

# INTERNATIONAL HEALTH POLICY SURVEY 2020 METHODOLOGY REPORT

Prepared by:

Robyn Rapoport, Rob Manley, Sarah Glancey, Christian Kline, & Jonathan Best



OCTOBER 2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents .....	2
OVERVIEW.....	6
TABLE 1: Total Number of Interviews Conducted in Each Country.....	7
SAMPLING METHODS .....	8
TABLE 2: Total Interviews by Sampling Frame.....	9
Sample Generation by Country .....	9
Australia and New Zealand .....	9
Canada.....	10
France, the Netherlands and the UK.....	10
Germany.....	11
Norway .....	11
Sweden.....	12
Switzerland.....	12
United States.....	12
Household and Respondent Selection .....	13
DATA COLLECTION.....	14
Questionnaire Review, Translations and Cultural Adaptations .....	14
Programming and Testing.....	15
Pretesting.....	15
TABLE 3: Summary of Pretest Interviews by Country.....	16
Field Procedures .....	17
Field Period.....	17
TABLE 4: Field Period Per Country.....	17
Survey Length and Language of Interview.....	17
TABLE 5: Language/s and Length of Interview per Country .....	17
Training Materials and Interviewer Training.....	18
In Person Visits to GDCC and Leger.....	18
Call Rule, Contact Attempts, Refusal Avoidance and Conversion Strategies .....	19
Australia, Canada, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, the UK, and the US (RDD Sample) .....	19
Germany.....	19
Norway .....	20

Sweden and Switzerland .....	20
TABLE 6: Sweden Contact Schedule.....	20
TABLE 7: Switzerland Contact Schedule .....	21
United States (ABS Sample) .....	21
TABLE 8: US ABS Contact Schedule .....	22
Field Monitoring .....	22
Weekly and Periodic Updates .....	23
Final Counts.....	23
TABLE 9: Final Counts Australia – Main Sample.....	24
TABLE 10: Final Counts Australia – New South Wales Oversample.....	25
TABLE 11: Final Counts Canada .....	26
TABLE 11 cont’d: Final Counts Canada .....	27
TABLE 12: Final Counts France .....	28
TABLE 12 cont’d: Final Counts France.....	29
TABLE 13: Final Counts Germany.....	30
TABLE 13 cont’d: Final Counts Germany.....	31
TABLE 14: Final Counts Netherlands.....	32
TABLE 14 cont’d: Final Counts Netherlands.....	32
TABLE 15: Final Counts New Zealand.....	33
TABLE 16: Final Counts Norway.....	34
TABLE 17: Final Counts Sweden.....	35
TABLE 18: Final Counts Switzerland .....	36
TABLE 18 cont’d: Final Counts Switzerland .....	37
TABLE 19: Final Counts United Kingdom.....	38
TABLE 20: Final Counts United States .....	39
Data Processing and Integration.....	40
RESPONSE RATES .....	41
TABLE 21: Response Rates by Country by Frame .....	41
TABLE 22: Landline Response Rates by Country.....	42
TABLE 22 Cont’d: Landline Response Rates by Country .....	43
TABLE 23: Cellphone Response Rates by Country .....	44
TABLE 23 Cont’d: Cellphone Response Rates by Country.....	45
TABLE 24: ABS Response Rate for Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States .....	45

WEIGHTING.....	46
TABLE 25: Post-Stratification Parameters per country .....	46
Detailed Weighting Procedures by Country.....	47
Australia .....	47
TABLE 26: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for total Australia and Australia Excluding NSW.....	49
TABLE 27: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for NSW.....	50
Canada.....	51
TABLE 28: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island .....	52
TABLE 29: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.....	53
TABLE 30: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Ontario and Quebec .....	54
TABLE 31: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Manitoba and Saskatchewan .....	55
TABLE 32: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Alberta and British Columbia .....	55
TABLE 33: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Canada as a whole .....	56
France.....	57
TABLE 34: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for France.....	58
Germany.....	59
TABLE 35: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Germany.....	60
The Netherlands .....	61
TABLE 36: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the Netherlands.....	62
New Zealand .....	63
TABLE 37: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for New Zealand .....	64
Norway .....	65
TABLE 38: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Norway .....	66
Sweden.....	67
TABLE 39: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Sweden.....	67
Switzerland.....	68
TABLE 40: Linguistic Region Base-Weight.....	68

TABLE 41: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Switzerland.....	69
The United Kingdom.....	70
TABLE 42: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Wales and Scotland .....	71
TABLE 43: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Northern Ireland and the Rest of the UK.....	72
TABLE 44: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the UK .....	73
The United States.....	74
TABLE 45: US RDD Stratification Adjustment.....	75
TABLE 46: US ABS Stratification Adjustment.....	76
TABLE 47: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the US .....	77
Design Effect and Margin of Sampling Error.....	78
TABLE 48: Design Effect and Margin of Error by Country .....	79
COVID-19 Supplemental Questions.....	80
Overview .....	80
Completes by Country.....	81
TABLE 49: Total Interviews in COVID-Supplement by Sampling Frame.....	81
Weighting.....	81
Design Effect and Margin of Sampling Error.....	82
TABLE 50: Design Effect and Margin of Error by Country .....	82
DELIVERABLES.....	83
Preliminary .....	83
Final.....	83
Appendix I .....	84
ABS Experimentation in the US.....	84
TABLE 51: ABS Experimentation .....	84

## 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 two decades. In a triennial cycle, the IHP survey targets different populations, including physicians, older adults, and the general adult population. The population for the 2020 survey is adults, age 18 and older.

The Commonwealth Fund and other country partners contracted with SSRS to oversee all aspects of survey administration for the 2020 IHP survey conducted among adults in Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand (NZ), Norway, the United Kingdom (UK), and the United States (US). SSRS fielded the survey in the US and collaborated with fieldwork partners to field the survey in other countries. Specifically, SSRS partnered with: Global Data Collection Company (GDCC) to field the survey in France, the Netherlands, and the UK; Leger to field the survey in Canada; Norstat to field the survey in Norway; and TKW Research Group (TKW) to field the survey in Australia and New Zealand. SSRS also provided project oversight and data integration for Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland. Germany contracted with Info GmbH to manage the data collection process and field the survey instrument in Germany. Sweden contracted with Statistics Sweden to manage the data collection process and field the instrument in Sweden. Switzerland contracted with M.I.S. Trend to do the same in Switzerland.

For all countries, the survey was conducted with a nationally representative sample of adults, age 18 and older. Surveys were conducted via landline and mobile telephone in most countries. In Sweden, Switzerland, and the US, the majority of interviews were completed online. Fieldwork took place between February 21 and May 26, 2020<sup>1</sup>.

Notably, data collection for the 2020 IHP Survey took place during the COVID-19 pandemic. In early to mid-March 2020, SSRS and the Commonwealth Fund discussed the potential advantages and disadvantages of either delaying the fieldwork for IHP 2020 or moving ahead as planned due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Taking into account that data collection had started in most countries at that point, the consensus was to continue fielding the IHP 2020 survey.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On May 26, 2020, the SSRS team pulled data based on completes to date to be used by the Fund's team for the Health Affairs article on IHP 2020. At this time, data collection was complete in France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, and the US. Australia, Canada and the UK continued in field until September 2, 2020 to obtain additional completes needed for regional and provincial oversamples. Additional information on these oversamples is included in the addendum at the end of this document.

<sup>2</sup> Prior to making this decision, SSRS reviewed each question in the questionnaire to determine which, if any, could potentially be affected by the pandemic. After review, we found only a few questions that would be more susceptible to effects by fielding during this time (e.g., Q1105, Q1110). Since the vast majority of questions in the survey are retrospective, the team anticipated responses would be less affected by the pandemic than they would be if they were more attitudinal. Additional information on this can be found in the COVID-19 Supplemental Questions section of this report.

The 2020 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
- Mental health needs and experiences
- Social service needs and experiences
- Overall views of the health care system
- Experiences during COVID-19 pandemic

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 <sup>3</sup>	2,201
Canada <sup>4</sup>	5,089
France	3,028
Germany	1,004
Netherlands	753
New Zealand	1,003
Norway	607
Sweden	2,513
Switzerland	2,284
UK <sup>5</sup>	1,991
US	2,488

This report is organized into six sections. The first section discusses the sample design. The next section describes data collection and fielding. The final four sections address the response rate to the survey, weighting procedures, the COVID-19 questionnaire supplement, and project deliverables.

<sup>3</sup> In Australia, data collection continued until September 2, 2020 and finished in the field with N=2,893 completes.

<sup>4</sup> In Canada, data collection continued until August 24, 2020 and finished in the field with N=7,753 completes.

<sup>5</sup> In the UK, data collection continued until June 29, 2020 and finished in the field with N=2,090 completes.

## SAMPLING METHODS

The target population for IHP 2020 was adults age 18 and older. The sampling approach for each country was aimed at obtaining a nationally representative sample of the target population by utilizing a probability design. 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., people with no telephone – landline or cell) differ systematically from those in the sample frame.

In Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the UK, a random digit dial (RDD) overlapping frame telephone design was used to obtain all completes. A portion of the US completes were also obtained using an overlapping frame telephone design. Random digit dial-based telephone interviewing has been a mainstay for survey data collection in the US and internationally for decades, given its coverage of the vast majority of the population, the ability to easily administer probability-based random-sampling and the ease of administration of complex survey instruments by phone. The overlapping-frame approach allows us to reach respondents who receive most of their calls on cell phones and are far less likely to be reached on a landline and produced a more nationally representative sample of respondents, age 18 and older.

For the US, a hybrid Address-Based Sampling (ABS) frame/RDD sample was used. The ABS was stratified to target areas with lower mean household incomes, as well as areas of high Hispanic incidence. In addition, a random subsample of cases flagged as 65+ only were purged prior to mailing to help increase the representation of younger respondents. In the RDD frame, both the landline and cell samples were disproportionately stratified to help reach more low-income respondents by oversampling telephone numbers in exchanges and rate centers associated with lower income households. The cell sample also included an oversample of prepaid phones, which are more often used by lower income and minority populations.

Interviews in Norway were completed using a sample list, similar to previous years, which covered approximately 75% of the general population. Sweden and Switzerland both used population-based registries to draw their sample.

**TABLE 2: Total Interviews by Sampling Frame**

	Landline	LL (%)	Cell phone	CELL (%)	ABS	ABS (%)	Total
Australia	615	28%	1,586	72%	-	-	2,201
Canada	2,506	49%	2,583	51%	-	-	5,089
France	1,117	37%	1,911	63%	-	-	3,028
Germany	496	49%	508	51%	-	-	1,004
Netherlands	225	30%	528	70%	-	-	753
New Zealand	252	25%	751	75%	-	-	1,003
Norway	22	4%	585	96%	-	-	607
Sweden	-	-	-	-	2,513	100%	2,513
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	2,284	100%	2,284
United Kingdom	822	41%	1,169	59%	-	-	1,991
United States <sup>6</sup>	86	3%	419	17%	1,983	80%	2,488

## Sample Generation by Country

### *Australia and New Zealand*

For Australia, including the NSW and Victoria oversamples<sup>7</sup>, landline and cell phone random digit dial (RDD) samples were drawn by Sample Solutions<sup>8</sup>. The landline RDD 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 was 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 two to four random numbers, which leads to a more efficient usage of higher populated numbering blocks. This sample was stratified by Australia's eight regions to ensure geographic representativeness. The selection of mobile RDD sample uses roughly the same approach as landline RDD sample in Australia. Notably, geographic information is not available for any mobile sample in Australia; however, for the most part, number ranges or blocks are given to specific providers. Thus, when selecting the sample, the shares of each provider for the entire market are balanced to ensure that all providers have proper representation. Often the blocks consist of too many unknown values (N>8) where a pure random generation of numbers would lead to a very low working rate. Therefore, a seed analysis is used in which residential or business listings are leveraged to more efficiently generate active phone numbers. Those phone numbers are then used as seeds and added with the provider information. Hereafter the seeds with N=2 unknowns are taken from the database and a random 2-digit value is added to that.

Sample Solutions also 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 and was stratified by New

<sup>6</sup> Among the RDD completes (N=505), 17% were completed via landline and 83% were completed with cell phones.

<sup>7</sup> The overall final sample for Australia also included an oversample of the Victoria population to complete an additional 690 interviews. These data were not included in the data presented in the Health Affairs article, as data collection for this oversample began after these data were delivered. More information on the Victoria oversample is included in an Addendum.

<sup>8</sup> More information about Sample Solutions can be found at: <https://sample.solutions/>

Zealand's 16 regions + Chatham Islands. Number blocks are four-digits long throughout the country, so no adjustments to block-size were required. Sample Solutions utilized electronic verification to filter out many non-working numbers. Using a standardized procedure, the landline RDD sample was pulsed in order to improve productivity. The RDD cell phone sampling in New Zealand is essentially the same as in Australia. Cell phone numbers have a length of eight to nine digits of which the first two digits indicate the service provider. All cell numbers are generated and stored in a single database from which a random selection is taken. Sample Solutions uses an electronic number verification procedure to filter out invalid phone numbers to improve sample efficiency.

### ***Canada***

For Canada as a whole, as well as Canadian oversample interviews<sup>9</sup>, landline and cell phone samples were drawn using RDD sample to ensure the most complete coverage and representation possible.

Sample for Canada was provided by Dynata, a premier global provider of sampling solutions. Dynata starts with the most recent monthly Telcordia TPM (Terminating Point Master) Data file. This is Telcordia's master file of NPA-NXX and Block-ID records for the North American Numbering Plan. The file of 1,000-blocks is sorted by Province, Carrier name, and 1,000-block. The intent is to provide a stratification that will yield a sample that is representative, both geographically and by large and small wireless carriers. A sampling interval is determined by dividing the universe of eligible 1,000-blocks by the desired sample size. From a random start within the first sampling interval, a systematic nth selection of 1,000-blocks is performed and a 3-digit random number between 000 and 999 is appended to each selected 1,000-block system. Deduplication is standard against Dynata's Canadian Business file. Additional deduplication against Do-Not-Call Preference files was performed. For sampling, landline numbers ported to wireless are included in the landline RDD frame.

### ***France, the Netherlands and the UK***

SSRS's sampling partner, Sample Solutions, provided landline and mobile phone RDD samples for France, the Netherlands and the UK. 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. The RDD landline sample for France was generated using the national numbering plan provided by The Autorité de Régulation des Communications Électroniques et des Postes, an independent French agency in charge of regulating telecommunications in France. The RDD landline frame for Netherlands was generated using the national numbering plan provided by the Ministry of Economic Affairs. The RDD landline frame for United Kingdom was generated using the national numbering plan provided by The Office of Communications (Ofcom), London, the British Federal Network Agency.

Based on the numbering plan for each country, Sample Solutions developed a probabilistic design for pulling "seed" blocks using a list of active phone numbers from which actual phone numbers were generated (stratified by official regions according to the population distribution).

---

<sup>9</sup> A total of 1,000 interviews were completed as part of the Commonwealth Fund's interviews in Canada. Canada-based oversample interviews were completed to reach a minimum N=250 in each Canadian province and territory, N=1,000 in Quebec, and N=1,500 in Ontario.

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. For the mobile sample, Sample Solutions identified mobile providers used for residential services and excluded those used for commercial sample. The mobile sample was sorted by amount of allocated numbering blocks. Starting blocks are provided by telecommunication authorities, in this case the cell phone numbers have a length of 9 digits, of which the first 2 or 3 digits indicate the service provider. Cell numbers are subdivided into blocks of 100 numbers each, and random digits are appended to each block in order to create a seed. The last 2 digits are randomized. Upon reaching the target completes in Wales for the UK oversample, sample from mobile providers with the least likelihood of including subscribers in Scotland and Northern Ireland were suppressed in order to help boost productivity due to the lower than anticipated incidence of respondents in those countries. Using a standardized procedure, the landline and mobile RDD sample were pulsed in order to improve productivity.

### *Germany*

Sample for Germany was sourced from the ADM sampling system (ADM master sample and ADM lock file). The ADM master sample contains more than 100 million randomly generated telephone numbers according to the ADM standard, covering all German landline numbers that may be assigned. This ensures that even households that have no entry in public telephone directories can be included in the sample. Such numbers for which the holder has declared to an ADM institute that he/she never wishes to be called in connection with a survey are recorded in the ADM block file and blocked in the selection basis. In accordance with their probability assignment, private and business telephone numbers are each marked in the ADM master sample. Numbers marked as "business" are excluded from the sample from the outset.

The mobile phone sample was taken from the corresponding ADM selection basis, which contains all possibly allocated mobile phone numbers in all area codes approved by the Federal Network Agency.

The stratification of the sample was carried out primarily according to the official zoning (in this case according to federal states, administrative districts, counties, independent cities, etc.) and on the BIK community types. Within the respective sample strata, an unrestricted proportional random selection was made from all available telephone numbers. According to DESTATIS (2018), 98.8% of private households in Germany have either a landline or a cell phone number.

### *Norway*

In Norway, landline and cell phone sample was drawn by Norstat using Data Factory AS. Approximately 75% of the general population in Norway<sup>10</sup> was covered by this frame. The generation of the landline and mobile RDD frame was randomly selected from the Data Factory list of known phone numbers. The population that was not covered in the sample are comprised of people:

1. With secret phone numbers<sup>11</sup>
2. Who have no identifying information attached to their number (e.g., age, gender, region)

---

<sup>10</sup> Population coverage is somewhat higher among older adults and lower among younger adults in Norway.

<sup>11</sup> Approximately 1% of the Norwegian population has a secret number.

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.

### *Sweden*

The sample frame for Sweden utilized The Total Population Registry (RTB). The RTB is comprised of 8,265,724 individuals and covers 99% of the Swedish population. Five variables were used to stratify this sample frame: degree of urbanization (three groups), Swedish/foreign background (two groups), level of education (three groups), and age (five groups). Together, this totaled 90 strata. A stratified, simple random sample of 9,041 potential respondents was drawn from the sample frame, so all units within a stratum had the same probability of being included in the sample.

### *Switzerland*

The sample source corresponded to data from the nationwide registry per the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (SFSO). This registry covers nearly 100% of the Swiss population and is updated on a quarterly basis. The sample was stratified by the three linguistic regions (German, French, Italian speaking). The cantons of Valais and Basel Stadt were oversampled and extracted separately as their own strata, for a total of five strata.

### *United States*

Three different sample frames were used for US data collection. Most of the interviews were conducted from address-based sample (ABS). Additionally, we used a dual frame random digit dial sample (DFRDD) to reach people either on a landline or a cell phone. Details about the sample frames and sampling procedures are below.

#### *ABS*

ABS sample was generated from the United States Postal Service (USPS) Computerized Delivery Sequence File (CDSF). The CDSF is a computerized file that contains information on all delivery addresses serviced by the USPS, with the exception of general delivery. The CDSF is updated weekly and contains home and apartment addresses as well as Post Office boxes and other types of addresses for mail delivery. We included in the sample all residential records with the exception of addresses coded as vacant, seasonal (vacation), and PO boxes other than those defined as OWGM (only way to get mail). The CDSF, which contains over 135 million residential addresses, covers nearly 100% of all households in the U.S., and is licensed by SSRS’s sister company Marketing Systems Group (MSG).

To produce the ABS sample, the frame was first divided into 32 strata defined by census region (4 strata), incidence of low-income households (2 strata), incidence of African American residents (2 strata) and incidence of Hispanic residents (2 strata). Strata were defined at the Block Group level based on data from the Census Planning Database.<sup>12</sup> Independent random samples were then drawn from each stratum. By

---

12 <https://www.census.gov/topics/research/guidance/planning-databases/2020.html>

oversampling strata that have higher incidences of the target groups relative to the other strata, we were able to increase their representation in the sample while maintaining a probability sample design.

The ABS sample was released in two waves. Doing this provided the ability to evaluate the returns after the first sample release and to make adjustments to the allocations for the second sample release. For the second sample release, we increased the sampling fraction in different strata to increase completes with African Americans and Hispanics.

### Dual Frame RDD

The RDD portion of the sample used for the US 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 cell phone 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, eprob 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.

Both the landline and cell RDD sample were disproportionately stratified to help reach more low-income respondents. The stratification was based on mapping telephone exchanges (for landline sample) and rate centers (for cellular sample) onto counties and oversampling phone numbers that map to counties with lower average household incomes. For the cell sample, in addition to the geographic stratification, we oversampled phone numbers associated with prepaid plans which have been shown to be used more often by lower income populations.

### Household and Respondent Selection

In each sampled landline household where more than one adult 18 and older resides, the respondent, age 18 or older, was selected using an at-home respondent selection. 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.

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, provided they were an adult.

In the US, for the ABS sample, respondents followed a similar selection procedure as the landline frame, asking the respondent, age 18 and older, who was currently living in the household and had the most recent birthday to complete the survey<sup>13</sup>.

In Sweden, respondents were targeted via The Total Population Registry (RTB) and asked to complete the survey. In Switzerland, respondents were targeted via the registry per the Federal Statistical Office (FSO).

## DATA COLLECTION

In the fall and winter of 2019, the IHP 2020 questionnaire was developed and revised. Prior to the field period, the study was programmed into SSRS's Computer Assisted Web Interviewing (CAWI) for the US and Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) systems for Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the US, and the UK. International partners administering interviews in Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland also programmed the survey into their respective interviewing software platforms. SSRS pretested the US version of the instrument in early January, 2020. Other-country pretests were conducted in February and April, 2020. Interviews were conducted between February 21 and May 26, 2020.

### Questionnaire Review, Translations and Cultural Adaptations

In the fall and winter of 2019, 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<sup>14</sup>. In addition, SSRS provided feedback on updating questions for web adaptation based on best practices.

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 translation partner, Language Connect, translated the Canadian-French, Spanish, Dutch, French, and Norwegian instruments. Info GmbH translated the German instrument, M.I.S. Trend translated the Swiss-Italian, Swiss-German, and Swiss-French instruments, and Statistics Sweden 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 and

---

<sup>13</sup> As part of the first invitation letter and first reminder postcard, the mailing materials asked for the youngest respondent in the household to complete the survey. For the first reminder letter and all mailing materials for the second ABS release asked for the adult with the most recent birthday to take the survey.

<sup>14</sup> Some country partners elected to include additional questions to be asked of respondents in their respective countries. SSRS also reviewed these questions using the same process as the core questionnaire. SSRS additionally worked with the country partners to determine the best location to include each question.

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 Conformat platform for both phone and online administration. Extensive checking of both programs was conducted to ensure that skip patterns followed the design of the questionnaire and all the language inserts were working properly. Members of the SSRS team thoroughly tested each country's program in both English and in-language to ensure that everything was working properly. In addition to programming the US questionnaire, SSRS also programmed the surveys for Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and the UK. SSRS's fieldwork partners utilized unique links created for each sample record to access the program from their respective dialers. Info GmbH, M.I.S. Trend and Statistics Sweden programmed each of their surveys into their respective survey software platform. Each of the international partners contracted to complete the survey in Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland conducted extensive testing of their instruments and members of the SSRS team reviewed the Germany and Sweden programs prior to their surveys going live.

The web program for the US was optimized for online administration via smartphone or other mobile handheld devices and was checked on multiple devices, including desktop computers and handheld mobile devices, and different web browsers in order to ensure consistent and optimized visualization across devices and web browsers.

For the ABS sample, SSRS generated unique survey passwords that were assigned and provided via mail to potential respondents. The web survey was accessed directly by respondents, using their unique passwords. This also gave respondents the ability to return to their survey later if they chose to suspend their interview.

At the beginning of the field period, SSRS reviewed data from each country programmed internally and requested preliminary SPSS files from each of the other-country survey providers to confirm that all skip instructions and variables were working as intended.

## Pretesting

In early January, SSRS completed 22 telephone pretest interviews in the US for the 2020 IHP Survey. With the implementation of the ABS portion of the study, in addition to the traditional phone pretests, the SSRS team also conducted five cognitive pretest interviews to evaluate the usability of the online survey instrument and the efficacy of the mailing materials. Upon completion of both pretests, SSRS 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, adjustments were made to the questionnaire (e.g., updating question wording for clarity and removing questions due to length concerns) and some interviewer notes were added for clarification across all countries.

From mid-January to April, after the updates were made to the program following the US pretest, pretest interviews were conducted in all countries except Norway and Sweden. Table 3 provides a summary of the number of pretest interviews conducted in each country. The SSRS team directly managed the pretests in Australia, Canada (in both English and French Canadian), France, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the UK. SSRS team members reviewed pretest recordings for Canada (both English and French Canadian), the UK, Australia, New Zealand, and France. Pretest feedback, including potential questionnaire/translation updates and interviewer feedback, was also provided by Leger, GDCC, TKW, Info GmbH, and M.I.S. Trend.

**TABLE 3: Summary of Pretest Interviews by Country**

	Pretest Conducted	Language(s) Pretest Conducted in	Dates Pretests Conducted	# of Pretests
Australia	Yes	English	2/21/20-2/25/20	10
Canada	Yes	English, French	1/15/20 (English) 2/14/20 (French)	15 (English) 10 (French)
France	Yes	French	2/10/20-2/13/20	10
Germany	Yes	German	4/16/20	11
New Zealand	Yes	English	2/21/20-2/25/20	10
Netherlands	Yes	Dutch	2/10/20-2/13/20	14
Norway	No	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	No	NA	NA	NA
Switzerland	Yes	German, French, Italian	2/11/20-2/13/20	10
United Kingdom	Yes	English	2/10/20-2/13/20	13
United States	Yes	English	1/7/20 (Phone) 1/8/20-1/10/20 (Web)	22 (Phone) 5 (Web)

SSRS provided updated memos to the Fund first upon completion of the pretest interviews in Canada, the UK, Netherlands, and France and again upon completion of pretest interviews in Australia and New Zealand. These memos included additional 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. After providing these updated memos, minor edits were made to some translations to help with confusion experienced by respondents.

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

## Field Procedures

### Field Period

Interviews were conducted from February through May 2020<sup>15</sup> for the main sample and most oversample interviews. The field times varied by country and are specified in Table 4 below.

**TABLE 4: Field Period Per Country**

	Field Period
Australia	3/23/2020 - 5/23/2020
Canada	3/6/2020 - 5/15/2020
France	3/5/2020 - 5/22/2020
Germany	4/22/2020 - 5/15/2020
Netherlands	3/5/2020 - 5/19/2020
New Zealand	3/18/2020 - 5/23/2020
Norway	4/14/2020 - 5/15/2020
Sweden	2/21/2020 - 5/18/2020
Switzerland	3/5/2020 - 5/4/2020
United Kingdom	3/5/2020 - 5/26/2020
United States	3/11/2020 - 5/26/2020

### Survey Length and Language of Interview

Table 5 outlines the language/s and length of interview for each country in the 2020 IHP survey.

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

	Language(s)	Average length in minutes
Australia	English	21
Canada	English, French	21
France	French	21
Germany	German	20
Netherlands	Dutch	25
New Zealand	English	24
Norway	Norwegian	21
Sweden	Swedish	36 (phone), 40 (web)
Switzerland	German, French, Italian	30 (phone), 23 (web)
United Kingdom	English	24
United States	English, Spanish	24 (phone), 17 (web)

<sup>15</sup> Data for all countries were pulled by May 26, 2020 for the delivery to the Fund on June 15, 2020. Data collection continued for oversamples in the UK, Quebec, and Victoria. These oversamples were completed in June 2020 (UK), August (Quebec), and September (Victoria).

## 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 briefed and trained interviewers in the US on the issues specific to the study, explaining the study's overall objectives, specific procedures, and questionnaire content. For Australia, Canada, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and the UK, SSRS' project team briefed the fieldwork partners, who in turn carried out detailed briefings at the start and during the field period with their interviewers. Similarly, Info GmbH, Statistics Sweden, and M.I.S. Trend managed the briefing and interviewer training in Germany, 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 instructions for interviewers.
2. An in-language questionnaire, if applicable, with translations for each respective country.
3. A test program for fieldwork partners in countries SSRS directly managed so interviewers could review and familiarize themselves with the survey.
4. 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.
5. 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 in each country was conducted prior to the pretest and immediately before the survey was officially launched. In the US, 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. Training procedures included role-playing methodology – assuming interviewer and respondent roles – in order to become comfortable with the CATI script. Throughout the field period, supervisors for each country conducted live monitoring and reviewed a selection of recorded interviews. Supervisors debriefed interviewers as a group and/or individually, as needed, during fieldwork.

GDCC, Leger, Norstat and TKW followed similar procedures with their supervisors and interviewers.

### *In Person Visits to GDCC and Leger*

In addition to the pre-launch briefings, members of the SSRS project team visited GDCC and Leger to meet the on-site project teams and interviewers and provide direct oversight of the fieldwork process.<sup>16</sup> During this meeting, members of the SSRS project team briefed supervisors and interviewers working on the project

---

<sup>16</sup> Prior to commencing IHP 2020, a SSRS team member, Robyn Rapoport, visited TKW to tour the facilities and get to know the staff there in preparation for this study.

in-person, live monitored interviews<sup>17</sup>. The SSRS team also addressed project specific questions from interviewers and members of GDCC's and Leger's project teams.

## Call Rule, Contact Attempts, Refusal Avoidance and Conversion Strategies

SSRS 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. SSRS' fieldwork partners followed out similar strategies to maximize survey response, based on SSRS' recommendations and guidelines.

### *Australia, Canada, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, the UK, and the US (RDD Sample)*

- The call rule included one initial call plus four callbacks in the US, one initial call plus five callbacks in Australia, Canada and New Zealand and one initial call plus nine callbacks in France, the Netherlands, and the UK before a sample record was considered exhausted.
- Cases where a call attempt resulted in a respondent or household refusal or other break-off were dialed again after a period of at least seven days "rest."
- 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.
- In the US, power (assisted manual) dialing of the landline sample and all cell phone sample was manually dialed as is required by law.
- Interviewers explained the purpose of the study and stated as accurately as possible the expected length of the interview.
- Specially-trained interviewers in Canada, France, the Netherlands, the UK and the US were utilized to attempt refusal conversions, following a rest period of at least seven days. Due to regulations in Australia and New Zealand, respondents who refused to take the survey were not re-contacted.
- Interviewers explained the purpose of the study and stated as accurately as possible the expected length of the interview.
- Respondents were permitted to schedule call-back times.
- In the US, interviews were completed in English and Spanish. Bilingual interviewers called back any sample that was deemed to be Spanish speaking.
- In Australia, New Zealand and the UK, interviews were completed in English. In France interviews were completed in French, in the Netherlands interviews were completed in Dutch and in Canada interviews were completed in both English and Canadian-French.

### *Germany*

- The call rule for Germany included one initial call plus nine callbacks.
- A differential call rule was established that required that call attempts be initiated at different times of day and different days of the week.
- Sample was released in batches to ensure that it would be worked effectively.

---

<sup>17</sup> When visiting GDCC, SSRS team members were able to live monitor pretest interviews in France, the Netherlands and the UK. When visiting Leger, SSRS team members were able to monitor live interviews in Canada.

- All interviews were completed in German.

### **Norway**

- The call rule for Norway included on initial plus eight callbacks.
- A differential call rule was established that required that call attempts be initiated at different times of day and different days of the week.
- Sample was released in one batch and carefully managed throughout fieldwork to work it efficiently.
- Interviewers explained the purpose of the study and stated as accurately as possible the expected length of the interview.
- All interviews were completed in Norwegian.

### **Sweden and Switzerland**

- In Sweden and Switzerland, respondents were recruited via postal mail and invited to participate in an online or call into complete a phone version of the survey.
- In Switzerland, for each stratum, the sample was separated into four replicates in order to be able to manage fieldwork in detail.
  - In total, 4,685 sample records were pulled from the registry and contacted to complete this study. Around half of the drawn sample was matched with a phone number, however, no outbound dialing was performed for these respondents. Only records that requested an appointment were dialed. All selected persons received an invitation letter to complete the survey online or by telephone. Non-responders received a reminder letter.
- In Sweden, personal identification numbers from the RTB were matched with addresses in order to send invitations via mail to respondents. An initial invitation was mailed to all respondents, followed by up to three reminders for non-responders. All respondents were provided a link to complete the survey via the web, and a phone number was provided for any respondents who preferred to take the survey on the phone. The contact schedule for Sweden is shown below (Table 6).
- In Switzerland, respondents were sent an initial invitation with information on how to take the survey online or over the phone, followed by one reminder mailing to non-responders. The contact schedule for Switzerland is shown below (Table 7).

**TABLE 6: Sweden Contact Schedule**

Contact	Timing/Dates	Description
1	2/21/2020	First postal mailing to full sample, including: - A letter (describing the nature of the survey and its objectives) - A web link and unique passcode - A telephone number to take the survey via the phone
2	3/9/2020	First reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing.
3	3/23/2020	Second reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing.
4	4/6/2020	Third and final reminder mailing sent to non-responders. This reminder excluded the option of taking the survey on the phone with an interviewer.
5	5/18/2020	End of fieldwork

**TABLE 7: Switzerland Contact Schedule**

Contact	Timing/Dates*	Description
1	3/5/2020	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 - A telephone number to take the survey via the phone
2	3/30/2020	Reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing.
3	5/4/2020	End of fieldwork

**United States (ABS Sample)**

- ABS sample was released in two waves. For each wave, respondents were first sent an invitation letter, followed by a reminder postcard and a letter asking them to participate in the study.
- Both the invitation and reminder letter included a one-page double-sided (English/Spanish) letter, printed on color letterhead inviting respondents to participate in an important research study.
- Similarly, the reminder postcard was printed on color letterhead and included translations for non-English speakers.
- To increase participation, SSRS:
  - Included a \$1.25 cash pre-incentive to all ABS sample
  - Offered a \$10 post-incentive in the form of a gift card or check to the portion of the ABS sample most likely to be low income or Hispanic
  - Sent two reminders (one postcard and one letter)
  - Included additional language around COVID-19 to help stress the importance of the study in order to help boost participation as part of the second wave of mailings.
- As part of the ABS, SSRS implemented two envelope-based experimentations for the ABS sample. Half of the sample was sent letters in a 6X9 envelope with a window for the address, and half of the sample was sent letters in a #11 envelope with a window for the address. Separately, half of the sample included a logo on the envelope, and half of the sample had no logo on the envelope. Together, 25% of the sample fell into each of these experiment quadrants<sup>18</sup>.

Table 8 below details the contact schedule for the ABS sample in the US.

---

<sup>18</sup> Learnings from these experiments can be found in the Appendix.

**TABLE 8: US ABS Contact Schedule**

Contact	Timing/Dates	Description
1	Wave 1 - 3/5/2020 Wave 2 - 4/24/2020	First postal mailing to the ABS sample, including: - An invitation letter (describing nature of the study and its objectives) <sup>19</sup> - A \$1.25 pre-incentive and a \$10 post-incentive to those likely to be low income or Hispanic - A web link, unique passcode and a QR code to access the survey - A toll-free telephone number to complete the survey by phone - An email address and a second telephone number for questions
	Wave 1 - 3/16/2020 Wave 2 - 4/28/2020	Second postal mailing to the ABS sample, including: - A reminder postcard - A web link and unique passcode - A QR code to access the survey via scanning with a mobile device - A toll-free telephone number to complete the survey by phone
3	Wave 1 - 3/30/2020 Wave 2 - 5/8/2020	Third postal mailing to the ABS sample, including: - A reminder letter (describing nature of the study and its objectives, as well as a note about ongoing COVID-19 pandemic) - A web link, unique passcode and a QR code to access the survey - A \$10 post-incentive to those likely to be low income or Hispanic - A toll-free telephone number to complete the survey by phone - An email address and a second telephone number for questions
	5/26/2020	End of fieldwork

## Field Monitoring

Prior to fielding, SSRS provided reporting data and disposition reporting templates to GDCC, Leger, TKW, Norstat, Info GmbH, Statistics Sweden, and M.I.S. Trend. While in field, on a bi-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.

During field, SSRS also reviewed non-response across Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the UK and the US. Any questions with high item non-response was addressed with supervisors and closely monitored.

The SSRS project team monitored and listened to recordings of interviews in the US (English and Spanish), Canada (English), Australia, New Zealand, and the UK throughout the field period and provided feedback,

<sup>19</sup> As part of the first invitation letter and first reminder postcard, the mailing materials asked for the youngest respondent in the household to complete the survey. For the first reminder letter and all mailing materials for the second ABS release asked for the adult with the most recent birthday to take the survey.

when necessary, to ensure that best practices were being followed. SSRS's partner, cApStAn, reviewed recordings for Canada (Canadian-French), France, the Netherlands, and Norway. Where necessary, SSRS provided corrective feedback to the project teams at GDCC, Leger, TKW, and Norstat.

In addition, while in field, SSRS participated in weekly calls with GDCC, Leger, TKW, and Norstat to discuss field progress and anything questions that needed to be addressed.

SSRS also provided GDCC, Leger, TKW, and Norstat with the ability to review data as needed on SSRS's platform via a Conformat reporting tool called Reportal. Reports were set up to allow for data to be reviewed across and within different sample variables and demographics to accurately track study progress against targets in real time.

### Weekly and Periodic Updates

Throughout the field period, SSRS provided the Fund with weekly updates that tracked key information and 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 weekly updates, SSRS provided a narrative regarding field progress and reported on any field-related concerns.

SSRS and the Fund also participated in bi-weekly calls where they could review the updates and overall progress in each country and discuss any other project related items.

In late April, 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 9 to 20 below show final counts per country by gender, age, region, and language of interview, where relevant.

**TABLE 9: Final Counts Australia – Main Sample**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	1	0%	2%	40	5%	98%	41	4%
Male / 25-34	0	0%	0%	85	11%	100%	85	8%
Male / 35-49	4	2%	4%	93	12%	96%	97	10%
Male / 50-64	27	11%	27%	72	10%	73%	99	10%
Male / 65+	58	23%	47%	66	9%	53%	124	12%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	6	1%	100%	6	1%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>45%</b>
Female / 18-24	1	0%	2%	42	6%	98%	43	4%
Female / 25-34	1	0%	1%	80	11%	99%	81	8%
Female / 35-49	6	2%	7%	84	11%	93%	90	9%
Female / 50-64	40	16%	32%	86	11%	68%	126	13%
Female / 65+	112	45%	55%	90	12%	45%	202	20%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	7	1%	100%	7	1%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>250</b>		<b>25%</b>	<b>751</b>		<b>75%</b>	<b>1001</b>	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
NSW	74	30%	26%	214	28%	74%	288	29%
Victoria	56	22%	18%	254	34%	82%	310	31%
Queensland	56	22%	32%	117	16%	68%	173	17%
Western Australia	22	9%	20%	87	12%	80%	109	11%
South Australia	27	11%	40%	41	5%	60%	68	7%
Tasmania	9	4%	36%	16	2%	64%	25	2%
Australian Capital Territory	6	2%	25%	18	2%	75%	24	2%
Northern Territory	0	0%	0%	4	1%	100%	4	0%
Unknown Region	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>250</b>		<b>25%</b>	<b>751</b>		<b>75%</b>	<b>1001</b>	

**TABLE 10: Final Counts Australia – New South Wales Oversample**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	6	2%	14%	36	4%	86%	42	4%
Male / 25-34	2	1%	2%	93	11%	98%	95	8%
Male / 35-49	8	2%	7%	115	14%	93%	123	10%
Male / 50-64	23	6%	18%	102	12%	82%	125	10%
Male / 65+	79	22%	47%	88	11%	53%	167	14%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	5	1%	100%	5	0%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>46%</b>
Female / 18-24	3	1%	8%	36	4%	92%	39	3%
Female / 25-34	4	1%	5%	73	9%	95%	77	6%
Female / 35-49	19	5%	16%	100	12%	84%	119	10%
Female / 50-64	54	15%	35%	102	12%	65%	156	13%
Female / 65+	167	46%	67%	82	10%	33%	249	21%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	3	0%	100%	3	0%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>54%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>365</b>		<b>30%</b>	<b>835</b>		<b>70%</b>	<b>1200</b>	

**TABLE 11: Final Counts Canada**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender/ Age (%)
Male / 18-24	23	1%	12%	162	6%	88%	185	4%
Male / 25-34	53	2%	18%	246	10%	82%	299	6%
Male / 35-49	179	7%	35%	333	13%	65%	512	10%
Male / 50-64	319	13%	51%	304	12%	49%	623	12%
Male / 65+	377	15%	67%	187	7%	33%	564	11%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	8	0%	29%	20	1%	71%	28	1%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>959</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>1252</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>2211</b>	<b>43%</b>
Female / 18-24	26	1%	18%	119	5%	82%	145	3%
Female / 25-34	72	3%	21%	270	10%	79%	342	7%
Female / 35-49	297	12%	43%	392	15%	57%	689	14%
Female / 50-64	476	19%	59%	330	13%	41%	806	16%
Female / 65+	646	26%	78%	181	7%	22%	827	16%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	24	1%	48%	26	1%	52%	50	1%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>1541</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>1318</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>2859</b>	<b>56%</b>
Other or Unknown / 18-24	0	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	1	0%
Other or Unknown / 25-34	0	0%	0%	7	0%	100%	7	0%
Other or Unknown / 35-49	2	0%	67%	1	0%	33%	3	0%
Other or Unknown / 50-64	2	0%	67%	1	0%	33%	3	0%
Other or Unknown / 65+	2	0%	50%	2	0%	50%	4	0%
Other or Unknown / >18 but refused exact	0	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	1	0%
<b>Other or Unknown Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2506</b>		<b>49%</b>	<b>2583</b>		<b>51%</b>	<b>5089</b>	

LANGUAGE	LAND LINE	Language (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Language (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Language (%)
ENGLISH	2015	80%	50%	2038	79%	50%	4053	80%
FRENCH	491	20%	47%	545	21%	53%	1036	20%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2506</b>		<b>49%</b>	<b>2583</b>		<b>51%</b>	<b>5089</b>	

**TABLE 11 cont'd: Final Counts Canada**

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Newfoundland and Labrador	134	5%	53%	118	5%	47%	252	5%
Prince Edward Island	129	5%	52%	121	5%	48%	250	5%
Nova Scotia	126	5%	50%	124	5%	50%	250	5%
New Brunswick	116	5%	46%	134	5%	54%	250	5%
Quebec	462	18%	46%	538	21%	54%	1000	20%
Ontario	650	26%	43%	851	33%	57%	1501	29%
Manitoba	122	5%	49%	128	5%	51%	250	5%
Saskatchewan	166	7%	66%	84	3%	34%	250	5%
Alberta	137	5%	51%	131	5%	49%	268	5%
British Columbia	119	5%	47%	135	5%	53%	254	5%
Yukon	113	5%	45%	137	5%	55%	250	5%
Northwest Territories	63	3%	51%	60	2%	49%	123	2%
Nunavut	169	7%	88%	22	1%	12%	191	4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2506</b>		<b>49%</b>	<b>2583</b>		<b>51%</b>	<b>5089</b>	

**TABLE 12: Final Counts France**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	5	0%	6%	85	4%	94%	90	3%
Male / 25-34	7	1%	3%	201	11%	97%	208	7%
Male / 35-49	41	4%	15%	236	12%	85%	277	9%
Male / 50-64	129	12%	38%	210	11%	62%	339	11%
Male / 65+	171	15%	63%	102	5%	37%	273	9%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	3	0%	100%	3	0%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>837</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>1190</b>	<b>39%</b>
Female / 18-24	11	1%	9%	111	6%	91%	122	4%
Female / 25-34	11	1%	5%	227	12%	95%	238	8%
Female / 35-49	118	11%	28%	297	16%	72%	415	14%
Female / 50-64	249	22%	45%	302	16%	55%	551	18%
Female / 65+	369	33%	73%	137	7%	27%	506	17%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	6	1%	100%	0	0%	0%	6	0%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>1074</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>1838</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1117</b>		<b>37%</b>	<b>1911</b>		<b>63%</b>	<b>3028</b>	

**TABLE 12 cont'd: Final Counts France**

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Alsace, Champagne-Ardenne, Lorraine	107	10%	44%	138	7%	56%	245	8%
Aquitaine Limousin Poitou-Charentes	99	9%	37%	171	9%	63%	270	9%
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes	142	13%	35%	264	14%	65%	406	13%
Bourgogne, Franche-Comté	56	5%	47%	63	3%	53%	119	4%
Bretagne	63	6%	50%	64	3%	50%	127	4%
Centre, Val de Loire	39	3%	36%	69	4%	64%	108	4%
Corse	2	0%	20%	8	0%	80%	10	0%
Île-de-France	193	17%	27%	525	27%	73%	718	24%
Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées	97	9%	36%	170	9%	64%	267	9%
Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Picardie	115	10%	52%	105	5%	48%	220	7%
Normandie	65	6%	51%	62	3%	49%	127	4%
Pays de la Loire	75	7%	46%	88	5%	54%	163	5%
Provence-Alpes, Côte-d'Azur	64	6%	27%	174	9%	73%	238	8%
French region missing	0	0%	0%	10	1%	100%	10	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1117</b>		<b>37%</b>	<b>1911</b>		<b>63%</b>	<b>3028</b>	

**TABLE 13: Final Counts Germany**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	2	0%	9%	20	4%	91%	22	2%
Male / 25-34	5	1%	10%	43	8%	90%	48	5%
Male / 35-49	25	5%	27%	69	14%	73%	94	9%
Male / 50-64	58	12%	42%	80	16%	58%	138	14%
Male / 65+	83	17%	65%	44	9%	35%	127	13%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>43%</b>
Female / 18-24	8	2%	27%	22	4%	73%	30	3%
Female / 25-34	9	2%	19%	38	7%	81%	47	5%
Female / 35-49	59	12%	50%	60	12%	50%	119	12%
Female / 50-64	121	24%	59%	85	17%	41%	206	21%
Female / 65+	125	25%	74%	44	9%	26%	169	17%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>57%</b>
Other or Unknown / 18-24	0	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	1	0%
Other or Unknown / 25-34	0	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	1	0%
Other or Unknown / 35-49	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or Unknown / 50-64	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or Unknown / 65+	0	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	1	0%
Other or Unknown / >18 but refused exact	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
<b>Other or Unknown Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>496</b>		<b>49%</b>	<b>508</b>		<b>51%</b>	<b>1004</b>	

TABLE 13 cont'd: Final Counts Germany

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Schleswig-Holstein	21	4%	47%	24	5%	53%	45	4%
Hamburg	12	2%	46%	14	3%	54%	26	3%
Bremen	2	0%	33%	4	1%	67%	6	1%
Niedersachsen	44	9%	54%	38	7%	46%	82	8%
Nordrhein-Westfalen	109	22%	58%	78	15%	42%	187	19%
Rheinland-Pfalz	27	5%	60%	18	4%	40%	45	4%
Saarland	7	1%	54%	6	1%	46%	13	1%
Hessen	44	9%	53%	39	8%	47%	83	8%
Baden-Württemberg	52	10%	47%	58	11%	53%	110	11%
Bayern	71	14%	43%	95	19%	57%	166	17%
Berlin	30	6%	46%	35	7%	54%	65	6%
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	6	1%	24%	19	4%	76%	25	2%
Brandenburg	13	3%	33%	27	5%	68%	40	4%
Sachsen-Anhalt	15	3%	60%	10	2%	40%	25	2%
Thüringen	12	2%	44%	15	3%	56%	27	3%
Sachsen	30	6%	52%	28	6%	48%	58	6%
German region missing	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>496</b>		<b>49%</b>	<b>508</b>		<b>51%</b>	<b>1004</b>	

**TABLE 14: Final Counts Netherlands**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender / Age (%)
Male / 18-24	2	1%	10%	18	3%	90%	20	3%
Male / 25-34	1	0%	2%	44	8%	98%	45	6%
Male / 35-49	6	3%	8%	67	13%	92%	73	10%
Male / 50-64	36	16%	32%	77	15%	68%	113	15%
Male / 65+	52	23%	44%	66	13%	56%	118	16%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>49%</b>
Female / 18-24	1	0%	5%	18	3%	95%	19	3%
Female / 25-34	1	0%	3%	35	7%	97%	36	5%
Female / 35-49	19	8%	25%	57	11%	75%	76	10%
Female / 50-64	29	13%	23%	95	18%	77%	124	16%
Female / 65+	78	35%	60%	51	10%	40%	129	17%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>225</b>		<b>30%</b>	<b>528</b>		<b>70%</b>	<b>753</b>	

**TABLE 14 cont'd: Final Counts Netherlands**

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Drenthe	8	4%	28%	21	4%	72%	29	4%
Flevoland	5	2%	29%	12	2%	71%	17	2%
Friesland	13	6%	48%	14	3%	52%	27	4%
Gelderland	22	10%	24%	69	13%	76%	91	12%
Groningen	8	4%	33%	16	3%	67%	24	3%
Limburg	19	8%	37%	33	6%	63%	52	7%
Noord-Brabant	30	13%	25%	89	17%	75%	119	16%
Noord-Holland	43	19%	36%	78	15%	64%	121	16%
Overijssel	10	4%	28%	26	5%	72%	36	5%
Utrecht	14	6%	25%	41	8%	75%	55	7%
Zeeland	6	3%	46%	7	1%	54%	13	2%
Zuid-Holland	47	21%	28%	120	23%	72%	167	22%
Dutch region missing	0	0%	0%	2	0%	100%	2	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>225</b>		<b>30%</b>	<b>528</b>		<b>70%</b>	<b>753</b>	

**TABLE 15: Final Counts New Zealand**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender/ Age (%)
Male / 18-24	2	1%	5%	41	5%	95%	43	4%
Male / 25-34	5	2%	5%	93	12%	95%	98	10%
Male / 35-49	7	3%	6%	104	14%	94%	111	11%
Male / 50-64	28	11%	29%	69	9%	71%	97	10%
Male / 65+	36	14%	51%	35	5%	49%	71	7%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	33%	2	0%	67%	3	0%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>42%</b>
Female / 18-24	4	2%	9%	42	6%	91%	46	5%
Female / 25-34	4	2%	5%	83	11%	95%	87	9%
Female / 35-49	16	6%	13%	109	15%	87%	125	12%
Female / 50-64	42	17%	32%	88	12%	68%	130	13%
Female / 65+	106	42%	57%	81	11%	43%	187	19%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	20%	4	1%	80%	5	0%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>252</b>		<b>25%</b>	<b>751</b>		<b>75%</b>	<b>1003</b>	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Landline (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Auckland	73	29%	20%	297	40%	80%	370	37%
North	69	27%	30%	162	22%	70%	231	23%
Central	46	18%	29%	111	15%	71%	157	16%
South	64	25%	27%	177	24%	73%	241	24%
New Zealand region missing	0	0%	0%	4	1%	100%	4	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>252</b>		<b>25%</b>	<b>751</b>		<b>75%</b>	<b>1003</b>	

**TABLE 16: Final Counts Norway**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell Phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 18-24	0	0%	0%	26	4%	100%	26	4%
Male / 25-34	1	5%	3%	30	5%	97%	31	5%
Male / 35-49	0	0%	0%	70	12%	100%	70	12%
Male / 50-64	3	14%	4%	69	12%	96%	72	12%
Male / 65+	3	14%	3%	94	16%	97%	97	16%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>49%</b>
Female / 18-24	0	0%	0%	9	2%	100%	9	1%
Female / 25-34	0	0%	0%	30	5%	100%	30	5%
Female / 35-49	1	5%	1%	67	11%	99%	68	11%
Female / 50-64	3	14%	3%	88	15%	97%	91	15%
Female / 65+	11	50%	10%	102	17%	90%	113	19%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>		<b>4%</b>	<b>585</b>		<b>96%</b>	<b>607</b>	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Agder	2	9%	5%	38	6%	95%	40	7%
Innlandet	1	5%	3%	29	5%	97%	30	5%
Møre og Romsdal	0	0%	0%	28	5%	100%	28	5%
Nordland	0	0%	0%	26	4%	100%	26	4%
Oslo	1	5%	1%	91	16%	99%	92	15%
Rogaland	2	9%	4%	43	7%	96%	45	7%
Troms og Finnmark	0	0%	0%	27	5%	100%	27	4%
Trøndelag	3	14%	4%	67	11%	96%	70	12%
Vestfold og Telemark	4	18%	8%	44	8%	92%	48	8%
Vestland	3	14%	5%	58	10%	95%	61	10%
Viken	6	27%	4%	134	23%	96%	140	23%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>		<b>4%</b>	<b>585</b>		<b>96%</b>	<b>607</b>	

**TABLE 17: Final Counts Sweden**

GENDER / AGE	WEB	Gender / Age (%)	Web (%)	PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender/ Age (%)
Male / 18-24	91	4%	100%	0	0%	0%	91	4%
Male / 25-34	111	5%	99%	1	1%	1%	112	4%
Male / 35-49	246	10%	99%	2	2%	1%	248	10%
Male / 50-64	312	13%	99%	2	2%	1%	314	12%
Male / 65+	393	16%	92%	36	33%	8%	429	17%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>1153</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1194</b>	<b>48%</b>
Female / 18-24	106	4%	100%	0	0%	0%	106	4%
Female / 25-34	130	5%	100%	0	0%	0%	130	5%
Female / 35-49	263	11%	100%	1	1%	0%	264	11%
Female / 50-64	329	14%	99%	3	3%	1%	332	13%
Female / 65+	424	18%	87%	63	58%	13%	487	19%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>1252</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1319</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2405</b>		<b>96%</b>	<b>108</b>		<b>4%</b>	<b>2513</b>	

**TABLE 18: Final Counts Switzerland**

GENDER / AGE	WEB	Gender / Age (%)	Web (%)	PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender/ Age (%)
Male / 18-24	65	3%	100%	0	0%	0%	65	3%
Male / 25-34	156	7%	100%	0	0%	0%	156	7%
Male / 35-49	296	14%	99%	2	1%	1%	298	13%
Male / 50-64	306	15%	94%	18	10%	6%	324	14%
Male / 65+	227	11%	84%	44	25%	16%	271	12%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>1050</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>1114</b>	<b>49%</b>
Female / 18-24	74	4%	100%	0	0%	0%	74	3%
Female / 25-34	156	7%	99%	1	1%	1%	157	7%
Female / 35-49	315	15%	99%	2	1%	1%	317	14%
Female / 50-64	320	15%	91%	32	18%	9%	352	15%
Female / 65+	190	9%	71%	76	43%	29%	266	12%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	1	1%	100%	1	0%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>1055</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>1167</b>	<b>51%</b>
Other or Unknown / 18-24	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or Unknown / 25-34	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or Unknown / 35-49	2	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	2	0%
Other or Unknown / 50-64	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Other or Unknown / 65+	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or Unknown / >18 but refused exact	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
<b>Other or Unknown Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2105</b>		<b>92%</b>	<b>176</b>		<b>8%</b>	<b>2284</b>	

TABLE 18 cont'd: Final Counts Switzerland

LANGUAGE	WEB	Language (%)	Web (%)	PHON E	Language (%)	Phone (%)	TOTAL	Language (%)
German	1210	58%	93%	88	50%	7%	1298	57%
French	591	28%	92%	53	30%	8%	644	28%
Italian	303	14%	90%	35	20%	10%	338	15%
Rhaeto-Romansch	4	0.2%	100%	0	0%	0%	4	0.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2108</b>		<b>92%</b>	<b>176</b>		<b>8%</b>	<b>2284</b>	

REGION	WEB	Region (%)	Web (%)	PHONE	Region (%)	Phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Zurich	208	10%	95%	12	7%	5%	220	10%
Bern	150	7%	90%	16	9%	10%	166	7%
Luzern	71	3%	95%	4	2%	5%	75	3%
Uri	7	0%	88%	1	1%	13%	8	0%
Schwyz	20	1%	95%	1	1%	5%	21	1%
Obwalden	7	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	7	0%
Nidwalden	8	0%	89%	1	1%	11%	9	0%
Glarus	7	0%	88%	1	1%	13%	8	0%
Zug	21	1%	91%	2	1%	9%	23	1%
Fribourg	63	3%	88%	9	5%	13%	72	3%
Solothurn	30	1%	88%	4	2%	12%	34	1%
Basel-Stadt	318	15%	93%	24	14%	7%	342	15%
Basel-Landschaft	46	2%	92%	4	2%	8%	50	2%
Schaffhausen	10	0%	91%	1	1%	9%	11	0%
Appenzell Ausserrhoden	6	0%	86%	1	1%	14%	7	0%
Appenzell Innerrhoden	4	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	4	0%
St. Gallen	67	3%	96%	3	2%	4%	70	3%
Graubunden	48	2%	100%	0	0%	0%	48	2%
Aargau	85	4%	93%	6	3%	7%	91	4%
Thurgau	45	2%	90%	5	3%	10%	50	2%
Ticino	294	14%	89%	35	20%	11%	329	14%
Vaud	155	7%	91%	15	9%	9%	170	7%
Valais	298	14%	93%	22	13%	7%	320	14%
Neuchatel	40	2%	95%	2	1%	5%	42	2%
Geneva	88	4%	96%	4	2%	4%	92	4%
Jura	12	1%	80%	3	2%	20%	15	1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2108</b>		<b>92%</b>	<b>176</b>		<b>8%</b>	<b>2284</b>	

**TABLE 19: Final Counts United Kingdom**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Landline (%)	CELL PHONE	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 18-24	5	1%	6%	81	7%	94%	86	4%
Male / 25-34	10	1%	7%	124	11%	93%	134	7%
Male / 35-49	47	6%	25%	142	12%	75%	189	9%
Male / 50-64	101	12%	41%	146	12%	59%	247	12%
Male / 65+	148	18%	62%	91	8%	38%	239	12%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	13%	7	1%	88%	8	0%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>903</b>	<b>45%</b>
Female / 18-24	8	1%	10%	69	6%	90%	77	4%
Female / 25-34	12	1%	9%	123	11%	91%	135	7%
Female / 35-49	67	8%	31%	151	13%	69%	218	11%
Female / 50-64	136	17%	48%	148	13%	52%	284	14%
Female / 65+	281	34%	78%	80	7%	22%	361	18%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	6	1%	46%	7	1%	54%	13	1%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>1088</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>822</b>		<b>41%</b>	<b>1169</b>		<b>59%</b>	<b>1991</b>	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell phone (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
Northeast	9	1%	21%	34	3%	79%	43	2%
Yorks & Humber	30	4%	38%	50	4%	63%	80	4%
East Midlands	14	2%	18%	62	5%	82%	76	4%
Eastern	13	2%	33%	26	2%	67%	39	2%
London	38	5%	22%	131	11%	78%	169	8%
South East	62	8%	33%	126	11%	67%	188	9%
South West	28	3%	31%	61	5%	69%	89	4%
West Midlands	18	2%	23%	59	5%	77%	77	4%
North West	45	5%	45%	54	5%	55%	99	5%
Wales	224	27%	55%	184	16%	45%	408	20%
Scotland	166	20%	41%	239	20%	59%	405	20%
Northern Ireland	175	21%	58%	127	11%	42%	302	15%
UK region missing	0	0%	0%	16	1%	100%	16	1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>822</b>		<b>41%</b>	<b>1169</b>		<b>59%</b>	<b>1991</b>	

**TABLE 20: Final Counts United States**

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	Gender / Age (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHON E	Gender / Age (%)	Cell phone (%)	WEB	Gender / Age (%)	Web (%)	TOTAL	Gender /Age (%)
Male / 18-24	0	0%	0%	16	4%	18%	74	4%	82%	90	4%
Male / 25-34	0	0%	0%	42	10%	22%	150	8%	78%	192	8%
Male / 35-49	5	6%	2%	49	12%	23%	155	8%	74%	209	8%
Male / 50-64	15	19%	6%	63	15%	24%	181	9%	70%	259	10%
Male / 65+	21	27%	9%	47	11%	21%	159	8%	70%	227	9%
Male/Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	2	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	2	0%
<b>Male Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>719</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>979</b>	<b>40%</b>
Female / 18-24	0	0%	0%	13	3%	9%	132	7%	91%	145	6%
Female / 25-34	0	0%	0%	38	9%	11%	302	15%	89%	340	14%
Female / 35-49	5	6%	1%	47	11%	14%	283	14%	84%	335	14%
Female / 50-64	7	9%	2%	55	13%	17%	264	13%	81%	326	13%
Female / 65+	26	33%	7%	46	11%	13%	275	14%	79%	347	14%
Female/Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
<b>Female Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>1256</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>1493</b>	<b>60%</b>
Other or unknown / 18-24	0	0%	0%	1	0%	50%	1	0%	50%	2	0%
Other or unknown / 25-34	2	2%	29%	0	0%	0%	5	0%	71%	7	0%
Other or unknown / 35-49	3	3%	75%	0	0%	0%	1	0%	25%	4	0%
Other or unknown / 50-64	2	2%	67%	0	0%	0%	1	0%	33%	3	0%
Other or Unknown / 65+	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
Other or Unknown / >18 but refused exact	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	0	0%
<b>Other or unknown Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>79</b>		<b>3%</b>	<b>418</b>		<b>17%</b>	<b>1975</b>		<b>80%</b>	<b>2472</b>	

LANGUAGE	LAND LINE	Lang- uage (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Lang- uage (%)	Cell phone (%)	WEB	Lang- uage (%)	Web (%)	TOTAL	Lang- uage (%)
ENGLISH	86	100%	4%	394	94%	16%	1926	97%	80%	2406	97%
SPANISH	0	0%	0%	25	6%	30%	57	3%	70%	82	3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>86</b>		<b>3%</b>	<b>419</b>		<b>17%</b>	<b>1983</b>		<b>80%</b>	<b>2488</b>	

REGION	LAND LINE	Region (%)	Land line (%)	CELL PHONE	Region (%)	Cell Phone (%)	WEB	Region (%)	Web (%)	TOTAL	Region (%)
North East	38	44%	10%	58	14%	15%	287	14%	75%	383	15%
North Central	11	13%	2%	88	21%	16%	444	22%	82%	543	22%
South	27	31%	3%	184	44%	18%	788	40%	79%	999	40%
West	10	12%	2%	89	21%	16%	464	23%	82%	563	23%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>86</b>		<b>3%</b>	<b>419</b>		<b>17%</b>	<b>1983</b>		<b>80%</b>	<b>2488</b>	

## Data Processing and Integration

For countries that SSRS directly managed, data file preparation began soon after the study entered the field. Data were readily downloaded from the SSRS server and were checked using multiple methods including a “data cleaning” procedure in which data processors recreated CAWI and 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<sup>20</sup>. 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.

In order to facilitate an efficient data integration process across countries, SSRS developed a standardized data map to be utilized by Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland when structuring their data in ASCII format. This data map contained the same data locations and formats used by the eight country programs that were programmed internally by SSRS. Once the integrated data were compiled, an independent checking of all variables was carried out to ensure that all variables were accurately constructed.

For Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland, the international partners, sent formatted ASCII files matching the locations of the data map for SSRS to review either prior to fieldwork starting or shortly after fieldwork began. SSRS and the partners worked together to resolve any issues with the format, if needed, to ensure

---

<sup>20</sup> In March 2020, the SSRS team identified an error in the French translation at Q1865 that was programmed in the survey. The program was then corrected and the SSRS team set up a callback program to reach those impacted. In total, 451 of the 582 France respondents who were not asked the correct question at Q1865 were successfully re-contacted and asked the appropriate question. Those who were not able to be reached were included in the data under the code “Not asked, programming error.”

that the data could be integrated properly. These data were then checked by SSRS's back-end data processor and the SSRS team according to the data cleaning and quality check procedures described above. This process was repeated with the final data once those ASCII files were delivered.

As described in the Data Memo provided to all partners in August 2020, additional quality control checks were performed on the final data, as needed. The memo included a description of checks for internal data consistency, logic checks, trending, and reviews of modal differences (applicable for Sweden, Switzerland and the US).

## RESPONSE RATES

The response rates for this study (shown in Tables 21-24 below) were calculated using AAPOR's RR3. The detailed summary table for Sweden, Switzerland and the ABS portion of the US are shown at the end of this section as they used address/registry-based designs.

**TABLE 21: Response Rates by Country by Frame**

	Landline	Cell phone	ABS	Total
Australia	21.3%	17.4%	N/A	18.5%
Canada <sup>21</sup>	19.9%	14.2%	N/A	17.1%
France	18.2%	25.4%	N/A	22.7%
Germany	36.1%	13.0%	N/A	24.4%
Netherlands	26.5%	25.1%	N/A	25.6%
New Zealand	13.6%	14.1%	N/A	14.0%
Norway	12.7%	19.8%	N/A	19.5%
Sweden	N/A	N/A	30.4%	30.4%
Switzerland	N/A	N/A	48.7%	48.7%
United Kingdom	10.3%	17.0%	N/A	14.2%
United States	17.1%	7.3%	14.9%	13.7%

<sup>21</sup> Canada response rates in this report are calculated excluding the territory oversamples, as they were not included in the Health Affairs data. Response rates including that sample are 23.0% for landline and 15.1% for cell, resulting in a combined 19.1% response rate.

**TABLE 22: Landline Response Rates by Country**

	Australia	Canada	France	Germany	Netherlands
<b>Eligible, Interview (Category 1)</b>					
Complete	615	2,161	1,117	496	225
<b>Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)</b>					
Refusal and breakoff	0	74	0	105	0
Break off	1	30	99	27	19
Answering machine	0	0	0	8	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	0	0	2	0
Language problem	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)</b>					
Always busy	282	863	64	0	7
No answer	10,362	13,981	4,262	2,413	488
Answering machine-don't know if household	6,029	11,860	1,069	1,775	77
Call blocking	0	338	0	0	0
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	392	2,268	2,828	192	581
No screener completed	1,938	7,758	2,998	218	236
<b>Not eligible (Category 4)</b>					
Fax/data line	66	1,868	447	22	14
Non-working number	30,865	40,016	1,942	740	375
Business, government office, other organizations	0	700	373	799	77
No eligible respondent	172	917	304	24	74
Quota filled	7	13	0	0	0
Total phone numbers used	50,729	82,847	15,503	6,821	2,173
<b>Response Rate 3</b>	<b>21.3%</b>	<b>19.9%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>36.1%</b>	<b>26.5%</b>

**TABLE 22 Cont'd: Landline Response Rates by Country**

	New Zealand	Norway	United Kingdom	United States
<b>Eligible, Interview (Category 1)</b>				
Complete	252	22	822	86
<b>Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)</b>				
Refusal and breakoff	0	162	0	16
Break off	0	3	121	2
Answering machine	0	0	0	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	0	0	0
Language problem	0	0	0	0
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)</b>				
Always busy	133	0	179	9
No answer	2,484	262	8,545	922
Answering machine-don't know if household	1,777	0	5,891	748
Call blocking	0	0	0	0
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	1,194	3	1,239	53
No screener completed	733	7	7,740	402
<b>Not eligible (Category 4)</b>				
Fax/data line	22	3	402	150
Non-working number	19,104	1	7,561	15,174
Business, government office, other organizations	0	0	471	38
No eligible respondent	52	5	544	29
Quota filled	5	0	0	0
Total phone numbers used	25,756	468	33,515	17,629
<b>Response Rate 3</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>10.3%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>

**TABLE 23: Cellphone Response Rates by Country**

	Australia	Canada	France	Germany	Netherlands
<b>Eligible, Interview (Category 1)</b>					
Complete	1,586	2,364	1,911	508	528
<b>Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)</b>					
Refusal and breakoff	0	102	0	116	0
Break off	19	88	392	46	116
Answering machine	0	0	0	18	0
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	0	0	2	0
Language problem	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)</b>					
Always busy	780	22,708	26	0	157
No answer	29,806	36,398	771	2,459	322
Answering machine-don't know if household	37,557	33,458	2,639	6,035	1,089
Call blocking	0	1,030	0	0	0
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	3,380	8,108	2,918	474	630
No screener completed	11,064	16,112	2,308	60	1,105
<b>Not eligible (Category 4)</b>					
Fax/data line	41	56	18	10	6
Non-working number	147,767	226,074	766	145	354
Business, government office, other organizations	0	748	221	254	71
No eligible respondent	2,957	1,738	595	0	162
Quota filled	0	20	0	0	0
Total phone numbers used	234,957	349,004	12,565	10,127	4,540
<b>Response Rate 3</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>25.1%</b>

**TABLE 23 Cont'd: Cellphone Response Rates by Country**

	New Zealand	Norway	United Kingdom	United States
<b>Eligible, Interview (Category 1)</b>				
Complete	751	585	1,169	419
<b>Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)</b>				
Refusal and breakoff	4	2,274	0	67
Break off	0	82	911	19
Answering machine	0	0	0	2
Physically or mentally unable/incompetent	0	0	0	0
Language problem	0	0	0	0
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)</b>				
Always busy	308	0	2,852	2
No answer	4,579	4,877	16,140	324
Answering machine-don't know if household	10,684	0	31,038	4,321
Call blocking	0	0	8	188
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	2,270	104	7,706	784
No screener completed	3,639	53	32,940	4386
<b>Not eligible (Category 4)</b>				
Fax/data line	104	7	87	10
Non-working number	183,853	1	6,405	4,082
Business, government office, other organizations	0	0	925	240
No eligible respondent	121	35	15,340	288
Quota filled	0	0	0	0
Total phone numbers used	206,313	8,018	115,521	15,132
<b>Response Rate 3</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>

**TABLE 24: ABS Response Rate for Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States**

	Sweden	Switzerland	United States
Total records	9,024	4,685	21,000
Ineligibles	236	0	1,203
Valid sample	6,275	2,401	17,814
Completes	2,513	2,284	1,983
<b>Response Rate</b>	<b>30.4%</b>	<b>48.7%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>

## WEIGHTING

Data from each country were weighted to ensure the final outcome was representative of the adult population, ages 18 and older<sup>22</sup>. The weighting procedures 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 2016 weighting protocol.<sup>23</sup>

Table 25 shows the post-stratification parameters per country and outlines the oversampling, if any, that was put in place.

**TABLE 25: Post-Stratification Parameters per country**

	Post-stratification Variables	Oversamples
Australia	age by gender, region, education, urban status	NSW <sup>24</sup>
Canada	age by gender, region (province distribution), education, knowledge of official language <sup>25</sup>	At least 250 completes per province and with larger sample sizes for Ontario and Quebec <sup>26</sup>
France	age by gender, region, education	None
Germany	age by gender, region, education, household size	None
Netherlands	age by gender, region, education	None
New Zealand	age by gender, region, education	None
Norway	age by gender, region, education	None
Sweden <sup>27</sup>	age by gender, education	None
Switzerland	age by gender, region, education	Cantons of Valais and Basel Stadt
UK	age by gender, region, education	Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland

<sup>22</sup> This is accomplished using SPSSINC RAKE, an SPSS extension module that simultaneously balances the distributions of all variables to known population parameters using a GENLOG procedure. To handle missing data among some of the parameter variables, consistent with prior waves of this study, we employed a technique called hot decking. Hot deck imputation replaces the missing values of a respondent randomly with another similar respondent without missing data. We use an SPSS macro detailed in 'Goodbye, Listwise Deletion: Presenting Hot Deck Imputation as an Easy and Effective Tool for Handling Missing Data' (Myers, 2011).

<sup>23</sup> Phone status was used as a parameter in weighting only for the USA for IHP 2020.

<sup>24</sup> An additional oversample was completed in Victoria; however, those data were not included in the data delivery used for the Health Affairs article. More information on the sampling, data collection and weighting procedures for this is included in an addendum to this report.

<sup>25</sup> Knowledge of Official Language was a benchmark only for Quebec, New Brunswick, and for Canada as a whole

<sup>26</sup> An additional oversample was completed in Quebec to obtain a minimum number of completes in each Health Region; however, those data were not included in the data delivery used for the Health Affairs article. More information on the sampling, data collection and weighting procedures for this is included in an addendum to this report.

<sup>27</sup> Unlike prior IHP waves, Sweden data were not weighted by region upon consultation with Vardanalyt. SSRS checked to ensure that the region distribution was in line with population parameters.

## Detailed Weighting Procedures by Country<sup>29</sup>

### *Australia*

The weighting procedure for Australia needed to address the following:

1. Disproportionate sample stratification across New South Wales in the overall Australian data.
2. The need to accurately represent the overall Australian adult population as well as the overall adults in the New South Wales population for state-specific analyses.
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 points the following steps were taken:

1. The NSW data and all remaining Australia data were weighted separately, so that each of these subsamples (NSW, rest of Australia) accurately represent the population.
2. To address different probabilities of selection:
  - a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correction was necessary.
  - b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
  - c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.
3. The sample was weighted to balance the number of completed interviews by Primary Health Network (PHN) in NSW. This weight was calculated as the percent of the population living in each PHN divided by the percentage of completed interviews attained in each PHN.

---

<sup>28</sup> Insurance status was used in past iterations of the IHP survey but was not included for IHP 2020.

<sup>29</sup> Missing data for gender, age and other variables were imputed using a Hot Deck procedure prior to raking.

4. A baseweight was created equaling the product of WHC X DUC X (PHN (for NSW) or 1 (for all other provinces)).
5. Post-stratification weighting:  
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 2016 Census data.
  - Educational attainment was generated using the Australian Bureau of Statistics TableBuilder function, based on the 2016 Census data. Because data are available only for 15 to 74 year olds, as in previous years, 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 2016 Census data.
  - PHN regions for NSW were included in the post-stratification and also obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics based on 2016 Census data.
6. Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.
7. Geographic representation: In the final weighting step, the NSW weights were decreased and the remaining weights increased so that the share of NSW responses reflect the share of NSW among Australian adults and the share of other states likewise reflect their share of the adult population.

Tables 26 and 27 below compare the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for NSW and Australia as a whole.

**TABLE 26: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for total Australia and Australia Excluding NSW**

	AUS Total - Unweighted	AUS Total - Weighted	AUS Total - Adults	Non-NSW Unweighted	Non-NSW Weighted	Non -NSW Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>						
Male 18-24	3.8%	6.2%	6.2%	4.5%	6.3%	6.2%
Male 25-34	8.3%	9.6%	9.6%	7.9%	9.6%	9.6%
Male 35-49	10.1%	12.4%	12.7%	9.8%	12.3%	12.7%
Male 50-64	10.4%	11.2%	11.1%	8.7%	11.3%	11.1%
Male 65+	13.3%	9.7%	9.6%	12.3%	9.7%	9.5%
Female 18-24	3.7%	5.7%	5.9%	3.9%	5.6%	5.9%
Female 25-34	7.2%	9.7%	9.7%	9.0%	9.8%	9.7%
Female 35-49	9.6%	12.6%	12.9%	9.4%	12.5%	13.0%
Female 50-64	13.0%	11.8%	11.6%	13.6%	11.8%	11.6%
Female 65+	20.6%	11.1%	10.9%	20.9%	11.1%	10.7%
<b>Education</b>						
High School or Less	26.5%	43.2%	44.4%	26.1%	43.2%	44.9%
Some Post-Secondary	23.0%	27.8%	27.2%	23.1%	28.6%	27.8%
University Degree or more	50.4%	29.0%	28.4%	50.8%	28.2%	27.3%
<b>Urban Status</b>						
Major City	72.6%	71.6%	71.3%	73.1%	71.8%	71.4%
Not Major City	27.4%	28.4%	28.7%	26.9%	28.2%	28.6%
<b>Region/Strata</b>						
NSW	67.6%	32.8%	32.0%	-	-	-
Victoria	14.1%	26.3%	26.2%	43.5%	39.2%	38.5%
Queensland	7.9%	19.2%	19.8%	24.3%	28.6%	29.2%
South Australia	3.1%	7.0%	7.0%	9.5%	10.5%	10.3%
Western Australia	5.0%	10.0%	10.2%	15.3%	14.9%	15.0%
Tasmania	1.1%	2.1%	2.1%	3.5%	3.1%	3.1%
Northern Territory	0.2%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	1.3%	1.4%
Australian Capital Territory	1.1%	1.7%	1.7%	3.4%	2.5%	2.5%

**TABLE 27: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for NSW**

	NSW-Unweighted	NSW-Weighted	NSW-Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	3.5%	6.1%	6.2%
Male 25-34	8.5%	9.6%	9.6%
Male 35-49	10.3%	12.6%	12.6%
Male 50-64	11.2%	10.9%	11.0%
Male 65+	13.7%	9.8%	9.8%
Female 18-24	3.6%	5.9%	5.8%
Female 25-34	6.3%	9.4%	9.6%
Female 35-49	9.7%	12.8%	12.8%
Female 50-64	12.8%	11.7%	11.5%
Female 65+	20.5%	11.2%	11.1%
<b>Education</b>			
High School or Less	26.7%	43.1%	43.3%
Some Post-Secondary	23.0%	26.1%	26.0%
University Degree or more	50.3%	30.9%	30.7%
<b>Urban Status</b>			
Major City	72.4%	71.3%	71.0%
Not Major City	27.6%	28.7%	29.0%
<b>PHN Strata</b>			
Central and Eastern Sydney	22.8%	19.9%	19.7%
Hunter New England and Central Coast	14.4%	17.0%	16.8%
Murrumbidgee	4.2%	3.4%	3.3%
Nepean Blue Mountains	4.4%	4.8%	4.9%
North Coast	6.9%	7.1%	7.0%
Northern Sydney	12.6%	11.9%	11.8%
South Eastern NSW	10.1%	8.3%	8.1%
South Western Sydney	5.4%	11.4%	12.3%
Western NSW	8.9%	4.4%	4.3%
Western Sydney	10.2%	11.8%	11.8%

## Canada

The weighting needed to address the following:

1. Disproportionate sample stratification across the 13 provinces and 3 territories.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
  - a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other adults.
  - b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points the following steps were taken:

1. Data for each province were weighted separately, so that each subsample (and the country as a whole) accurately represent the corresponding population.
2. To address different probabilities of selection:
  - a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
  - b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
  - c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.

3. Post-stratification weighting:

With the base-weight applied, each subsample (each of Canadas 13 provinces and 3 territories) and the entire national sample were balanced to match known population parameters for age-by-gender, educational attainment, knowledge of official languages (only for Quebec, New Brunswick, and on Canada as a whole). Population parameters were derived from the Canada 2016 Census. SSRS obtained populations estimates from Statistics Canada for the adult population (age 18 or older) for each of the provinces and for Canada as a whole.

Two weights were developed for varying analytical purposes:

**Weight<sup>30</sup>** is to be used for total country estimates. This weight excludes the territory oversample. Including those cases would have made the design effect much too high and the weights would not converge.

---

<sup>30</sup> A portion of the sample was asked questions related to COVID-19. That portion of the sample underwent similar post stratification procedures.

**CANADA\_WeightProvinces**<sup>31</sup> includes all cases in the data and is to be used for estimates WITHIN each province or territory. This weights each province and territory within themselves but does not rebalance at the end to the distribution each brings to the total population in Canada.

4. Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.
5. Geographic representation: In the final weighting step, the weights within each province were adjusted to their correct share among Canadian adults.

Tables 28 through 33 and compare the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters.

**TABLE 28: 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
<b>Gender by Age</b>						
Male 18-24	5.2%	4.2%	4.6%	4.8%	6.3%	5.4%
Male 25-34	6.0%	6.7%	6.7%	2.8%	4.2%	6.5%
Male 35-49	7.1%	12.5%	11.8%	10.0%	11.8%	11.2%
Male 50-64	11.9%	15.7%	14.6%	15.6%	14.7%	14.1%
Male 65+	11.9%	11.2%	10.7%	13.6%	11.5%	10.7%
Female 18-24	.8%	3.7%	4.5%	3.6%	5.1%	5.2%
Female 25-34	5.2%	7.0%	6.9%	4.0%	6.1%	7.0%
Female 35-49	11.9%	10.7%	12.8%	9.2%	11.2%	12.2%
Female 50-64	23.8%	16.3%	15.4%	16.4%	16.2%	15.2%
Female 65+	16.3%	12.0%	11.9%	20.0%	12.8%	12.3%
<b>Education</b>						
High School or Less	21.8%	45.3%	46.5%	29.2%	44.6%	43.9%
Some Post-Secondary	24.2%	39.5%	38.2%	14.8%	35.7%	36.1%
University Degree or more	54.0%	15.2%	15.3%	56.0%	19.7%	20.0%

<sup>31</sup> The province weight was provided to Canadian partners in order to facilitate analysis and comparisons within provinces and territories.

**TABLE 29: 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
<b>Gender by Age</b>						
Male 18-24	2.8%	5.9%	5.2%	1.6%	4.4%	4.9%
Male 25-34	4.0%	7.0%	6.9%	5.6%	7.0%	6.6%
Male 35-49	8.4%	10.5%	10.8%	10.0%	11.9%	11.6%
Male 50-64	14.4%	14.3%	14.2%	11.6%	14.0%	14.5%
Male 65+	16.0%	10.8%	10.8%	9.2%	11.0%	10.9%
Female 18-24	2.4%	5.4%	5.1%	2.4%	4.9%	4.7%
Female 25-34	5.6%	7.4%	7.2%	5.2%	5.5%	6.8%
Female 35-49	11.6%	11.2%	11.9%	18.0%	12.9%	12.3%
Female 50-64	14.0%	15.2%	15.3%	17.6%	15.9%	15.4%
Female 65+	20.8%	12.4%	12.5%	18.8%	12.4%	12.3%
<b>Education</b>						
High School or Less	22.8%	42.6%	42.9%	28.8%	48.9%	48.5%
Some Post-Secondary	21.2%	36.5%	35.4%	13.6%	32.9%	34.1%
University Degree or more	56.0%	20.9%	21.6%	57.6%	18.2%	17.4%
<b>Language</b>						
English Only	-	-	-	52.0%	57.6%	57.4%
French Only	-	-	-	8.0%	7.4%	7.6%
Both	-	-	-	40.0%	35.0%	35.0%

**TABLE 30: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Ontario and Quebec**

	QC- Unweighted	QC- Weighted	QC- Adults	ON- Unweighted	ON- Weighted	ON- Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>						
Male 18-24	3.2%	5.6%	5.3%	4.1%	6.1%	5.9%
Male 25-34	5.4%	7.9%	7.8%	6.7%	8.1%	8.0%
Male 35-49	11.5%	12.4%	12.2%	9.5%	11.8%	11.9%
Male 50-64	10.1%	13.1%	13.9%	12.3%	13.4%	13.2%
Male 65+	9.8%	9.5%	9.7%	11.3%	9.1%	9.2%
Female 18-24	2.8%	5.2%	5.2%	4.1%	5.6%	5.7%
Female 25-34	7.2%	8.2%	7.9%	8.0%	8.1%	8.3%
Female 35-49	16.9%	12.6%	12.3%	12.5%	13.0%	13.0%
Female 50-64	16.8%	14.3%	14.3%	15.9%	13.7%	14.0%
Female 65+	16.3%	11.1%	11.2%	15.6%	10.9%	10.8%
<b>Education</b>						
High School or Less	27.7%	39.1%	39.2%	22.0%	42.6%	42.5%
Some Post-Secondary	16.6%	39.3%	39.5%	13.2%	30.1%	30.3%
University Degree or more	55.7%	21.7%	21.3%	64.8%	27.3%	27.2%
<b>Language</b>						
English Only	3.0%	4.8%	4.8%	-	-	-
French Only	44.2%	45.6%	45.6%	-	-	-
Both	52.8%	49.6%	49.6%	-	-	-

**TABLE 31: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Manitoba and Saskatchewan**

	MB- Unweighted	MB- Weighted	MB- Adults	SK- Unweighted	SK- Weighted	SK- Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>						
Male 18-24	3.6%	7.0%	6.3%	2.0%	6.3%	5.9%
Male 25-34	7.2%	9.2%	8.8%	6.0%	9.6%	9.4%
Male 35-49	11.2%	12.3%	12.2%	5.6%	12.1%	12.1%
Male 50-64	11.2%	13.2%	12.9%	15.2%	13.4%	13.2%
Male 65+	10.8%	8.9%	8.7%	14.8%	8.9%	8.9%
Female 18-24	2.4%	5.6%	6.0%	2.4%	4.7%	5.7%
Female 25-34	8.4%	8.2%	8.9%	4.0%	9.3%	9.3%
Female 35-49	12.8%	11.9%	12.5%	14.0%	12.2%	12.1%
Female 50-64	13.6%	13.7%	13.3%	14.0%	13.4%	13.3%
Female 65+	18.8%	10.1%	10.3%	22.0%	10.0%	10.2%
<b>Education</b>						
High School or Less	35.6%	48.7%	49.1%	30.0%	48.8%	48.7%
Some Post-Secondary	19.6%	30.0%	29.8%	20.4%	32.9%	32.3%
University Degree or more	44.8%	21.2%	21.1%	49.6%	18.4%	18.9%

**TABLE 32: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Alberta and British Columbia**

	AB- Unweighted	AB- Weighted	AB- Adults	BC- Unweighted	BC- Weighted	BC- Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>						
Male 18-24	2.6%	4.3%	5.9%	5.1%	5.9%	5.4%
Male 25-34	7.5%	10.9%	10.4%	6.7%	7.7%	8.1%
Male 35-49	14.9%	13.8%	13.9%	9.4%	11.2%	11.7%
Male 50-64	14.9%	13.2%	12.7%	8.7%	12.4%	13.2%
Male 65+	11.6%	7.3%	7.1%	12.2%	10.3%	10.1%
Female 18-24	2.2%	5.4%	5.6%	3.1%	5.5%	5.1%
Female 25-34	5.2%	10.3%	10.3%	6.3%	8.7%	8.3%
Female 35-49	9.3%	13.8%	13.7%	12.6%	12.8%	12.6%
Female 50-64	11.9%	13.2%	12.7%	15.7%	14.3%	14.2%
Female 65+	19.8%	7.9%	7.8%	20.1%	11.3%	11.2%
<b>Education</b>						
High School or Less	26.1%	41.6%	42.3%	25.6%	43.0%	42.8%
Some Post-Secondary	23.1%	33.8%	33.3%	22.8%	32.3%	31.6%
University Degree or more	50.7%	24.6%	24.5%	51.6%	24.7%	25.6%

**TABLE 33: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Canada as a whole**

	Canada-Unweighted	Canada-Weighted	Canada-Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	3.6%	5.7%	5.7%
Male 25-34	6.0%	8.3%	8.3%
Male 35-49	10.0%	12.2%	12.2%
Male 50-64	12.2%	13.4%	13.4%
Male 65+	11.5%	9.3%	9.3%
Female 18-24	3.1%	5.4%	5.4%
Female 25-34	6.7%	8.4%	8.4%
Female 35-49	13.4%	12.8%	12.8%
Female 50-64	16.1%	14.0%	14.0%
Female 65+	17.5%	10.7%	10.7%
<b>Education</b>			
High School or Less	25.7%	42.4%	42.4%
Some Post-Secondary	17.0%	33.4%	33.4%
University Degree or more	57.3%	24.3%	24.3%
<b>Language</b>			
English Only	65.7%	70.0%	70.0%
French Only	10.3%	11.0%	11.0%
Both	24.0%	19.0%	19.0%
<b>Region/Strata</b>			
Newfoundland and Labrador	5.6%	1.5%	1.5%
Prince Edward Island	5.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Nova Scotia	5.5%	2.7%	2.7%
New Brunswick	5.5%	2.2%	2.2%
Quebec	22.1%	23.2%	23.3%
Ontario	33.1%	38.5%	38.5%
Manitoba	5.5%	3.5%	3.5%
Saskatchewan	5.5%	3.0%	3.0%
Alberta	5.9%	11.2%	11.2%
British Columbia	5.6%	13.5%	13.5%
Yukon Territory	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Northwest Territories	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Nunavut	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%

## France

The weighting procedure for France addressed several issues:

1. Differences in the probability of selection by:
  - a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other adults.
  - b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phone have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
2. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters

To address these points the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection:
  - a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correction was necessary.
  - b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
  - c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.

2. Post-stratification weighting:

Parameters used for the French sample were region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment.

Population parameters were derived from the following sources:

- Gender, age, and region are based on 2018 data from the statistical office of the European Union (Eurostat).
  - Education was based on data from the 2016 INSEE's Employment Survey for the age 15 plus segment of the population. Adjustments were made to remove the 15 to 17 year olds from the population estimates, as done in previous years.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 34 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for France as a whole.

**TABLE 34: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for France**

	France-Unweighted	France-Weighted	France-Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	3.0%	5.1%	5.2%
Male 25-34	6.9%	7.5%	7.4%
Male 35-49	9.1%	11.7%	12.2%
Male 50-64	11.2%	11.9%	11.9%
Male 65+	9.1%	10.8%	10.9%
Female 18-24	4.1%	5.1%	5.0%
Female 25-34	7.9%	7.8%	7.7%
Female 35-49	13.8%	12.6%	12.5%
Female 50-64	18.2%	12.9%	12.7%
Female 65+	16.8%	14.6%	14.4%
<b>Education</b>			
No diploma or at most BEPC, College certificate, DNB	12.1%	27.9%	28.9%
Certificate of professional skills, Certificate of professional studies	31.6%	25.2%	24.8%
General, technological or vocational baccalaureate	8.8%	16.9%	16.8%
Graduate Diploma	47.5%	30.0%	29.5%
<b>Region/Strata</b>			
Alsace, Champagne-Ardenne, Lorraine	8.2%	8.6%	8.6%
Aquitaine Limousin Poitou-Charentes	8.9%	9.5%	9.5%
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes	13.5%	12.4%	12.3%
Bourgogne, Franche-Comté	4.0%	4.3%	4.4%
Bretagne	4.2%	5.2%	5.2%
Centre, Val de Loire	3.6%	3.8%	4.0%
Corse	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%
Île-de-France	23.7%	18.6%	18.4%
Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées	8.9%	9.3%	9.2%
Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Picardie	7.3%	9.0%	9.1%
Normandie	4.2%	5.0%	5.1%
Pays de la Loire	5.4%	5.8%	5.8%
Provence-Alpes, Côte-d'Azur	7.9%	7.9%	7.9%

## Germany

The weighting procedure for Germany addressed several issues:

1. Differences in the probability of selection by:
  - a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other adults.
  - b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
2. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters

To address these points the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection:
  - a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
  - b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
  - c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.
2. Post-stratification weighting:

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 2018 data.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 35 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Germany as a whole.

**TABLE 35: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Germany**

	Germany-Unweighted	Germany-Weighted	Germany-Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	2.2%	4.1%	4.8%
Male 25-34	4.8%	7.8%	7.9%
Male 35-49	9.4%	11.5%	11.4%
Male 50-64	13.7%	13.7%	13.6%
Male 65+	12.6%	11.3%	11.3%
Female 18-24	3.1%	4.3%	4.3%
Female 25-34	4.8%	7.4%	7.4%
Female 35-49	12.0%	11.3%	11.2%
Female 50-64	20.5%	13.9%	13.7%
Female 65+	16.9%	14.6%	14.5%
<b>Education</b>			
High School or Less	43.0%	43.4%	43.5%
Some Post-Secondary	23.7%	23.4%	23.4%
University Degree or more	33.3%	33.2%	33.1%
<b>Household Size</b>			
Single-Person Household	30.4%	25.4%	25.4%
Multiple-Person HH	69.6%	74.6%	74.6%
<b>Region/Strata</b>			
Schleswig-Holstein	4.5%	3.5%	3.5%
Hamburg	2.6%	2.2%	2.2%
Bremen	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%
Niedersachsen	8.2%	9.5%	9.6%
Nordrhein-Westfalen	18.6%	21.3%	21.5%
Rheinland-Pfalz	4.5%	4.8%	4.9%
Saarland	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%
Hessen	8.3%	7.5%	7.5%
Baden-Württemberg	11.0%	13.1%	13.3%
Bayern	16.5%	15.9%	15.7%
Berlin	6.5%	4.5%	4.4%
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	2.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Brandenburg	4.0%	3.1%	3.1%
Sachsen-Anhalt	2.5%	2.7%	2.7%
Thüringen	2.8%	2.6%	2.6%
Freistaat Sachsen	5.8%	5.1%	5.0%

## *The Netherlands*

The weighting procedure for The Netherlands addressed several issues:

1. Differences in the probability of selection by:
  - a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other adults.
  - b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
2. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection:
  - a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
  - b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
  - c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.

2. Post-stratification weighting:

Parameters used for the Netherlands sample were region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:

- Gender, age, education, and region were based on 2018 data from the statistical office of the European Union (Eurostat).
  - Education data was based on adults aged 18 to 74. Final parameters included adults aged 75 or older as a separate category.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 36 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for The Netherlands as a whole.

**TABLE 36: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the Netherlands**

	Netherlands- Unweighted	Netherlands- Weighted	Netherlands – Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	2.7%	4.9%	5.5%
Male 25-34	6.0%	7.9%	7.9%
Male 35-49	9.7%	12.3%	12.1%
Male 50-64	15.0%	13.3%	13.0%
Male 65+	15.7%	11.1%	10.8%
Female 18-24	2.5%	4.3%	5.3%
Female 25-34	4.8%	7.7%	7.7%
Female 35-49	10.1%	12.2%	12.1%
Female 50-64	16.5%	13.2%	12.9%
Female 65+	17.1%	13.0%	12.7%
<b>Education</b>			
High School or Less	19.5%	22.3%	23.0%
Some Post-Secondary	33.1%	37.1%	37.5%
University Degree or more	34.7%	30.4%	29.6%
Age 75 or older	12.7%	10.2%	10.0%
<b>Region/Strata</b>			
Drenthe	3.9%	3.0%	2.9%
Flevoland	2.3%	2.3%	2.3%
Friesland	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%
Gelderland	12.2%	11.7%	11.9%
Groningen	3.2%	3.5%	3.5%
Limburg	6.9%	6.9%	6.8%
Noord-Brabant	15.8%	15.1%	14.8%
Noord-Holland	16.2%	16.7%	16.5%
Overijssel	4.8%	6.4%	6.6%
Utrecht	7.3%	7.0%	7.4%
Zeeland	1.7%	2.2%	2.2%
Zuid-Holland	22.2%	21.6%	21.3%

## *New Zealand*

The weighting procedure for New Zealand addressed several issues:

1. Differences in the probability of selection by:
  - a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other adults.
  - b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
2. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points 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 weigh 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:

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 2018 Census of Population and Dwellings, provided to SSRS by Statistics New Zealand.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 37 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for New Zealand as a whole.

**TABLE 37: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for New Zealand**

	New Zealand - Unweighted	New Zealand - Weighted	New Zealand - Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	4.3%	6.2%	6.3%
Male 25-34	9.8%	9.3%	9.2%
Male 35-49	11.3%	12.0%	12.3%
Male 50-64	9.8%	11.9%	11.8%
Male 65+	7.1%	8.6%	9.3%
Female 18-24	4.6%	6.0%	5.9%
Female 25-34	8.7%	9.3%	9.2%
Female 35-49	12.8%	13.1%	13.0%
Female 50-64	13.1%	12.7%	12.4%
Female 65+	18.7%	10.9%	10.6%
<b>Education</b>			
High School or Less	24.6%	52.6%	53.6%
Some Post-Secondary	30.2%	20.3%	19.9%
University Degree or more	45.2%	27.1%	26.5%
<b>Region/Strata</b>			
Auckland	37.0%	33.5%	33%
North	23.1%	26.0%	27%
Central	15.7%	16.3%	16%
South	24.2%	24.2%	24%

## Norway

The weighting procedure for Norway addressed several issues:

1. Differences in the probability of selection by:
  - a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other adults.
  - b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
  - c. Age distribution adjustment due to over representation of 50 plus age targeted sample within the listed frame.
2. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points the following steps were taken:

1. To address different probabilities of selection:
  - a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
  - b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).
  - c. A base weight was created by taking the product of the within household correction and the dual-usage correction.
2. Post-stratification weighting:

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 2020."
  - Education was based on Statistics Norway's tabulation for "Population 16 Years and Over, by Level of Education, Gender and Age" for 2020.<sup>32</sup>
3. Weights were trimmed at the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 38 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Norway as a whole.

---

<sup>32</sup> 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.

**TABLE 38: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Norway**

	Norway-Unweighted	Norway-Weighted	Norway-Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	4.3%	6.0%	5.8%
Male 25-34	5.1%	8.6%	8.9%
Male 35-49	11.5%	13.4%	13.2%
Male 50-64	11.9%	12.5%	12.1%
Male 65+	16.0%	10.5%	10.1%
Female 18-24	1.5%	4.2%	5.4%
Female 25-34	4.9%	7.7%	8.6%
Female 35-49	11.2%	12.8%	12.5%
Female 50-64	15.0%	12.0%	11.6%
Female 65+	18.6%	12.2%	11.7%
<b>Education</b>			
High School or Less	37.4%	63.4%	64.8%
Some Post-Secondary	34.9%	25.7%	24.8%
University Degree or more	27.7%	10.9%	10.4%
<b>Region/Strata</b>			
Agder (Aust-Agder, Vest-Agder)	6.6%	5.7%	5.7%
Innlandet (Hedmark, Oppland)	4.9%	7.2%	7.2%
Møre og Romsdal	4.6%	4.8%	5.0%
Nordland	4.3%	4.8%	4.6%
Oslo	15.2%	12.7%	13.0%
Rogaland	7.4%	8.9%	8.6%
Troms og Finnmark (Troms, Finnmark, Svalbard)	4.4%	4.6%	4.7%
Trøndelag (Sør-Trøndelag, Nord-Trøndelag)	11.5%	9.0%	8.8%
Vestfold og Telemark (Vestfold, Telemark)	7.9%	7.7%	7.9%
Vestland (Hordaland, Sogn og Fjordane)	10.0%	12.0%	11.8%
Viken (Østfold, Akershus, Buskerud)	23.1%	22.6%	22.8%

## Sweden

The weighting procedure for Sweden addressed systematic non-response along known demographic parameters.

To address this point, the following steps were taken:

1. Post-stratification weighting:  
Parameters used for the Sweden sample were age-by-gender and educational attainment.<sup>33</sup>  
Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
  - Gender and age were based on Statistics Sweden’s 2019 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 2019, excluding 16 and 17 year-olds.
2. Weights were trimmed at the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 39 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Sweden as a whole.

**TABLE 39: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Sweden**

	Sweden-Unweighted	Sweden-Weighted	Sweden-Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	3.6%	5.4%	5.3%
Male 25-34	4.5%	8.4%	9.2%
Male 35-49	9.9%	12.3%	12.2%
Male 50-64	12.5%	11.8%	11.6%
Male 65+	17.1%	12.1%	11.8%
Female 18-24	4.2%	4.8%	4.7%
Female 25-34	5.2%	8.1%	8.7%
Female 35-49	10.5%	11.8%	11.7%
Female 50-64	13.2%	11.5%	11.3%
Female 65+	19.4%	13.8%	13.5%
<b>Education</b>			
High School or Less	56.5%	63.3%	62.0%
Some Post-Secondary	7.0%	12.9%	14.7%
University Degree or more	36.5%	23.8%	23.3%

<sup>33</sup> Unlike prior IHP waves, Sweden data were not weighted by region, due to privacy concerns preventing the variable from being included in the data, upon consultation with Vardanalyt. SSRS, however, checked to ensure that the region distribution was reasonable relative to the official benchmark (within less than 2% difference from the benchmark for the Sweden-wide sample, and within max 3 to 4% difference for the COVID-19 specific sample).

## 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).<sup>34</sup>
2. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points 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, 2018).

**TABLE 40: Linguistic Region Base-Weight**

Linguistic Region	Statistics Switzerland (%)	Data (%)	Weight
German with phone	34.7%	30.0%	1.15
German without phone	36.9%	26.9%	1.37
French with phone	10.4%	13.5%	0.77
French without phone	13.9%	14.7%	0.94
Italian French with phone	2.0%	7.5%	0.27
Italian French without phone	2.2%	7.3%	0.30

2. Post-stratification weighting:  
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.
  - Gender, age, education, and region (Canton) from Statistics Switzerland data for 2018.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 41 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Switzerland as a whole.

---

<sup>34</sup> Even though outbound dialing was not implemented, for consistency's sake relative to prior waves and for an accurate representation of the registry, this adjustment was kept in similar to what was done in prior IHP waves of this study.

**TABLE 41: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Switzerland**

	Switzerland- Unweighted	Switzerland- Weighted	Switzerland- Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	2.8%	4.4%	4.9%
Male 25-34	6.8%	8.3%	8.5%
Male 35-49	13.0%	13.0%	13.0%
Male 50-64	14.2%	13.0%	12.8%
Male 65+	11.9%	10.2%	10.0%
Female 18-24	3.2%	4.5%	4.6%
Female 25-34	6.9%	8.2%	8.3%
Female 35-49	14.0%	12.9%	12.8%
Female 50-64	15.5%	13.0%	12.7%
Female 65+	11.6%	12.6%	12.5%
<b>Education</b>			
High School or Less	61.7%	68.4%	67.2%
Some Post-Secondary	7.7%	13.0%	13.3%
University Degree or more	30.6%	18.7%	19.4%
<b>Region</b>			
Zürich	9.6%	17.4%	17.8%
Bern French speaking	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Bern German speaking	6.7%	11.7%	11.6%
Luzern	3.3%	4.9%	4.8%
Uri	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Schwyz	0.9%	1.9%	1.9%
Obwalden	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Nidwalden	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%
Glarus	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%
Zug	1.0%	1.5%	1.5%
Fribourg French speaking	2.6%	2.8%	2.7%
Fribourg German speaking	0.6%	0.9%	0.9%
Solothurn	1.5%	3.1%	3.2%
Basel-Stadt	15.0%	2.4%	2.3%
Basel-Landschaft	2.2%	3.4%	3.4%
Schaffhausen	0.5%	1.0%	1.0%
Appenzell Ausserrhoden	0.3%	0.6%	0.6%
Appenzell Innerrhoden	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
St. Gallen	3.1%	5.7%	5.9%
Graubünden	2.1%	2.4%	2.4%
Aargau	4.0%	7.7%	7.9%
Thurgau	2.2%	3.3%	3.2%
Ticino	14.4%	4.3%	4.2%
Vaud	7.4%	9.4%	9.2%
Valais French speaking	11.1%	3.1%	3.0%
Valais German speaking	2.9%	1.0%	1.0%
Neuchatel	1.8%	2.0%	2.0%

Geneva	4.0%	5.9%	5.8%
Jura	0.7%	0.9%	0.9%

### *The United Kingdom*

The weighting procedure for the United Kingdom addressed several issues:

1. Disproportionate sample stratification across Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland.
2. Differences in the probability of selection by:
  - a. Household size: Respondents who live with no other adults have a higher probability of being sampled than respondents who live with other adults.
  - b. Telephone use: respondents who have both a landline and a cell phones have a greater probability of selection than those who have just one type of phone.
3. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points the following steps were taken:

1. Data for each oversampled region were weighted separately, so that each subsample (and the country as a whole) accurately represent the corresponding population.
2. To address different probabilities of selection:
  - a. Within Household Correction: Respondents reached by landline phone and living in households with two or more adults received a weight adjustment of 2 while those living with no other adults received no within household correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1). Since cell phones are treated as personal devices, no within household correct was necessary.
  - b. Dual-Usage Correction: Adults who have both a landline and a cell phone received a weight adjustment of 0.5 while those who have only one kind of phone received no dual-usage correction (i.e., a weight adjustment of 1).

A base weight was created by taking the product of the listed cellphone, the within household, and the dual-usage corrections.

3. Post-stratification weighting:
 

With the base-weight applied, each subsample (Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) and the entire national sample were balanced to match known population parameters for region, age-by-gender, and educational attainment. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:

  - Gender, age and region were based on 2018 data from the statistical office of the European Union (Eurostat).
  - Education was based off the January-December 2019 Annual Population Survey from the Office of National Statistics in the UK. Education data was available for adults aged 18 to 64. Final population parameters included adults aged 65 or older as a separate category.

4. Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Tables 42 through 44 and compare the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters.

**TABLE 42: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Wales and Scotland**

	Wales- Unweighted	Wales- Weighted	Wales- Adults	Scotland- Unweighted	Scotland- Weighted	Scotland- Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>						
Male 18-24	3.7%	5.9%	6.0%	5.2%	5.5%	5.5%
Male 25-34	3.9%	7.6%	7.9%	7.7%	8.3%	8.3%
Male 35-49	9.6%	10.4%	11.0%	8.4%	11.7%	11.6%
Male 50-64	10.8%	12.3%	12.1%	15.3%	12.5%	12.4%
Male 65+	15.0%	12.2%	12.0%	11.9%	10.5%	10.4%
Female 18-24	4.2%	5.5%	5.4%	2.2%	4.6%	5.4%
Female 25-34	4.2%	7.9%	7.7%	7.7%	8.8%	8.5%
Female 35-49	8.3%	11.5%	11.3%	14.3%	12.3%	12.2%
Female 50-64	17.4%	12.8%	12.6%	11.1%	13.1%	13.1%
Female 65+	23.0%	13.9%	14.1%	16.3%	12.6%	12.8%
<b>Education</b>						
High School or Less	14.0%	28.0%	28.2%	15.8%	24.3%	24.5%
Some Post-Secondary	20.1%	16.0%	16.1%	15.6%	13.9%	14.0%
University Degree or more	27.9%	29.8%	29.7%	40.5%	38.6%	38.4%
Age 65 or older	38.0%	26.1%	26.0%	28.1%	23.2%	23.1%

**TABLE 43: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Northern Ireland and the Rest of the UK**

	N. Ireland- Unweighted	N. Ireland- Weighted	N. Ireland- Adults	Rest of UK- Unweighted	Rest of UK- Weighted	Rest of UK- Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>						
Male 18-24	2.6%	5.4%	5.9%	4.8%	5.5%	5.6%
Male 25-34	6.3%	8.8%	8.5%	7.9%	8.9%	8.7%
Male 35-49	7.9%	12.4%	12.4%	11.0%	12.3%	12.4%
Male 50-64	11.6%	12.4%	12.1%	12.2%	11.8%	11.7%
Male 65+	14.2%	9.7%	9.6%	10.2%	10.3%	10.5%
Female 18-24	4.0%	5.6%	5.5%	4.5%	5.4%	5.3%
Female 25-34	4.6%	8.4%	8.7%	8.8%	8.6%	8.6%
Female 35-49	12.3%	13.3%	13.1%	10.3%	12.5%	12.5%
Female 50-64	13.9%	12.5%	12.5%	15.2%	12.1%	12.1%
Female 65+	22.5%	11.6%	11.7%	15.3%	12.6%	12.5%
<b>Education</b>						
High School or Less	12.3%	30.8%	31.0%	16.3%	25.6%	26.5%
Some Post-Secondary	15.2%	16.8%	16.9%	20.7%	16.7%	16.3%
University Degree or more	35.8%	31.1%	30.8%	37.6%	34.8%	34.2%
Age 65 or older	36.8%	21.3%	21.3%	25.5%	22.9%	23.0%
<b>Region</b>						
Northeast	-	-	-	5.0%	4.9%	4.8%
Yorks & Humber	-	-	-	9.2%	9.9%	9.8%
East Midlands	-	-	-	8.9%	8.8%	8.6%
East	-	-	-	4.6%	9.4%	11.1%
London	-	-	-	19.7%	16.1%	15.7%
South East	-	-	-	21.7%	16.7%	16.3%
South West	-	-	-	10.5%	10.4%	10.2%
West Midlands	-	-	-	8.9%	10.4%	10.4%
North West	-	-	-	11.4%	13.2%	13.0%

**TABLE 44: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the UK**

	UK-Unweighted	UK-Weighted	UK-Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	4.3%	5.5%	5.6%
Male 25-34	6.8%	8.8%	8.7%
Male 35-49	9.7%	12.1%	12.2%
Male 50-64	12.5%	11.9%	11.8%
Male 65+	12.1%	10.4%	10.5%
Female 18-24	3.9%	5.4%	5.3%
Female 25-34	7.0%	8.6%	8.6%
Female 35-49	11.0%	12.5%	12.5%
Female 50-64	14.6%	12.2%	12.2%
Female 65+	18.2%	12.7%	12.6%
<b>Education</b>			
High School or Less	15.1%	25.8%	26.6%
Some Post-Secondary	18.7%	16.4%	16.1%
University Degree or more	35.9%	34.7%	34.2%
Age 65 or older	30.3%	23.1%	23.1%
<b>Region/Strata</b>			
Northeast	2.2%	4.1%	4.1%
Yorks & Humber	4.1%	8.3%	8.2%
East Midlands	3.9%	7.4%	7.3%
East	2.0%	7.8%	9.3%
London	8.7%	13.5%	13.2%
South East	9.5%	14.0%	13.7%
South West	4.6%	8.7%	8.6%
West Midlands	3.9%	8.7%	8.8%
North West	5.0%	11.1%	11.0%
Wales	20.5%	4.9%	4.8%
Scotland	20.3%	8.6%	8.4%
Northern Ireland	15.2%	2.9%	2.8%

## *The United States*

The weighting procedure for the United States ensures that sample is representative of the target population. The following steps were taken to weight the data:

1. Base weight adjustments. Different base weights and adjustments were made for the telephone samples and the Address Based Sample.

### **a) Telephone Sample**

#### a. Probability of Selection Adjustment

- i. Probability of Selection ( $P_{\text{phone}}$ ): A phone number's probability of selection depends on the number of phone-numbers selected out of the total sample frame. So for each respondent whose household has a landline phone number this is calculated as total landline numbers dialed divided by total numbers in the landline frame and conversely for respondents answering at least one cell phone number, this is calculated as total cell phone numbers divided by total numbers in the cell phone frame.
- ii. Probability of Respondent selection ( $P_{\text{select}}$ ): 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.
- iii. Total Probability of Selection: This is calculated as the phone number's probability of selection (by frame), and for landlines, divided by the number of adults in the household. Thus, for each respondent a probability can be calculated for being reached via landline ( $LL_{\text{prob}}$ ) and for being reached via cell phone ( $Cell_{\text{prob}}$ ). These calculations are:

$$LL_{\text{prob}} = P_{\text{phone}} * P_{\text{select}}$$

$$Cell_{\text{prob}} = P_{\text{phone}}$$

The sample weights derived at this stage are calculated as the inverse of the combined probability of selection, or:

$$1 / (LL_{\text{prob}} + Cell_{\text{prob}} - LL_{\text{prob}} * Cell_{\text{prob}})$$

#### b. Stratification Adjustment

- i. A correction was applied to adjust for the oversampling of certain strata according to income.

**TABLE 45: US RDD Stratification Adjustment**

Strata	Population Distribution	Unweighted	Weight
1-Poorest	10.0%	19.2%	0.52
2	10.0%	17.2%	0.58
3	10.0%	13.9%	0.72
4	10.0%	15.4%	0.65
5	20.0%	15.0%	1.33
6	19.9%	10.1%	1.97
7-Richest	20.1%	9.1%	2.20

- c. Prepaid Cellphone Adjustment
  - i. Prepaid cell numbers were oversampled in the cell frame. The prepaid cellphone adjustment corrects for this oversampling by applying an adjustment to balance the proportion of prepaid cell numbers in the sample to match the proportion in the RDD cell sample frame.

**b) ABS Frame**

- a. Probability of Selection Adjustment
  - i. Correction for the number of adults in the household (capped at 3 or more).
- b. Disproportionate Stratification Adjustment
  - i. The ABS frame was divided in strata based on region, incidence of African American household, incidence of Hispanic households and incidence of low-income households. Sample rates were different across the strata. A stratification adjustment was made to balance the distribution of the sample across strata to match the distribution of the sample frame across strata.

**TABLE 46: US ABS Stratification Adjustment**

Strata	Population Distribution	Unweighted	Weight
NE, Low inc, high hisp, high AA	1.3%	1.6%	0.82
MW, Low inc, high hisp, high AA	0.5%	0.8%	0.60
South, Low inc, high hisp, high AA	2.3%	3.7%	0.62
West, Low inc, high hisp, high AA	1.0%	1.6%	0.63
NE, Low inc, high hisp, low AA	1.0%	1.4%	0.72
MW, Low inc, high hisp, low AA	0.8%	1.8%	0.42
South, Low inc, high hisp, low AA	2.8%	4.2%	0.68
West, Low inc, high hisp, low AA	4.3%	8.0%	0.54
NE, Low inc, low hisp, high AA	1.0%	1.7%	0.63
MW, Low inc, low hisp, high AA	2.6%	4.2%	0.61
South, Low inc, low hisp, high AA	6.5%	12.0%	0.54
West, Low inc, low hisp, high AA	0.3%	0.6%	0.44
NE, Low inc, low hisp, low AA	2.0%	3.4%	0.58
MW, Low inc, low hisp, low AA	3.8%	5.4%	0.70
South, Low inc, low hisp, low AA	4.6%	5.7%	0.80
West, Low inc, low hisp, low AA	2.4%	3.4%	0.69
NE, High inc, high hisp, high AA	0.5%	0.4%	1.23
MW, High inc, high hisp, high AA	0.1%	0.2%	0.90
South, High inc, high hisp, high AA	1.6%	2.5%	0.62
West, High inc, high hisp, high AA	0.5%	0.9%	0.57
NE, High inc, high hisp, low AA	1.0%	1.0%	1.08
MW, High inc, high hisp, low AA	0.7%	1.0%	0.69
South, High inc, high hisp, low AA	2.9%	3.4%	0.85
West, High inc, high hisp, low AA	4.4%	6.1%	0.73
NE, High inc, low hisp, high AA	1.1%	0.9%	1.22
MW, High inc, low hisp, high AA	1.4%	1.9%	0.73
South, High inc, low hisp, high AA	5.6%	5.4%	1.03
West, High inc, low hisp, high AA	0.4%	0.3%	1.20
NE, High inc, low hisp, low AA	9.9%	4.1%	2.39
MW, High inc, low hisp, low AA	12.4%	7.1%	1.75
South, High inc, low hisp, low AA	11.9%	2.8%	4.20
West, High inc, low hisp, low AA	8.5%	2.5%	3.46

2. Post-stratification weighting<sup>35</sup>:

Parameters used for the US sample were Census region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, number of adults in the household, race/ethnicity, phone status (cell phone only, landline only, dual

<sup>35</sup>Unlike prior waves, due to the uncertainty on insurance status due to the COVID-19 pandemic that benchmark was not included in the weighting scheme.

user)<sup>36</sup>, and internet access<sup>37</sup>. The ABS and RDD samples were weighted separately and combined into a single weight. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:

- Gender, age, region, education, race/ethnicity, and household size were based on the 2019 U.S. Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey (CPS) March supplement.<sup>38</sup>
  - Phone status was based on the January-June 2019 estimates from the NHIS.
  - Internet access via the 2018 American Community Survey (ACS)<sup>39</sup>
3. Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 47 below compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for the US as a whole.

**TABLE 47: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the US**

	US-Unweighted	US-Weighted	US-Adults
<b>Gender by Age</b>			
Male 18-24	3.7%	5.4%	5.8%
Male 25-34	7.8%	8.5%	9.1%
Male 35-49	8.5%	11.8%	12.1%
Male 50-64	10.5%	12.5%	11.9%
Male 65+	9.2%	9.0%	9.5%
Female 18-24	5.9%	5.4%	5.8%
Female 25-34	13.9%	9.3%	9.0%
Female 35-49	13.5%	13.2%	12.4%
Female 50-64	13.1%	13.7%	12.9%
Female 65+	13.9%	11.3%	11.5%
<b>Education</b>			
Less than High School	4.5%	9.3%	10.6%
High School	20.2%	27.4%	28.3%
Some Post-Secondary	32.1%	28.1%	27.8%
University Degree or more	43.2%	35.2%	33.3%
<b>Phone Status</b>			
Landline Only	2.4%	3.5%	3.6%
Cell Phone Only	30.5%	34.7%	35.2%
Both	67.1%	61.8%	61.2%
<b>Region/Strata</b>			
Northeast	15.4%	16.8%	17.5%
Midwest	40.2%	37.9%	37.9%
South	21.8%	21.5%	20.8%

<sup>36</sup> This was a parameter for the telephone sample only

<sup>37</sup> This was a parameter for the ABS sample only

<sup>38</sup> Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles and J. Robert Warren. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 7.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V7.0>

<sup>39</sup> Steven Ruggles, Sarah Flood, Ronald Goeken, Josiah Grover, Erin Meyer, Jose Pacas and Matthew Sobek. IPUMS USA: Version 10.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V10.0>

	<b>West</b>	22.6%	23.8%	23.8%
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
	<b>White non-Hispanic</b>	65.2%	63.3%	63.1%
	<b>Black non-Hispanic</b>	11.4%	11.7%	11.8%
	<b>Hispanic</b>	15.1%	16.2%	16.4%
	<b>Other non-Hispanic</b>	8.3%	8.8%	8.6%
<b>Household Size</b>				
	<b>1 adult HH</b>	32.1%	17.8%	16.9%
	<b>2 adult HH</b>	48.4%	53.3%	52.9%
	<b>3+ adult HH</b>	19.5%	28.8%	30.2%
<b>Internet Access (ABS)</b>				
	<b>Yes</b>	97.4%	93.2%	90.7%
	<b>No</b>	2.6%	6.8%	9.3%

## 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 48: Design Effect and Margin of Error by Country**

	N-Size	Design Effect	Margin of Error
Australia	2,201	2.45	3.3
NSW	1,488	1.67	3.3
Rest of Australia	713	1.57	4.6
Canada <sup>40</sup>	4,530	2.57	2.3
Newfoundland	252	2.31	9.4
Prince Edward Island	250	2.38	9.6
Nova Scotia	250	1.91	8.6
New Brunswick	250	2.24	9.3
Quebec	1,000	1.87	4.2
Ontario	1,501	2.00	3.6
Manitoba	250	1.67	8.0
Saskatchewan	250	2.87	10.5
Alberta	268	1.89	8.2
British Columbia	254	1.89	8.5
Yukon	250	1.85	8.4
Northwest Territories	123	2.16	13.0
Nunavut	191	1.83	9.6
France	3,028	1.65	2.3
Germany	1,004	1.24	3.4
Netherlands	753	1.24	4.0
New Zealand	1,003	1.76	4.1
Norway	607	1.61	5.0
Sweden	2,513	1.23	2.2
Switzerland	2,284	1.64	2.6
UK	1,991	2.12	3.2
Wales	408	1.49	5.9
Scotland	405	1.23	5.4
Northern Ireland	302	1.72	7.4
Rest of the UK	876	1.29	3.8
US	2,488	1.85	2.7

<sup>40</sup> The design effect and margin of error reported for Canada overall is based on the main weight for Canada, while the design effects and margin of errors for the individual provinces/territories for Canada is based on the province weight.

# COVID-19 SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

## Overview

In early to mid-March 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic began to spread and intensify across the world, SSRS and the Commonwealth Fund met to discuss the potential advantages and disadvantages of delaying the fieldwork for IHP 2020 or moving ahead as planned. After much discussion and taking into account that data collection had started in most countries at that point, the consensus was to continue fielding the IHP 2020 survey. Prior to making this decision, SSRS reviewed each question in the questionnaire to determine which, if any, could potentially be affected by the pandemic. After review, we found only a few questions that would be more susceptible to effects by fielding during this time (e.g., Q1105, Q1110). Since the vast majority of questions in the survey are retrospective, the team anticipated responses would be less affected by the pandemic than they would be if they were more attitudinal. Further, continuing data collection as planned offered the best opportunity to complete in a similar timeframe as originally planned and it would also be the most cost-effective as a whole.

The project teams at SSRS and the Fund also discussed the benefit of adding additional questions related to COVID-19 to the core survey and ultimately, the Fund supported adding a battery of questions for as many countries as possible. The Fund's team drafted questions that were reviewed by SSRS and within the Fund. The SSRS team provided feedback through multiple iterations of questionnaire development and review..

The final COVID battery consisted of nine questions aimed at understanding: how the coronavirus affected respondents' work, savings and/or emotions; if they had been tested or diagnosed with the coronavirus; and how they feel about how their respective governmental entities were handling the coronavirus outbreak. Country partners were offered the opportunity to incorporate these questions into their survey. In total, these questions were incorporated into Australia (main sample), New Zealand, the US, Canada (main sample and Quebec oversample), UK (both main sample and oversample), France, Netherlands, Norway<sup>41</sup>, and Sweden. Germany elected to incorporate two of these COVID-19 specific questions into their program. Switzerland elected to not add any additional questions.

---

<sup>41</sup> A shorter version of the COVID-19 specific questions was incorporated for Norway. CORO5b, CORO6 and CORO9 were not included for Norway respondents.

## Completes by Country

Table 49 below details the number of completes by sampling frame for each country that were asked the COVID-19 supplement.

**TABLE 49: Total Interviews in COVID-Supplement by Sampling Frame**

	Landline	LL (%)	Cell phone	CELL (%)	ABS	ABS (%)	Total
Australia	250	25%	751	75%	-	-	1,001
Canada	507	43%	666	57%	-	-	1,173
France	107	22%	389	78%	-	-	496
Germany	496	49%	508	51%	-	-	1,004
Netherlands	127	31%	278	69%	-	-	405
New Zealand	95	11%	751	89%	-	-	846
Norway	22	4%	585	96%	-	-	607
Sweden	-	-	-	-	454	100%	454
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United Kingdom	506	50%	501	50%	-	-	1,007
United States	86	7%	419	33%	761	60%	1,266

## Weighting

Since not all respondents were asked the COVID-19 question battery, a separate COVID-19 specific weight was needed for analysis of these questions in Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, the UK and the US to ensure those data were representative of the population. Thus, SSRS provided an additional COVID-19 specific weight in the data delivery in addition to the main weight.

The weighting process followed the same weighting procedure for each country as detailed earlier; however, was run on the subset of completes that were asked the COVID-19 series of questions.

Since all respondents in Germany and Norway were asked this series of questions, the main weight could be used when analyzing CORO1 through CORO9 for these countries.

## Design Effect and Margin of Sampling Error

Table 50, below, shows the design effects and margins-of-error for the COVID weights.

**TABLE 50: Design Effect and Margin of Error by Country**

	N-Size	Design Effect	Margin of Error
Australia	1,001	1.61	3.9
Canada	1,173	3.06	5.0
Quebec	697	1.84	5.0
Non-Quebec	476	1.99	6.3
France	496	1.62	5.6
Germany	1,004	1.24	3.4
Netherlands	405	1.30	5.5
New Zealand	846	1.77	4.5
Norway	607	1.61	5.0
Sweden	454	1.18	5.0
Switzerland	-	-	-
UK	1,007	2.29	4.7
Wales	255	1.94	8.6
Scotland	132	1.41	10.1
Northern Ireland	201	2.06	9.9
Rest of the UK	419	1.29	5.4
US	1,266	1.77	3.7

## DELIVERABLES

### Preliminary

In May 2020, SSRS delivered a preliminary weighted dataset in both SPSS and Stata along with the all country banner in both Word and Excel to The Commonwealth Fund.

### Final

SSRS delivered the following to the Commonwealth Fund and sponsoring organizations: (1) final weighted dataset<sup>42</sup>, (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, and (6) final created variable and banner specification memos.

In addition, SSRS provided the Fund with a trending banner that included results from 2013, 2016 and 2020 among questions that could be tracked, and a questionnaire crosswalk to compare the questions asked year over year.

---

<sup>42</sup> This was provided in SPSS or the preferred file format of the partner.

# APPENDIX I

## ABS Experimentation in the US

As part of the ABS, SSRS implemented two envelope-based experimentations for the ABS sample. Half of the sample was sent letters in a 6X9 envelope with a window for the address, and half of the sample was sent letters in a #11 envelope with a window for the address. Separately, half of the sample included a logo on the envelope, and half of the sample had no logo on the envelope. Together, 25% of the sample fell into each of these experiment quadrants.

In reviewing the results, SSRS noted how the different envelope types were associated with different completion rates overall. When looking at the overall completion rate for each experiment type, a #11 envelope with no logo performed the best, as shown in Table 51 below.

**TABLE 51: ABS Experimentation**

	6x9 with Logo	#11 with Logo	6x9 w/o Logo	#11 w/o Logo
Amount Mailed	5250	5250	5250	5250
Number of Completes	475	466	489	554
Yield	11	11	11	9