%	46%
South Australia	2%	8%	7%	20%	19%	17%
Western Australia	2%	11%	11%	19%	25%	25%
Tasmania	1%	3%	2%	6%	6%	5%
Northern Territory	<1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%
Australian Capital Territory	<1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	4%

**TABLES 25: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for
NSW and VICTORIA**

	NSW- Unweighted	NSW- Weighted	NSW- Adults	Victoria- Unweighted	Victoria- Weighted	Victoria- Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 18-24	4%	6%	6%	5%	8%	6%
Male 25-34	8%	10%	9%	10%	11%	10%
Male 35-49	15%	13%	13%	16%	13%	13%
Male 50-64	11%	11%	12%	12%	10%	11%
Male 65+	9%	9%	9%	8%	8%	9%
Female 18-24	3%	6%	6%	5%	7%	6%
Female 25-34	10%	10%	9%	11%	11%	10%
Female 35-49	15%	13%	13%	12%	12%	13%
Female 50-64	14%	12%	12%	12%	11%	12%
Female 65+	11%	10%	11%	10%	10%	10%
Education						
High School or Less	33%	48%	47%	32%	45%	45%
Some Post-Secondary	26%	25%	27%	27%	27%	26%
University Degree or more	41%	27%	27%	41%	28%	29%
Urban Status						
Major City	61%	71%	71%	48%	75%	73%
Not Major City	39%	30%	30%	52%	25%	28%
PHN Strata						
Central and Eastern Sydney	11%	21%	21%	-	-	-
Hunter New England and Central Coast	11%	17%	17%	-	-	-
Murrumbidgee	10%	3%	3%	-	-	-
Nepean Blue Mountains	9%	5%	5%	-	-	-
North Coast	10%	7%	7%	-	-	-
Northern Sydney	10%	12%	12%	-	-	-
South Eastern NSW	10%	8%	8%	-	-	-
South Western Sydney	10%	11%	12%	-	-	-
Western NSW	10%	4%	4%	-	-	-
Western Sydney	10%	12%	12%	-	-	-
Health Regions						
Rural	-	-	-	49%	22%	23%
N. & W. Metro. (Urban)	-	-	-	16%	30%	29%
S. Metro. (Urban)	-	-	-	13%	21%	21%
E. Metro. (Urban)	-	-	-	12%	16%	17%

Canada

Survey data for Canada were weighted by age-by-gender, educational attainment, and phone-status (cell phone only or not) within each of the ten largest provinces (Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia). Data were weighted for knowledge of official language within Quebec and Canada as a whole. Additionally, data were then weighted to reflect Canada's overall geographic distribution, by provinces and territories.

The weighting needed to address several issues:

1. Over- and under-representation of provinces as a result of sample design.
2. The need to accurately represent overall adult Canadian population as well as the overall adult populations in the ten largest provinces.
3. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a. The number of adults in the household, since in households reached by landline only one adult was selected, respondents living in multiple-adult households had a lower probability of selection.
 - b. The types of phone selected respondents answer: respondents whose households answer both landlines and cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those answering just one mode.
4. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

- 1/2. Data for each of ten provinces were weighted separately, so that each subsample accurately represented the corresponding population.
3. To address concerns about probability of selection:
 - a. Within Household Correction (WHC): Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with 2 or more adults received a weight of 2. Those living in single adult households, received a weight of 1. Since no selection was done in cell phone households, the probability of selection there was 1.
 - b. Dual-Usage Correction (DUC): Adults answering both landlines and cell phones received a weight of 0.5. Those answering only a single mode, received a weight of 1.
 - c. A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC.

Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, each subsample (Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia) underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near zero. Tables 26 to 31 below compare the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Quebec, Ontario, Alberta, and Canada as a whole.

Parameters used for the Canadian sample were province, age-by-gender, educational attainment, knowledge of official languages (only within Quebec and on Canada as a whole), and phone status (cell phone only or not). Population parameters (with the exception of phone status) were derived from the Canada 2011 Census. SSRS obtained population estimates from Statistics Canada for the adult population (age 18 or older) for each of the ten provinces and for Canada as a whole. Data were provided for Canada as a whole and, specifically, for all ten provinces.

Phone status was derived from the 2013 Residential Telephone Service Survey (RTSS), for Canada as a whole and for all ten provinces in particular. For each geographic unit, the cell-phone only percentage indicated in the data was a projected estimate based off of ITU 2014 mobile usage subscriptions and 2014 Canada Survey of Household Spending.

4. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.
5. Geographic representation: In the final weighting step, the weights were decreased and or increased as necessary so that the share of each province reflected the share of that province among Canadian adults.

TABLE 26: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island

	NL- Unweighted	NL- Weighted	NL- Adults	PEI- Unweighted	PEI- Weighted	PEI- Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 18-24	2%	4%	5%	3%	5%	6%
Male 25-34	3%	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%
Male 35-49	9%	11%	13%	7%	12%	13%
Male 50-64	14%	16%	15%	13%	15%	14%
Male 65+	13%	9%	9%	15%	9%	9%
Female 18-24	3%	5%	5%	3%	5%	6%
Female 25-34	4%	6%	7%	5%	7%	7%
Female 35-49	13%	15%	14%	10%	14%	14%
Female 50-64	22%	17%	15%	22%	15%	15%
Female 65+	19%	11%	10%	19%	11%	10%
Education						
High School or Less	31%	46%	49%	36%	45%	45%
Some Post-Secondary	27%	38%	37%	17%	36%	37%
University Degree or more	42%	16%	14%	47%	19%	18%
Phone Status						
Cell Phone Only	10%	11%	12%	15%	13%	14%

TABLE 27: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick

	NS- Unweighted	NS- Weighted	NS- Adults	NB- Unweighted	NB- Weighted	NB- Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 18-24	2%	5%	6%	4%	6%	5%
Male 25-34	3%	5%	7%	5%	7%	7%
Male 35-49	9%	13%	13%	7%	11%	13%
Male 50-64	11%	14%	14%	14%	16%	14%
Male 65+	12%	9%	9%	11%	9%	9%
Female 18-24	3%	6%	6%	2%	5%	5%
Female 25-34	3%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%
Female 35-49	11%	14%	14%	10%	12%	14%
Female 50-64	21%	16%	15%	25%	16%	15%
Female 65+	26%	12%	11%	18%	11%	10%
Education						
High School or Less	38%	44%	44%	35%	49%	50%
Some Post-Secondary	22%	36%	36%	23%	35%	34%
University Degree or more	41%	20%	20%	42%	17%	16%
Phone Status						
Cell Phone Only	10%	18%	18%	8%	13%	13%

TABLE 28: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Ontario and Quebec

	QC- Unweighted	QC- Weighted	QC- Adults	ON- Unweighted	ON- Weighted	ON- Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 18-24	2%	5%	6%	2%	6%	6%
Male 25-34	4%	7%	8%	5%	7%	8%
Male 35-49	10%	12%	13%	9%	14%	14%
Male 50-64	14%	14%	14%	13%	14%	13%
Male 65+	10%	9%	8%	11%	9%	8%
Female 18-24	2%	5%	6%	1%	4%	6%
Female 25-34	8%	8%	8%	5%	7%	8%
Female 35-49	13%	14%	13%	12%	14%	15%
Female 50-64	21%	15%	14%	22%	15%	14%
Female 65+	16%	11%	10%	21%	11%	10%
Education						
High School or Less	33%	43%	41%	29%	43%	43%
Some Post-Secondary	14%	36%	39%	17%	30%	33%
University Degree or more	53%	21%	19%	54%	27%	25%
Language						
English Only	3%	6%	5%	-	-	-
French Only	44%	49%	48%	-	-	-
Both	52%	45%	48%	-	-	-
Phone Status						
Cell Phone Only	11%	17%	18%	11%	21%	23%

TABLE 29: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Manitoba and Saskatchewan

	MB- Unweighted	MB- Weighted	MB- Adults	SK- Unweighted	SK- Weighted	SK- Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 18-24	2%	5%	6%	3%	6%	7%
Male 25-34	7%	9%	8%	5%	9%	9%
Male 35-49	9%	13%	13%	12%	13%	12%
Male 50-64	11%	14%	13%	12%	14%	13%
Male 65+	11%	9%	8%	14%	9%	8%
Female 18-24	4%	6%	6%	2%	6%	6%
Female 25-34	5%	6%	9%	8%	9%	9%
Female 35-49	12%	14%	14%	11%	13%	13%
Female 50-64	16%	14%	13%	15%	13%	13%
Female 65+	25%	10%	10%	19%	11%	10%
Education						
High School or Less	38%	52%	50%	35%	50%	50%
Some Post-Secondary	20%	28%	31%	24%	34%	34%
University Degree or more	42%	20%	19%	41%	17%	16%
Phone Status						
Cell Phone Only	7%	15%	19%	16%	21%	22%

TABLE 30: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Alberta and British Columbia

	AB- Unweighted	AB- Weighted	AB- Adults	BC- Unweighted	BC- Weighted	BC- Adults
Gender by Age						
Male 18-24	5%	7%	6%	2%	6%	6%
Male 25-34	6%	10%	10%	4%	6%	8%
Male 35-49	10%	15%	14%	10%	13%	13%
Male 50-64	14%	13%	13%	13%	14%	13%
Male 65+	14%	7%	6%	17%	9%	9%
Female 18-24	2%	6%	6%	2%	4%	5%
Female 25-34	6%	9%	10%	5%	8%	8%
Female 35-49	14%	15%	14%	10%	14%	14%
Female 50-64	14%	12%	12%	17%	15%	14%
Female 65+	16%	7%	7%	23%	11%	10%
Education						
High School or Less	29%	43%	43%	28%	42%	42%
Some Post-Secondary	21%	35%	35%	23%	34%	35%
University Degree or more	50%	22%	22%	49%	24%	23%
Phone Status						
Cell Phone Only	19%	22%	22%	15%	22%	24%

TABLE 31: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Canada as a whole

	Canada-Unweighted	Canada-Weighted	Canada-Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	2%	5%	6%
Male 25-34	4%	7%	8%
Male 35-49	9%	13%	13%
Male 50-64	13%	14%	13%
Male 65+	12%	9%	8%
Female 18-24	2%	5%	6%
Female 25-34	6%	8%	8%
Female 35-49	12%	14%	14%
Female 50-64	20%	14%	14%
Female 65+	20%	10%	10%
Education			
High School or Less	32%	44%	43%
Some Post-Secondary	19%	33%	35%
University Degree or more	50%	23%	22%
Language			
English Only	66%	69%	69%
French Only	10%	12%	12%
Both	25%	19%	19%
Region/Strata			
Newfoundland and Labrador	6%	2%	2%
Prince Edward Island	6%	<1%	<1%
Nova Scotia	6%	3%	3%
New Brunswick	6%	2%	2%
Quebec	22%	24%	24%
Ontario	33%	38%	38%
Manitoba	6%	3%	3%
Saskatchewan	6%	3%	3%
Alberta	6%	11%	11%
British Columbia	6%	13%	13%
Territories	<1%	<1%	<1%

France

The weighting procedure for France addressed several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall adult French population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a. The number of adults in the household, since in households reached by landline only one adult was selected, respondents living in multiple-adult households had a lower probability of selection.
 - b. The types of phone selected respondents answer: respondents whose households answer both landlines and cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those answering just one mode.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

1. To address concerns about probability of selection:
 - a. Within Household Correction (WHC): Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with 2 or more adults received a weight of 2. Those living in single adult households, received a weight of 1. Since no selection was done in cell phone households, the probability of selection there was 1.
 - b. Dual-Usage Correction (DUC): Adults answering both landlines and cell phones received a weight of 0.5. Those answering only a single mode, received a weight of 1.
 - c. A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC.
2. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, the sample underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near zero. Table 32 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for France as a whole. Parameters used for the French sample were region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, and phone status (cell phone only or not). Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
 - Gender and age are based on the 2016 French Census conducted by the Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE).
 - Region is based on 2012 data from the INSEE.
 - Education was based on data from the 2014 INSEE's Employment Survey for the age 15 plus segment of the population.
 - Phone status (cell phone only or not) was adjusted as it was not within +/- 5% of the projected estimate based off of ITU 2014 mobile usage subscriptions.
4. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.

TABLE 32: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for France

	France-Unweighted	France-Weighted	France-Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	6%	5%	5%
Male 25-34	8%	8%	8%
Male 35-49	13%	12%	12%
Male 50-64	12%	12%	12%
Male 65+	10%	11%	10%
Female 18-24	6%	5%	5%
Female 25-34	9%	8%	8%
Female 35-49	14%	12%	13%
Female 50-64	12%	13%	13%
Female 65+	11%	14%	14%
Education			
High School or Less	21%	37%	38%
Some Post-Secondary	50%	49%	48%
University Degree or more	29%	14%	14%
Phone Status			
Cell Phone Only	4%	12%	14%
Region/Strata			
Alsace, Champagne-Ardenne, Lorraine	9%	9%	9%
Aquitaine Limousin Poitou-Charentes	9%	9%	9%
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes	14%	12%	12%
Bourgogne, Franche-Comté	4%	4%	4%
Bretagne	6%	5%	5%
Centre, Val de Loire	4%	4%	4%
Corse	1%	1%	1%
Île-de-France	15%	18%	18%
Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées	10%	9%	9%
Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Picardie	8%	9%	9%
Normandie	4%	5%	5%
Pays de la Loire	6%	6%	6%
Provence-Alpes, Côte-d'Azur	9%	8%	8%

Germany

The weighting procedure for Germany addressed several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall adult German population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a. The number of adults in the household, since in households reached by landline only one adult was selected, respondents living in multiple-adult households had a lower probability of selection.
 - b. The types of phone selected respondents answer: respondents whose households answer both landlines and cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those answering just one mode.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

1. To address concerns about probability of selection:
 - a. Within Household Correction (WHC): Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with 2 or more adults received a weight of 2. Those living in single adult households, received a weight of 1. Since no selection was done in cell phone households, the probability of selection there was 1.
 - b. Dual-Usage Correction (DUC): Adults answering both landlines and cell phones received a weight of 0.5. Those answering only a single mode, received a weight of 1.
 - c. A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC.
2. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, the sample underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near zero. Table 33 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Germany as a whole. Parameters used for the German sample were region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, and household-size. Gender, age, education, region and household size were based on Statistisches Bundesamt 2014 data.
3. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.

TABLE 33: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Germany

	Germany-Unweighted	Germany -Weighted	Germany -Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	6%	5%	5%
Male 25-34	8%	8%	8%
Male 35-49	13%	13%	12%
Male 50-64	12%	13%	13%
Male 65+	10%	11%	11%
Female 18-24	5%	4%	4%
Female 25-34	8%	8%	7%
Female 35-49	13%	12%	12%
Female 50-64	12%	13%	13%
Female 65+	13%	14%	14%
Education			
High School or Less	59%	49%	48%
Some Post-Secondary	29%	23%	23%
University Degree or more	12%	28%	29%
Household Size			
Single-Person Household	34%	25%	25%
Multiple-Person HH	66%	75%	75%
Region/Strata			
Schleswig-Holstein	5%	4%	3%
Hamburg	4%	2%	2%
Bremen	2%	1%	1%
Niedersachsen	9%	10%	10%
Nordrhein-Westfalen	22%	22%	22%
Rheinland-Pfalz	5%	5%	5%
Saarland	1%	1%	1%
Hessen	6%	7%	7%
Baden-Württemberg	12%	13%	13%
Bayern	14%	15%	16%
Berlin	4%	4%	4%
Mecklenburg- Vorpommern	3%	2%	2%
Brandenburg	4%	3%	3%
Sachsen-Anhalt	3%	3%	3%
Thüringen	3%	3%	3%
Sachsen	4%	5%	5%

The Netherlands

The weighting procedure for The Netherlands addressed several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall adult Dutch population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a. The number of adults in the household, since in households reached by landline only one adult was selected, respondents living in multiple-adult households had a lower probability of selection.
 - b. The types of phone selected respondents answer: respondents whose households answer both landlines and cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those answering just one mode.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

1. To address concerns about probability of selection:
 - a. Within Household Correction (WHC): Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with 2 or more adults received a weight of 2. Those living in single adult households, received a weight of 1. Since no selection was done in cell phone households, the probability of selection there was 1.
 - b. Dual-Usage Correction (DUC): Adults answering both landlines and cell phones received a weight of 0.5. Those answering only a single mode, received a weight of 1.
 - c. A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC.
3. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, the sample underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near zero. Table 34 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for The Netherlands as a whole. Parameters used for the Netherlands sample were region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
 - Gender, age, and region were based on Statistics Netherland's 2015 Population Dynamics; Birth, Death and Migration Per Region report.
 - Education was based on Statistics Netherland's 2015 and extrapolated to include just those 18 years or older.
3. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.

TABLE 34: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the Netherlands

	Netherlands-Unweighted	Netherlands -Weighted	Netherlands -Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	6%	5%	6%
Male 25-34	10%	8%	8%
Male 35-49	11%	13%	13%
Male 50-64	12%	13%	13%
Male 65+	10%	10%	10%
Female 18-24	3%	5%	5%
Female 25-34	6%	8%	8%
Female 35-49	15%	13%	13%
Female 50-64	13%	13%	13%
Female 65+	13%	12%	12%
Education			
High School or Less	29%	33%	33%
Some Post-Secondary	42%	40%	39%
University Degree or more	28%	28%	28%
Region/Strata			
Drenthe	3%	3%	3%
Flevoland	3%	2%	2%
Friesland	4%	4%	4%
Gelderland	13%	12%	12%
Groningen	3%	3%	3%
Limburg	8%	7%	7%
Noord-Brabant	16%	15%	15%
Noord-Holland	14%	16%	16%
Overijssel	7%	7%	7%
Utrecht	8%	7%	7%
Zeeland	2%	2%	2%
Zuid-Holland	19%	21%	21%

New Zealand

The weighting procedure for New Zealand addressed several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall New Zealand adult population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a. The number of adults in the household, since in households reached by landline only one adult was selected, respondents living in multiple-adult households had a lower probability of selection.
 - b. The types of phone selected respondents answer: respondents whose households answer both landlines and cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those answering just one mode.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

1. To address concerns about probability of selection:
 - a. Within Household Correction (WHC): Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with 2 or more adults received a weight of 2. Those living in single adult households, received a weight of 1. Since no selection was done in cell phone households, the probability of selection there was 1.
 - b. Dual-Usage Correction (DUC): Adults answering both landlines and cell phones received a weight of 0.5. Those answering only a single mode, received a weight of 1.
 - c. A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC.
2. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, the sample underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near zero. Table 35 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for New Zealand as a whole. Parameters used for New Zealand sample were region (in 4 groups), age-by-gender, and educational attainment. Gender, age, region and education for the population 18 or older were based on data from the 2013 Census of Population and Dwellings, provided to SSRS by Statistics New Zealand.
3. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.

TABLE 35: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for New Zealand

	New Zealand -Unweighted	New Zealand -Weighted	New Zealand -Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	6%	7%	6%
Male 25-34	9%	8%	8%
Male 35-49	12%	13%	13%
Male 50-64	10%	11%	12%
Male 65+	9%	8%	9%
Female 18-24	3%	6%	6%
Female 25-34	8%	8%	8%
Female 35-49	17%	14%	14%
Female 50-64	16%	14%	13%
Female 65+	10%	10%	10%
Education			
High School or Less	6%	18%	20%
Some Post-Secondary	63%	59%	59%
University Degree or more	31%	23%	21%
Region/Strata			
Auckland	30%	32%	33%
North	26%	26%	26%
Central	16%	16%	17%
South	28%	25%	24%

Norway

The weighting procedure for Norway addressed several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall adult Norwegian population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a. The number of adults in the household, since in households reached by landline only one adult was selected, respondents living in multiple-adult households had a lower probability of selection.
 - b. The types of phone selected respondents answer: respondents whose households answer both landlines and cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those answering just one mode.
 - c. Age distribution adjustment due to over representation of 50 plus age targeted sample within the listed frame.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

1. To address concerns about probability of selection:
 - a. Within Household Correction (WHC): Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with 2 or more adults received a weight of 2. Those living in single adult households, received a weight of 1. Since no selection was done in cell phone households, the probability of selection there was 1.
 - b. Dual-Usage Correction (DUC): Adults answering both landlines and cell phones received a weight of 0.5. Those answering only a single mode, received a weight of 1.
 - c. Age-targeted Distribution Correction (ADC): Sample was over-represented within the 50 plus segments.
 - d. A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC X ADC.
2. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, the sample underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near zero. Table 36 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Norway as a whole. Parameters used for the Norway sample were region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
 - Gender, age and region were based on Statistic Norway's tabulation for "Population by Age, Sex, Marital Status and Citizenship, 1 January 2016."
 - Education was based on Statistics Norway's tabulation for "Population 16 Years and Over, by Level of Education, Gender and Age" for 2014.¹⁰

¹⁰ The estimates were adjusted to account for the fact that the total were for the 16 and older population, rather than 18 or older. Since the 16 to 17 year old population is almost exclusively "high school or less," its inclusion in the estimates is likely to inflate the estimated share of the population at that educational attainment level. To address this, the overall share of 16 and 17 year olds within the 16 to 19 year old was estimated and those cases removed from the estimated population totals.

- Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.

TABLE 36: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Norway

	Norway-Unweighted	Norway - Weighted	Norway - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	3%	6%	6%
Male 25-34	5%	9%	9%
Male 35-49	8%	14%	14%
Male 50-64	15%	12%	12%
Male 65+	14%	10%	10%
Female 18-24	3%	6%	6%
Female 25-34	5%	8%	9%
Female 35-49	11%	13%	13%
Female 50-64	16%	12%	11%
Female 65+	19%	11%	11%
Education			
High School or Less	44%	67%	68%
Some Post-Secondary	30%	24%	23%
University Degree or more	26%	10%	9%
Region/Strata			
Østfold	6%	6%	6%
Akershus	11%	11%	11%
Oslo	13%	13%	13%
Hedmark	3%	4%	4%
Oppland	4%	4%	4%
Buskerud	5%	5%	5%
Vestfold	4%	5%	5%
Telemark	3%	3%	3%
Aust-Agder	2%	2%	2%
Vest-Agder	4%	3%	3%
Rogaland	9%	9%	9%
Hordaland	10%	10%	10%
Sogn og Fjordane	2%	2%	2%
Møre og Romsdal	5%	5%	5%
Sør-Trøndelag	6%	6%	6%
Nord-Trøndelag	3%	3%	3%
Nordland	5%	5%	5%
Troms	3%	3%	3%
Finmark	1%	1%	1%

Sweden

The weighting procedure for Sweden addressed several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall adult Swedish population.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a. The number of adults in the household, since in households reached by landline only one adult was selected, respondents living in multiple-adult households had a lower probability of selection.
 - b. The types of phone selected respondents answer: respondents whose households answer both landlines and cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those answering just one mode.
 - c. Over- and under-representation of regions due to sample design.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

1. To address concerns about probability of selection:
 - Within Household Correction (WHC): Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with 2 or more adults received a weight of 2. Those living in single adult households, received a weight of 1. Since no selection was done in cell phone households, the probability of selection there was 1.
 - Dual-Usage Correction (DUC): Adults answering both landlines and cell phones received a weight of 0.5. Those answering only a single mode, received a weight of 1.
 - Strata-based Correction (SBC): Adjust for the over and under representation of the sample within strata.
 - A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC X SBC.
1. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, the sample underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near zero. Table 37 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Sweden as a whole. Parameters used for the Sweden sample were region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
 - Gender, age, and region were based on Statistics Sweden's 2015 counts.
 - Education was based on Statistic Sweden's tabulation of "Population 16-95+ Years of Age by Region, Level of Education, Age and Sex," for 2014, excluding 16 and 17 year olds.
2. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 5.

TABLE 37: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Sweden

	Sweden - Unweighted	Sweden - Weighted	Sweden - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	3%	6%	6%
Male 25-34	5%	9%	9%
Male 35-49	7%	12%	12%
Male 50-64	9%	11%	11%
Male 65+	24%	12%	11%
Female 18-24	2%	5%	5%
Female 25-34	3%	8%	8%
Female 35-49	7%	12%	12%
Female 50-64	10%	11%	11%
Female 65+	30%	14%	13%
Education			
High School or Less	61%	66%	66%
Some Post-Secondary	6%	13%	14%
University Degree or more	33%	20%	20%
Region/Strata			
Stockholm county	8%	22%	22%
Uppsala county	4%	4%	4%
Södermanland county	4%	3%	3%
Östergötland county	4%	5%	5%
Jönköping county	4%	4%	4%
Kronoberg county	4%	2%	2%
Kalmar county	4%	3%	2%
Gotland county	3%	1%	1%
Blekinge county	4%	2%	2%
Skåne county	8%	13%	13%
Halland county	5%	3%	3%
Västra Götaland county	8%	17%	17%
Värmland county	4%	3%	3%
Örebro county	4%	3%	3%
Västmanland county	4%	3%	3%
Dalarna county	4%	3%	3%
Gävleborg county	4%	3%	3%
Västernorrland county	4%	3%	3%
Jämtland county	4%	1%	1%
Västerbotten county	4%	3%	3%
Norrbottn county	4%	3%	3%

Switzerland

The weighting procedure for Switzerland addressed several issues:

1. The need to correctly represent the proportion of respondents with and without a phone number match to the registry by linguistic region (German, French, and Italian speaking).
2. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

1. The sample was weighted to balance the number of completed interviews with and without a phone match in the registry by linguistic region (German, French, and Italian speaking). Data were weighted to the breakdown in the sampling frame (Statistics, Switzerland, 2015).

TABLE 38: Linguistic Region Base-Weight

Linguistic Region	Statistics Switzerland (%)	Data (%)	Weight
German with phone	38.9	33.7	0.87
German without phone	14.1	37.7	2.66
French with phone	19.9	10.8	0.54
French without phone	6.7	13.3	1.99
Italian French with phone	15.1	1.9	0.13
Italian French without phone	5.3	2.6	0.49

2. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, the sample underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near zero. Table 39 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Switzerland as a whole. Parameters used for the Switzerland sample were region (Canton), age-by-gender, and educational attainment. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
 - Phone number match to the registry by linguistic region from the official figures from the Statistic Office for the adult population in the Swiss Registry.
 - Genr, age, and region (Canton) from Statistics Switzerland data for 2015.
 - Education from Statistics Switzerland 2014.
3. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.

TABLE 39: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Switzerland

	Switzerland - Unweighted	Switzerland - Weighted	Switzerland - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	4%	4%	4%
Male 25-34	7%	8%	8%
Male 35-49	14%	13%	13%
Male 50-64	14%	13%	13%
Male 65+	11%	10%	10%
Female 18-24	5%	4%	4%
Female 25-34	7%	8%	8%
Female 35-49	13%	13%	13%
Female 50-64	15%	13%	13%
Female 65+	11%	12%	12%
Education			
High School or Less	63%	68%	68%
Some Post-Secondary	8%	13%	14%
University Degree or more	29%	19%	18%
Linguistic Region by Phone			
German with phone	39%	38%	34%
French with phone	20%	12%	11%
Italian with phone	15%	3%	2%
German without phone	14%	33%	38%
French without phone	7%	12%	13%
Italian without phone	5%	2%	3%

TABLE 39 cont'd: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Switzerland

Region/Strata	Switzerland - Unweighted	Switzerland - Weighted	Switzerland - Adults
Zürich	13%	18%	18%
Bern	9%	12%	12%
Luzern	4%	5%	5%
Uri	<1%	<1%	<1%
Schwyz	1%	2%	2%
Obwalden	<1%	<1%	<1%
Nidwalden	1%	<1%	1%
Glarus	1%	<1%	<1%
Zug	1%	1%	1%
Fribourg	4%	4%	4%
Solothurn	2%	3%	3%
Basel-Stadt	2%	2%	2%
Basel-Landschaft	3%	3%	3%
Schaffhausen	1%	1%	1%
Appenzell Ausserrhoden	1%	1%	1%

The United Kingdom

The weighting procedure for the United Kingdom addressed several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall adult UK population
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a. The number of adults in the household, since in households reached by landline only one adult was selected, respondents living in multiple-adult households had a lower probability of selection.
 - b. The types of phone selected respondents answer: respondents whose households answer both landlines and cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those answering just one mode.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these concerns the following steps were taken:

1. To address concerns about probability of selection:
 - a. Within Household Correction (WHC): Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with 2 or more adults received a weight of 2. Those living in single adult households, received a weight of 1. Since no selection was done in cell phone households, the probability of selection there was 1.
 - b. Dual-Usage Correction (DUC): Adults answering both landlines and cell phones received a weight of 0.5. Those answering only a single mode, received a weight of 1.

- c. A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC.
2. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, the sample underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near 0. Table 40 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for the UK as a whole.

Parameters used for the UK sample were region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, and phone status (cell phone only or not). Population parameters were derived from the following sources:

- Gender, age and region were based on the 2014 Censuses for England and Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland.
 - Education for England and Wales is based off the Qualifications Gained Data for the 2014 Neighborhood Statistics; for Scotland data and for Northern Ireland the data were derived from 2011 Census data.
 - Phone status was derived from Q1 2015 Communications Market Report by Ofcom for UK as a whole. The cell-phone only percentage indicated in the data was increased by a factor demonstrated by the change in growth in mobile subscriptions from ITU-D (ITU) telecommunications indicators for 2015 to account for the likely change over the time elapsed since data collection.
3. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.

TABLE 40: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the UK

	UK - Unweighted	UK - Weighted	UK - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	8%	6%	6%
Male 25-34	10%	8%	9%
Male 35-49	12%	12%	13%
Male 50-64	10%	11%	11%
Male 65+	9%	10%	10%
Female 18-24	3%	6%	6%
Female 25-34	8%	8%	9%
Female 35-49	14%	13%	13%
Female 50-64	13%	11%	12%
Female 65+	13%	12%	12%
Education			
High School or Less	49%	56%	55%
Some Post-Secondary	24%	16%	16%
University Degree or more	26%	28%	28%
Phone Status			
Cell Phone Only	9%	16%	16%
Region/Strata			
Northeast	5%	4%	4%
Yorks & Humber	6%	8%	8%
East Midlands	8%	7%	7%
East	5%	9%	9%
London	14%	13%	13%
South East	17%	14%	14%
South West	10%	8%	9%
West Midlands	8%	9%	9%
North West	10%	11%	11%
Wales	4%	5%	5%
Scotland	10%	8%	8%
Northern Ireland	2%	3%	3%

The United States

The weighting procedure for the United States addressed several issues:

1. The need to accurately represent the overall adult US population
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
 - a) Probability of Selection (phone number): A phone number's probability of selection depends on the number of phone-numbers selected out of the total sample frame. So for each landline number this is calculated as total landline numbers dialed divided by total numbers in the landline frame and conversely for the cell phone numbers this is calculated as total cell phone numbers divided by total numbers in the cell phone frame.
 - b) Probability of Contact: The probability that the sampling unit (households on landlines or respondents on cell phone) will be reached is a product of the number of phones (by type) a respondent or their household answer.
 - c) Probability of Respondent selection: In households reached by landline, a single respondent is selected. Thus, the probability of selection within a household is inversely related to the number of adults in the household.

Total Probability of Selection: This is calculated as the phone number's probability of selection (by frame), multiplied by the number of devices of each type the respondent answers, and for landlines, divided by the number of adults in the household.¹¹ The sample weights derived at this stage are calculated as the inverse of the probability of selection.

3. Post-stratification weighting: With the base-weight applied, the sample underwent iterative proportional fitting (IPF or 'raking'), a procedure in which the data are repeatedly balanced to match the known marginal distribution of population parameters. This procedure was repeated until the total differences between the weighted sample and the population parameters and the weighed data were near 0. Table 41 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for the US as a whole.

Parameters used for the US sample were Census region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, number of adults in the household, race/ethnicity, insurance status (insured vs. not insured) and phone status (cell phone only, landline only, dual user). Population parameters were derived from the following sources:

- Gender, age, region, education, race/ethnicity, insurance status and household size were based on the 2015 U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) March supplement.
 - Phone status was based on the January-June 2015 estimates from the NHIS.
4. Weight truncation ('trimming'): To reduce variance caused by extremely large weights, the weights were truncated to a range of 0.2 to 4.

¹¹ To avoid extremely large or small weights, the maximum number of devices for each type of phone, and the maximum number of adults was capped at 3.

TABLE 41: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the US

	US - Unweighted	US - Weighted	US - Adults
Gender by Age			
Male 18-24	4%	6%	6%
Male 25-34	8%	9%	9%
Male 35-49	10%	12%	12%
Male 50-64	13%	13%	12%
Male 65+	12%	8%	8%
Female 18-24	3%	6%	6%
Female 25-34	6%	9%	9%
Female 35-49	11%	13%	13%
Female 50-64	16%	13%	13%
Female 65+	18%	10%	10%
Education			
Less than High School	7%	12%	12%
High School	23%	34%	34%
Some Post-Secondary	32%	25%	25%
University Degree or more	38%	29%	29%
Phone Status			
Cell Phone Only	37%	49%	49%
Landline Only	5%	6%	6%
Both	58%	45%	45%
Region/Strata			
Northeast	18%	18%	18%
Midwest	23%	21%	21%
South	38%	37%	37%
West	20%	23%	23%
Ethnicity			
White non-Hispanic	70%	65%	66%
Black non-Hispanic	11%	12%	12%
Hispanic	11%	15%	15%
Other non-Hispanic	8%	8%	8%
Household Size			
1 adult HH	33%	17%	17%
2 adult HH	45%	53%	53%
3+ adult HH	22%	30%	30%
Insurance Status			
Insured	91%	84%	85%
Uninsured	9%	15%	15%

Design Effect and Margin of Sampling Error

Weighting procedures increase the variance in the data, with larger weights causing greater variance. Complex survey designs and post-data collection statistical adjustments affect variance estimates and, as a result, tests of significance and confidence intervals. These are weight-adjusted margins-of-error for countries and targeted regions. The margins of error reported apply to estimates of 50%, for smaller or larger estimates, the margin of sampling error will be smaller. Sampling error is only one type of error that could affect survey outcomes.

TABLE 42: Design Effect and Margin of Error by Country

	Design Effect	Margin of Error
Australia	5.17	3.08
NSW	1.96	2.22
Victoria	1.94	4.32
Rest of Australia	1.82	6.51
Canada	2.48	2.29
Newfoundland	1.99	8.68
Prince Edward Island	1.97	8.69
Nova Scotia	1.95	8.60
New Brunswick	1.82	8.34
Quebec	2.02	4.40
Ontario	1.99	3.57
Manitoba	1.85	8.36
Saskatchewan	1.77	8.22
Alberta	1.81	8.02
British Columbia	1.92	8.52
France	1.61	3.75
Germany	1.51	3.80
Netherlands	1.19	3.05
New Zealand	1.52	3.82
Norway	1.62	3.77
Sweden	2.52	1.84
Switzerland	1.62	3.20
UK	1.39	3.65
US	1.53	2.71

DELIVERABLES

Preliminary

SSRS delivered preliminary weighted SPSS and set of four banners to The Commonwealth Fund.

Final

SSRS delivered the following to the Commonwealth Fund and sponsoring organizations: (1) final weighted SPSS dataset, (2) final weighted all-country and country-specific banners in Microsoft Word and Excel format, (3) final methodology report, (4) a memo on the final survey data and trends, (5) final versions of the questionnaires in English as well as the translated versions, (6) final created variable and banner specification memos, and (7) a memo outlining the weighting procedures.