

International Health Policy Survey

2023

Methodology Report

Prepared for



The
Commonwealth
Fund

September 2023

Prepared by:

Robyn Rapoport

Rob Manley

Christian Kline

Molly Fisch-Friedman

 **ssrs**
redefining research



Table of Contents

Overview.....	1
Sampling Methods.....	2
Sample Generation by Country.....	4
Australia and New Zealand.....	4
Canada.....	5
France and the Netherlands.....	5
Germany.....	6
Sweden.....	6
Switzerland.....	7
United Kingdom.....	7
United States.....	8
Household and Respondent Selection.....	11
Data Collection.....	12
Questionnaire Review, Translations and Cultural Adaptations.....	12
Programming and Testing.....	12
Pretesting.....	13
Training Materials and Interviewer Training.....	15
Call Rule, Contact Attempts, Refusal Avoidance and Conversion Strategies.....	15
Australia, Canada, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, the UK (RDD Sample), and the US (Prepaid Cell Sample).....	16
Germany.....	16
Sweden and Switzerland.....	16
United Kingdom (Panel Sample).....	18
United States (ABS Sample).....	19
United States (Panel Sample).....	20
Field Procedures.....	22
Field Period.....	22
Survey Length and Language of Interview.....	23
Field Monitoring.....	23

Weekly and Periodic Updates	24
Final Counts	24
Data Processing and Integration	35
Response Rates	36
Weighting	40
How to Analyze Data with Oversamples	41
Detailed Weighting Procedures by Country	43
Australia	43
Canada	45
France	53
Germany	55
The Netherlands	58
New Zealand	60
Sweden	62
Switzerland	64
The United Kingdom	67
The United States	74
Design Effect and Margin of Sampling Error	79
Deliverables	80
Preliminary	80
Final	81

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 10 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 2023 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 2023 IHP survey conducted among adults in Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand (NZ), 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; Kantar to field the survey in the UK; Leger to field the survey in Canada; 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 The Robert Koch Institute (RKI) 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 survey 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, and in the UK, roughly half of the interviews were completed online. Fieldwork took place between March 6 and August 20, 2023.

The 2023 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 technology to access medical care, including through patient portals and telehealth
- 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
- Patient’s overall health and medical conditions
- Behavioral factors affecting health and social context
- Mental health needs and experiences
- Social service needs and experiences
- Experiences of caregivers
- Perceived instances of experiencing discrimination when receiving medical care

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	751
Canada	4,820
France	751
Germany	2,005
Netherlands	751
New Zealand	750
Sweden	2,266
Switzerland	2,292
UK	3,361
US	3,594

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

Sampling Methods

The target population for IHP 2023 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. 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. Survey coverage refers to the extent to which the sample frame for a survey includes all members of the target population.

In Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and New Zealand, a random digit dial (RDD) overlapping frame telephone design was used to obtain all completes. A portion of the UK 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.

In the UK, probability panel sample was also included to help increase interviews with subgroups of interest, namely economically inactive¹ UK adults.

As a part of the planning discussions for IHP 2023, the Fund noted a primary goal for the US sample for the general population survey was to obtain sufficient samples among subgroups of analytical interest. Based on these conversations, the SSRS project team, in collaboration with our Advanced Methods team, analyzed the data collected in IHP 2020 to develop a sample design that would effectively meet these objectives. The resulting multi-frame design included Address-Based Sampling (ABS), SSRS Opinion Panel sample, and Prepaid Cell sample.

Sweden and Switzerland both used population-based registries to draw their sample.

Sample utilized for each country is described in more detail below. Table 2 below shows the interviews completed in each country by sampling frame.

TABLE 2: Total Interviews by Sampling Frame

	LANDLINE	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	CELL (%)	ABS	ABS (%)	Panel	Panel (%)	TOTAL
Australia	150	20%	601	80%	-	-	-	-	751
Canada	1,638	34%	3,182	66%	-	-	-	-	4,820
France	225	30%	526	70%	-	-	-	-	751
Germany	1,253	62%	752	38%	-	-	-	-	2,005
Netherlands	150	20%	601	80%	-	-	-	-	751
New Zealand	150	20%	600	80%	-	-	-	-	750
Sweden	-	-	-	-	2,266	100%	-	-	2,266
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	2,292	100%	-	-	2,292
United Kingdom	350	10%	1,401	42%	-	-	1,610	48%	3,361
United States	-	-	300	8%	2,295	64%	999	28%	3,594

¹ Adults in the UK were asked the following question: “Currently, are you yourself employed full time, part time, or not at all?” Those who responded with full time, part time, temporarily unemployed, on a government training scheme, or unpaid worker in family business were categorized as economically active. Those who responded with retired, looking after family or home, student, disabled, or something else (not employed) were categorized as economically inactive.

Sample Generation by Country

Australia and New Zealand

In Australia and New Zealand, landline and cell phone random digit dial (RDD) samples were drawn by Sample Solutions².

For Australia, 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 landline 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.

For New Zealand, landline sample was based on the numbering plan provided by Telecom of New Zealand and was stratified by New Zealand's 16 regions + Chatham Islands, while the RDD cell sampling 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.

For both Australia and New Zealand, Sample Solutions utilized electronic verification to filter out many non-working numbers and used a standardized procedure to pulse each sample type to improve productivity.

² More information about Sample Solutions can be found at: <https://sample.solutions/>

Canada

For Canada as a whole, as well as Canadian oversample interviews³, landline and cell phone samples were drawn using RDD sample to ensure the most complete coverage and representation possible.

The majority of the 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.

Territory Oversamples – Additional Efforts

Because of the extremely small populations in the Canadian territories and lower than anticipated response, additional efforts were made to draw sample to achieve minimum sample sizes in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut. ASDE Survey Sampler provided cell phone sample in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut that was generated at random within cell exchanges. An IVR (interactive voice response) system was used to attempt to connect to each number, and cell phone numbers that were confirmed to connect to an answering machine or were answered by a person were included in the provided sample. Additionally, Sample Solutions used mobile filtering on undialed cell sample from Dynata to see if the SIM card associated with the number is registered. Nonactive numbers were removed from the remaining sample to be dialed.

France and the Netherlands

SSRS's sampling partner, Sample Solutions, provided landline and mobile phone RDD samples for France and the Netherlands. 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

³ A total of 1,000 interviews were completed as part of the Commonwealth Fund's interviews in Canada. Canada-based oversample interviews aimed to reach minimum completes in each Canadian province and territory, including N=1,000 in Quebec and N=1,300 in Ontario.

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.

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).

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. 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 (Arbeitsgemeinschaft ADM-Telefonstichproben). The ADM master sample is based on the range of numbers available in the German telephone network as updated, monitored and published by the Federal Network Agency (the government agency in charge of the German telephone network). This range of numbers covers all possible telephone numbers in Germany, whether actually in use or not. Numbers from the German landline-based telephone network are generated as blocks of numbers with a range of 10, and numbers from the German cellular telephone network are generated as number blocks with a range of 10,000. Since about 99% of the population can be reached via at least one telephone number, the ADM system provides near-full coverage of the German population.

Sweden

The sample frame for Sweden utilized The Total Population Registry (RTB). The RTB is comprised of 8,455,637 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. In general, proportional allocation was used (sample size in each stratum proportional to

number of individuals in stratum) but for some strata, oversampling was used⁴. After removing over-coverage in the drawn sample, the final sample comprised of 8,974 individuals.

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, Zurich, Ticino and Vaud were oversampled and extracted separately as their own strata, for a total of seven strata.

United Kingdom

During the IHP 2023 planning process, The Health Foundation expressed an interest in being able to compare healthcare experiences of adults who are employed full time or part time with those who are economically inactive, particularly among UK adults aged 18-24 and 50-64. As a part of this endeavor, SSRS utilized a hybrid sample design that combined RDD landline and cell samples with probability panel sample. Completing a portion of the interviews via probability panel allowed us to oversample age groups more likely to be economically inactive, while also completing a substantial portion of interviews with a representative sample of adults.

Dual Frame RDD Sample

SSRS's sampling partner, Sample Solutions, provided landline and mobile phone RDD samples for 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 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 the UK, 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).

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

⁴ To achieve acceptable precision in small groups, strata containing people with low level of education, people with foreign background, and people living in thinly populated areas had a higher sampling fraction (oversampled).

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. Using a standardized procedure, the landline and mobile RDD sample were pulsed in order to improve productivity.

Probability Panel Sample

Online interviews were completed via Kantar’s Public Voice™ panel in the UK, a probabilistic panel recruited via telephone and face-to-face interviews. Both recruitment protocols use probability sampling drawn to ensure the entire population of the UK is represented. The panel sample was stratified by economic status (active vs. inactive) and age groups, with adults aged 18-24 and 50-64 sampled at a higher rate in order to ensure a sufficient sample size of economically inactive adults for analysis.

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 the SSRS Opinion Panel and Prepaid Cell. Details about the sample frames and sampling procedures are below.

Table 3 below shows completed interviews across each sample frame for each of the subgroups of interest.

TABLE 3: Completed Interviews by Subgroup of Interest

	ABS	Prepaid Cell	SSRS Opinion Panel	Total
Low Income Adults	937	187	423	1,548
Black Adults	238	64	259	561
Hispanic Adults	382	84	203	670
Young Adults Age 18-34	500	72	416	988
Black Young Adults Age 18-34	44	13	127	184
Hispanic Young Adults Age 18-34	140	33	100	273
Women Age 18-49	657	62	450	1,171
Black Women Age 18-49	76	16	155	247
Hispanic Women Age 18-49	151	23	111	286
Older Adults 60+	881	114	74	1069
Adults with Mental Health Conditions	927	118	502	1,548

Address-based Sample

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.⁵ Independent random samples were then drawn from each stratum. By 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. In addition, there are two modeled strata – one to reach Hispanics and one to reach younger adults. The modeled strata were created using predictive models.

The ABS sample was released in two waves.

TABLE 4: US Address Based Sample Stratification

Region	Income, Hispanic, and AA strata	ABS Frame Counts	
Northeast	Low inc, high Hisp., high AA	816,804	0.6%
Northeast	Low inc, high Hisp., low AA	688,001	0.5%
Northeast	Low inc, low Hisp., high AA	769,478	0.6%
Northeast	Low inc, low Hisp., low AA	1,558,489	1.2%
Northeast	High inc, high Hisp., high AA	475,780	0.4%
Northeast	High inc, high Hisp., low AA	979,775	0.7%
Northeast	High inc, low Hisp., high AA	1,075,483	0.8%
Northeast	High inc, low Hisp., low AA	8,917,878	6.7%
Midwest	Low inc, high Hisp., high AA	306,927	0.2%

⁵ <https://www.census.gov/topics/research/guidance/planning-databases/2020.html>

Midwest	Low inc, high Hisp., low AA	506,865	0.4%
Midwest	Low inc, low Hisp., high AA	1,747,426	1.3%
Midwest	Low inc, low Hisp., low AA	2,758,045	2.1%
Midwest	High inc, high Hisp., high AA	163,727	0.1%
Midwest	High inc, high Hisp., low AA	679,194	0.5%
Midwest	High inc, low Hisp., high AA	1,400,234	1.1%
Midwest	High inc, low Hisp., low AA	12,014,908	9.0%
South	Low inc, high Hisp., high AA	1,526,720	1.1%
South	Low inc, high Hisp., low AA	1,622,655	1.2%
South	Low inc, low Hisp., high AA	4,701,674	3.5%
South	Low inc, low Hisp., low AA	3,374,845	2.5%
South	High inc, high Hisp., high AA	1,520,369	1.1%
South	High inc, high Hisp., low AA	2,570,836	1.9%
South	High inc, low Hisp., high AA	5,706,269	4.3%
South	High inc, low Hisp., low AA	11,751,234	8.8%
West	Low inc, high Hisp., high AA	631,532	0.5%
West	Low inc, high Hisp., low AA	2,516,341	1.9%
West	Low inc, low Hisp., high AA	182,423	0.1%
West	Low inc, low Hisp., low AA	1,611,942	1.2%
West	High inc, high Hisp., high AA	497,731	0.4%
West	High inc, high Hisp., low AA	4,254,077	3.2%
West	High inc, low Hisp., high AA	349,317	0.3%
Modeled Hispanic		12,485,510	9.4%
Modeled 18-29		34,607,644	26.0%

SSRS Opinion Panel

The SSRS Opinion Panel is a nationally representative panel of U.S. adults age 18 or older. The hallmarks of the SSRS Opinion Panel are methodological rigor, accuracy, affordability, mode flexibility and representativeness. Our panel is being actively used by major academic institutions, media organizations and other private sector entities.

SSRS Opinion Panel members are recruited randomly based on a nationally representative ABS (Address Based Sample) probability design (including Hawaii and Alaska). Additionally, we have recruited hard-to-reach demographic groups via our past Omnibus survey platform.

For this study, the SSRS Opinion Panel was used to target populations that are typically under-represented in ABS samples, including low income and non-White adults.

Prepaid Cell Sample

Prepaid cell sample was included in the design to help increase the representation of low-income and non-White respondents in our sample. This cell sample consists of phone numbers connected to a prepaid cell phone. Prepaid cell numbers are associated with cell phones that are “pay as you go” and do not require a contract. Extensive SSRS-based research has shown that prepaid cell phones are more likely to be used by Hispanics, people with lower education and lower income, and other related groups that are often underrepresented in general population samples and are especially important in this research⁶. Including this sample helped increase the statistical power of these subgroups.

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.

⁶ Best, J., McKinstry, J., Hasanbasri, A., Loveridge, C., Trieu, H., "Supplementing Address-Based Sample With Prepaid Cell Sample to Help Improve Sample Representativeness" Paper presented at the 2022 Annual American Association of Public Opinion Research Conference, Chicago, IL.

Goyle, A., Sherr, S., Park, R.J., Loveridge, C., "Have Your Cake and Eat It Too: The Utility of a Prepaid Sample Component in bolstering the Representativeness of an Address-Based Sample Design " Paper presented at the 2022 Annual American Association of Public Opinion Research Conference, Chicago, IL.

McGeeney, K. (2015). "Appending a Prepaid Phone Flag to the Cell Phone Sample," Survey Practice, 8(3). Pew Research Center, (October 2016), "Cell Phone Activity Flags." available at: <http://www.pewresearch.org/2016/10/24/cellphone-activity-flags>

For the US and UK probability panel samples, a person-based design was used, as the sample is person based. Only the selected panelist was eligible to complete the survey.

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

Questionnaire Review, Translations and Cultural Adaptations

In the fall and winter of 2022, 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 quality⁷.

Upon approval from The Commonwealth Fund research team, new and revised questions were translated into Canadian-French, Spanish, German, Dutch, French, Swedish, Swiss-Italian, Swiss-French and Swiss-German. SSRS's translation partner, THG Fluently, translated the Canadian-French, Spanish, Dutch, and French instruments. RKI 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 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 Confirmat 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, and the UK (RDD respondents). SSRS's fieldwork partners utilized unique links created for each sample record to access the program from their respective

⁷ 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.

dialers. SSRS worked with Kantar to program the survey into Kantar's survey software platform, and members of the SSRS team reviewed Kantar's UK program prior to their surveys going live. RKI, 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.

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 US 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 to mid-January, SSRS completed 17 telephone pretest interviews in the US for the 2023 IHP Survey. With the implementation of the ABS portion of the study, in addition to the traditional phone pretests, the SSRS team also conducted six 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 or highly-modified questions, questions asked in past IHP surveys, and areas of focus for future interviewer training. During these pretest interviews, it was also identified that the survey instrument was significantly longer than estimated.

In late January, 38 English-language telephone pretest interviews were completed in Australia (n=10), Canada (n=5), New Zealand (n=10), and the UK (n=13). Following these English-language pretests, adjustments were made to the questionnaire to update question wording for clarity, and several questions were removed from the core survey instrument due to the length concerns identified.

Following these adjustments, a second round of English-language telephone pretest interviews were completed in mid-February in the US (n=5) and Canada (n=5) to test the edits and updates

made following the initial set of English-language pretests. These additional English-language pretests also provided an estimate of the revised length of the core instrument.

Leger conducted 10 pretest interviews on February 22, 2023 in Canadian French. GDCC conducted pretest interviews in the Netherlands (n=11) on February 21, 2023 and in France (n=11) between April 11 and April 15, 2023. M.I.S. Trend conducted pretest interviews in Switzerland (n=15) from March 2 to March 3, 2023, and RKI conducted pretest interviews in Germany (n=15) between April 6 and April 12, 2023.

SSRS provided an updated memo to the Fund upon completion of pretest interviews in Australia, New Zealand, Canada (English and Canadian French), the UK, and the Netherlands, along with the second round of US pretest interviews. This memo included additional observations about new or 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. Table 5 provides a summary of the number of pretest interviews conducted in each country.

TABLE 5: Summary of Pretest Interviews by Country

	PRETEST CONDUCTED	LANGUAGE(S) PRETEST CONDUCTED IN	DATES PRETESTS CONDUCTED	# OF PRETESTS
Australia	Yes	English	1/22/23-1/24/23	10
Canada	Yes	English, Canadian-French	1/24/23 (English, part 1) 2/13/23 (English, part 2) 2/22/23 (French)	5 (English, part 1) 5 (English, part 2) 10 (French)
France	Yes	French	4/11/23-4/15/23	11
Germany	Yes	German	4/6/23-4/12/23	15
New Zealand	Yes	English	1/22/23-1/24/23	10
Netherlands	Yes	Dutch	2/21/23	11
Sweden	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Switzerland	Yes	German, French, Italian	3/2/23-3/3/23	5 (Phone) 10 (Web)
United Kingdom	Yes	English	1/24/23-1/25/23	13
United States	Yes	English	1/12/23 (Phone, part 1) 1/11/23-1/18/23 (Web) 2/14/23 (Phone, part 2)	17 (Phone, part 1) 6 (Web) 6 (Phone, part 2)

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, 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, RKI, 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. 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, and TKW followed similar procedures with their supervisors and interviewers.

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 (RDD Sample), and the US (Prepaid Cell Sample)

- The call rule included one initial call plus four callbacks in the US, one initial call plus five callbacks in Canada, France, the Netherlands, and the UK and one initial call plus six callbacks in Australia and New Zealand 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, 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 seven 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.
- All interviews were completed in German.

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, 4,981 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 four 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 two reminder mailings to non-responders. The contact schedule for Switzerland is shown below (Table 7).

TABLE 6: Sweden Contact Schedule

CONTACT	TIMING/DATES	DESCRIPTION
1	3/1/2023	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	3/15/2023	First reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing.
3	3/29/2023	Second reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing.
4	4/14/2023	Third reminder mailing sent to non-responders. This reminder excluded the option of taking the survey on the phone with an interviewer.
5	5/3/2023	Fourth and final reminder mailing sent to non-responders. This reminder was only send to non-responders with a digital mailbox and excluded the option of taking the survey on the phone with an interviewer.
	5/12/2023	End of fieldwork

TABLE 7: Switzerland Contact Schedule

CONTACT	TIMING/DATES	DESCRIPTION
1	3/31/2023	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	4/24/2023	Reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing.
3	5/22/2023	Reminder mailing sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial mailing.
	6/12/2023	End of fieldwork

United Kingdom (Panel Sample)

- In total, 4,366 Public Voice panel members were sampled for the IHP 2023 survey. Panelists were divided into 3 groups: a soft launch within the main sample (n=500), a full launch within the main sample (n=2,885), and a reserve pool (n=981).
 - The reserve pool was subdivided into 5 batches of n=196-197.
 - The reserve sample from stratum 1 (n=93) was released, but no other reserve cases were released into the sample.
- Invitations to complete the survey were sent to panelists via email which contained individualized survey hyperlinks. If an invited panelist had not opened the email 24 hours after it was sent, an SMS text message reminder was sent.
 - If a panelist had neither an email address nor a cell phone number on file, an invitation letter was sent.
- A reminder letter was sent to all main sample non-responders on May 30, 2023. The letter contained survey login details but not a printed individualized survey hyperlink.
- Panelists who completed the survey were sent a thank you email and/or SMS text message with a £10 e-voucher. Panelists without an email address or cell phone number on file were sent a thank you letter, including a £10 shopping voucher card.

TABLE 8: UK Panel Contact Schedule

CONTACT	TIMING/DATES	DESCRIPTION
1	4/27/2023	First invitation sent to soft launch main sample via email or SMS, including an individualized survey link.
2	5/15/2023	First invitation sent to full launch main sample via email or SMS (or letter if neither email address nor cell phone number available), including an individualized survey link.
3	5/22/2023	First reminder (email/SMS text message) sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial invitation.
4	5/30/2023	Second reminder (letter) sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial invitation
5	5/31/2023	First invitation sent to reserve sample via email or SMS (or letter if neither email address nor cell phone number available), including an individualized survey link.
6	6/3/2023	Third reminder (email/SMS text message) sent to non-responders from main sample with the same information as the initial invitation
7	6/6/2023	Final reminder (email/SMS text message) sent to all non-respondents with the same information as the initial invitation.
	6/8/2023	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 an electronic gift card or check to the portion of the ABS sample most likely to be low income or Hispanic
 - Sent up to two reminders (one postcard and one letter)

Table 9 below details the contact schedule for the ABS sample in the US.

TABLE 9: US ABS Contact Schedule

CONTACT	TIMING/DATES	DESCRIPTION
1	Wave 1 - 3/8/2023 Wave 2 - 4/27/2023	First postal mailing to the ABS sample, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An invitation letter (describing nature of the study and its objectives) - 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 for questions
2	Wave 1 - 3/13/2023 Wave 2 - 5/2/2023	Second postal mailing to the ABS sample, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 - 3/22/2023 Wave 2 - 5/11/2023	Third postal mailing to the ABS sample, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A reminder letter - 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 for questions
4	5/31/2023	End of ABS fieldwork

United States (Panel Sample)

- A “soft launch” inviting a limited number of panelists to participate was conducted on April 4, 2023. Soft launch data was checked to ensure functionality of the program and administration length of the survey were within the scope of work. After checking soft launch data to ensure that all questionnaire content and skip patterns were correct, additional sample was released to ensure the final sample met the study goals.
- The full launch was divided into 3 groups: the first sample pull was among all panelists age 18 and up, the second sample pull was among panelists age 18-59, and the third sample pull was among panelists age 18-49. The second and third sample pulls were targeted by

age in an effort to gather more completes from younger panelists, who were completing the survey at rates below expectation and are a key group of interest for the Fund. Fieldwork ended for full launch panelists on May 30, 2023.

- After ABS fieldwork was closed, it was discovered that there was an error in sampling which resulted in duplicate completes between the first wave ABS sample and the SSRS Opinion Panel sample. In total, 9 individuals completed the survey twice (first as an ABS respondent and second through the panel), and their second responses were removed from the dataset. To gather additional responses to account for these removals, invitations were sent to additional fresh sample (n=100, age 18-29 and non-White) on June 23, 2023.
- Web panelists were emailed an invitation to complete the survey online. The email for each respondent included a unique password-embedded link. All panelists who did not respond to the email invitation reminder emails, and panelists who had opted into receiving text messages from the SSRS Opinion Panel received text message reminders. See Table 10 for the panel contact and reminder schedule.
- In appreciation for their participation, panelists received post-paid compensation in the form of an electronic gift card, sent via email immediately after completion of the survey. Panelists with less than a high school education, panelists who took the survey in Spanish, and Black panelists⁸ were offered a larger compensation to encourage participation.

TABLE 10: US Panel Contact Schedule

CONTACT	TIMING/DATES	DESCRIPTION
1	4/4/2023	First invitation sent to soft launch sample via email, including a unique password-embedded link.
2	4/5/2023	First invitation sent to first full launch sample via email, including a unique password-embedded link.
3	4/6/2023	First reminder (email/SMS text message) sent to non-responders (male, HS or less, age 18-39, Black, and/or Hispanic) with the same information as the initial invitation.
4	5/2/2023	First invitation sent to second full launch sample via email, including a unique password-embedded link.
5	5/4/2023	Second email reminder sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial invitation.
6	5/8/2023	Third email reminder sent to non-responders with the same information as the initial invitation.
7	5/17/2023	First invitation sent to third full launch sample via email, including a unique password-embedded link.
8	5/22/2023	Fourth reminder (email/SMS text message) sent to non-responders (all Black adults age 18-34) with the same information as the initial invitation.

⁸ Black panelists were offered larger compensation beginning with the fourth reminder.

9	5/24/2023	Fifth reminder (email/SMS text message) sent to non-responders (all adults age 18-34) with the same information as the initial invitation.
10	5/25/2023	Sixth and final reminder (email/SMS text message) sent to non-responders (all adults age 18-34, and women age 35-49) with the same information as the initial invitation.
11	5/30/2023	End of fieldwork among full launch
12	6/23/2023	First invitation sent to additional sample via email, including a unique password-embedded link.
13	6/24/2023	End of fieldwork among additional sample

Field Procedures

Field Period

Interviews were conducted from March through August 2023. Data for all countries were pulled by July 5, 2023 for the delivery to the Fund on July 25, 2023. Data collection continued through August 20, 2023 for the Canada territories oversample. The field times varied by country and are specified in Table 11 below.

TABLE 11: Field Period Per Country

	FIELD PERIOD
Australia	3/20/2023-6/7/2023
Canada	3/14/2023-8/20/2023
France	4/24/2023-6/20/2023
Germany	4/19/2023-6/1/2023
Netherlands	3/6/2023-6/1/2023
New Zealand	3/20/2023-5/30/2023
Sweden	3/6/2023-5/5/2023
Switzerland	3/29/2023-6/11/2023
United Kingdom	3/6/2023-6/6/2023
United States	3/9/2023-6/23/2023

Survey Length and Language of Interview

Table 12 outlines the language/s and length of interview for each country in the IHP 2023 survey.

TABLE 12: Language/s and Length of Interview per Country

	LANGUAGE(S)	AVERAGE LENGTH IN MINUTES
Australia	English	20
Canada	English, French	22
France	French	23
Germany	German	30
Netherlands	Dutch	25
New Zealand	English	20
Sweden	Swedish	27 (phone), 13 (web)
Switzerland	German, French, Italian	31 (phone), 20 (web)
United Kingdom	English	20 (phone), 16 (web)
United States	English, Spanish	27 (phone), 16 (web)

Field Monitoring

Prior to fielding, SSRS provided reporting data and disposition reporting templates to GDCC, Leger, TKW, RKI, Statistics Sweden, M.I.S. Trend, and Kantar, which they reviewed together during a kickoff call with each partner. On these calls, SSRS also reviewed all documentation, study procedures, and answered any questions about the IHP 2023 Survey.

While in field, SSRS reviewed the status of data collection two to three times per week 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.

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

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

SSRS also provided GDCC, Leger, and TKW 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 biweekly 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 biweekly updates, SSRS provided a narrative regarding field progress and reported on any field-related concerns.

SSRS and the Fund also participated in biweekly 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 (except France, which had only just entered the field) with an interim status update on data collection, including an up-to-date distribution of interviews by gender, age, region, and language of interview, along with selected data from the new series related to discrimination.

Final Counts

Tables 13 to 22 below show final counts per country by gender, age, region, and language of interview, where relevant.

TABLE 13: Final Counts Australia

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	GENDER / AGE (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	GENDER / AGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	0	0%	0%	38	6%	100%	38	5%
Male / 25-34	1	1%	2%	63	10%	98%	64	9%
Male / 35-49	2	1%	3%	75	12%	97%	77	10%
Male / 50-64	11	7%	16%	59	10%	84%	70	9%
Male / 65+	42	28%	39%	67	11%	61%	109	15%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	4	1%	100%	4	1%
Male Total	56	37%	15%	306	51%	85%	362	48%
Female / 18-24	0	0%	0%	31	5%	100%	31	4%
Female / 25-34	1	1%	2%	57	9%	98%	58	8%
Female / 35-49	3	2%	5%	58	10%	95%	61	8%

Female / 50-64	11	7%	13%	71	12%	87%	82	11%
Female / 65+	77	51%	50%	76	13%	50%	153	20%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	2	1%	50%	2	0%	50%	4	1%
Female Total	94	63%	24%	295	49%	76%	389	52%
TOTAL	150		20%	601		80%	751	

REGION	LAND LINE	REGION (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	REGION (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	REGION (%)
NSW	25	17%	13%	171	28%	87%	196	26%
Victoria	43	29%	21%	162	27%	79%	205	27%
Queensland	40	27%	24%	130	22%	76%	170	23%
Western Australia	16	11%	20%	65	11%	80%	81	11%
South Australia	11	7%	22%	38	6%	78%	49	7%
Tasmania	10	7%	43%	13	2%	57%	23	3%
Australian Capital Territory	5	3%	24%	16	3%	76%	21	3%
Northern Territory	0	0%	0%	6	1%	100%	6	1%
TOTAL	150		20%	601		80%	751	

TABLE 14: Final Counts Canada

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	GENDER / AGE (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	GENDER / AGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	13	1%	7%	181	6%	93%	194	4%
Male / 25-34	17	1%	5%	321	10%	95%	338	7%
Male / 35-49	63	4%	13%	428	13%	87%	491	10%
Male / 50-64	185	11%	33%	381	12%	67%	566	12%
Male / 65+	305	19%	55%	249	8%	45%	554	11%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	8	0%	24%	25	1%	76%	33	1%
Male Total	591	36%	27%	1585	50%	73%	2176	45%
Female / 18-24	8	0%	5%	139	4%	95%	147	3%
Female / 25-34	13	1%	5%	242	8%	95%	255	5%
Female / 35-49	106	6%	18%	478	15%	82%	584	12%
Female / 50-64	270	16%	39%	428	13%	61%	698	14%
Female / 65+	627	38%	71%	257	8%	29%	884	18%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	14	1%	37%	24	1%	63%	38	1%
Female Total	1038	63%	40%	1568	49%	60%	2606	54%

Other or Unknown Total	9	1%	24%	29	1%	76%	38	1%
TOTAL	1638		34%	3182		66%	4820	

LANGUAGE	LAND LINE	LANG-UAGE (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	LANG-UAGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	LANG-UAGE (%)
English	1404	86%	37%	2407	76%	63%	3811	79%
French	234	14%	23%	775	24%	77%	1009	21%
TOTAL	1638		34%	3182		66%	4820	

REGION	LAND LINE	REGION (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	REGION (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	REGION (%)
Newfoundland and Labrador	110	7%	44%	141	4%	56%	251	5%
Prince Edward Island	102	6%	41%	148	5%	59%	250	5%
Nova Scotia	65	4%	25%	196	6%	75%	261	5%
New Brunswick	76	5%	30%	174	5%	70%	250	5%
Quebec	234	14%	23%	767	24%	77%	1001	21%
Ontario	478	29%	37%	822	26%	63%	1300	27%
Manitoba	88	5%	35%	163	5%	65%	251	5%
Saskatchewan	93	6%	37%	158	5%	63%	251	5%
Alberta	64	4%	25%	195	6%	75%	259	5%
British Columbia	78	5%	31%	173	5%	69%	251	5%
Yukon Territory	122	7%	49%	129	4%	51%	251	5%
Northwest Territories	44	3%	31%	99	3%	69%	143	3%
Nunavut	84	5%	83%	17	1%	17%	101	2%
TOTAL	1638		34%	3182		66%	4820	

TABLE 15: Final Counts France

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	GENDER / AGE (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	GENDER / AGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	3	1%	10%	26	5%	90%	29	4%
Male / 25-34	0	0%	0%	49	9%	100%	49	7%
Male / 35-49	8	4%	11%	64	12%	89%	72	10%
Male / 50-64	20	9%	22%	69	13%	78%	89	12%
Male / 65+	50	22%	45%	60	11%	55%	110	15%
Male Total	81	36%	23%	268	51%	77%	349	46%
Female / 18-24	2	1%	6%	33	6%	94%	35	5%
Female / 25-34	1	0%	3%	37	7%	97%	38	5%
Female / 35-49	15	7%	20%	60	11%	80%	75	10%
Female / 50-64	43	19%	41%	62	12%	59%	105	14%
Female / 65+	83	37%	57%	63	12%	43%	146	19%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	3	1%	100%	3	0%
Female Total	144	64%	36%	258	49%	64%	402	54%
TOTAL	225		30%	526		70%	751	

REGION	LAND LINE	REGION (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	REGION (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	REGION (%)
Grand Est	22	10%	31%	50	10%	69%	72	10%
Nouvelle Aquitaine	16	7%	27%	43	8%	73%	59	8%
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes	36	16%	36%	63	12%	64%	99	13%
Bourgogne, Franche-Comté	7	3%	23%	24	5%	77%	31	4%
Bretagne	12	5%	38%	20	4%	63%	32	4%
Centre-Val de Loire	10	4%	42%	14	3%	58%	24	3%
Corse	1	0%	25%	3	1%	75%	4	1%
Île-de-France	25	11%	18%	117	22%	82%	142	19%
Occitanie	25	11%	34%	48	9%	66%	73	10%
Hauts-de France	21	9%	39%	33	6%	61%	54	7%
Normandie	14	6%	40%	21	4%	60%	35	5%
Pays de la Loire	12	5%	31%	27	5%	69%	39	5%
TOTAL	225		30%	526		70%	751	

TABLE 16: Final Counts Germany

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	GENDER / AGE (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	GENDER / AGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	26	2%	40%	39	5%	60%	65	3%
Male / 25-34	12	1%	16%	63	8%	84%	75	4%
Male / 35-49	52	4%	33%	106	14%	67%	158	8%
Male / 50-64	138	11%	54%	119	16%	46%	257	13%
Male / 65+	280	22%	78%	80	11%	22%	360	18%
Male Total	508	41%	56%	407	54%	44%	915	46%
Female / 18-24	5	0%	19%	22	3%	81%	27	1%
Female / 25-34	14	1%	22%	49	7%	78%	63	3%
Female / 35-49	93	7%	52%	85	11%	48%	178	9%
Female / 50-64	237	19%	67%	117	16%	33%	354	18%
Female / 65+	396	32%	85%	72	10%	15%	468	23%
Female Total	745	59%	68%	345	46%	32%	1090	54%
TOTAL	1253		62%	752		38%	2005	

REGION	LAND LINE	REGION (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	REGION (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	REGION (%)
Schleswig-Holstein	42	3%	62%	26	3%	38%	68	3%
Hamburg	31	2%	69%	14	2%	31%	45	2%
Bremen	29	2%	81%	7	1%	19%	36	2%
Niedersachsen	102	8%	57%	78	10%	43%	180	9%
Nordrhein-Westfalen	243	19%	64%	134	18%	36%	377	19%
Rheinland-Pfalz	72	6%	66%	37	5%	34%	109	5%
Saarland	19	2%	76%	6	1%	24%	25	1%
Hessen	90	7%	61%	58	8%	39%	148	7%
Baden-Württemberg	170	14%	65%	93	12%	35%	263	13%
Bayern	187	15%	63%	112	15%	37%	299	15%
Berlin	67	5%	58%	49	7%	42%	116	6%
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	18	1%	43%	24	3%	57%	42	2%
Brandenburg	41	3%	60%	27	4%	40%	68	3%
Sachsen-Anhalt	39	3%	65%	21	3%	35%	60	3%
Thüringen	27	2%	51%	26	3%	49%	53	3%
Freistaat Sachsen	75	6%	68%	36	5%	32%	111	6%
TOTAL	1253		62%	752		38%	2005	

TABLE 17: Final Counts Netherlands

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	GENDER / AGE (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	GENDER/ AGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	0	0%	0%	25	4%	100%	25	3%
Male / 25-34	0	0%	0%	38	6%	100%	38	5%
Male / 35-49	6	4%	8%	70	12%	92%	76	10%
Male / 50-64	16	11%	14%	97	16%	86%	113	15%
Male / 65+	45	30%	36%	79	13%	64%	124	17%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	1	0%
Male Total	67	45%	18%	310	52%	82%	377	50%
Female / 18-24	0	0%	0%	19	3%	100%	19	3%
Female / 25-34	1	1%	2%	40	7%	98%	41	5%
Female / 35-49	6	4%	8%	73	12%	92%	79	11%
Female / 50-64	21	14%	18%	99	16%	83%	120	16%
Female / 65+	55	37%	49%	58	10%	51%	113	15%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	0	0%	0%	2	0%	100%	2	0%
Female Total	83	55%	22%	291	48%	78%	374	50%
TOTAL	150		20%	601		80%	751	

REGION	LAND LINE	REGION (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	REGION (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	REGION (%)
Drenthe	7	5%	35%	13	2%	65%	20	3%
Flevoland	3	2%	13%	20	3%	87%	23	3%
Friesland	8	5%	30%	19	3%	70%	27	4%
Gelderland	15	10%	19%	63	10%	81%	78	10%
Groningen	5	3%	25%	15	2%	75%	20	3%
Limburg	8	5%	21%	31	5%	79%	39	5%
Noord-Brabant	28	19%	25%	84	14%	75%	112	15%
Noord-Holland	19	13%	15%	108	18%	85%	127	17%
Overijssel	8	5%	17%	40	7%	83%	48	6%
Utrecht	9	6%	15%	51	8%	85%	60	8%
Zeeland	4	3%	22%	14	2%	78%	18	2%
Zuid-Holland	36	24%	22%	130	22%	78%	166	22%
Unknown Region	0	0%	0%	13	2%	100%	13	2%
TOTAL	150		20%	601		80%	751	

TABLE 18: Final Counts New Zealand

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	GENDER / AGE (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	GENDER/ AGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	0	0%	0%	19	3%	100%	19	3%
Male / 25-34	0	0%	0%	34	6%	100%	34	5%
Male / 35-49	1	1%	1%	69	12%	99%	70	9%
Male / 50-64	17	11%	19%	74	12%	81%	91	12%
Male / 65+	39	26%	36%	69	12%	64%	108	14%
Male Total	57	38%	18%	265	44%	82%	322	43%
Female / 18-24	1	1%	8%	12	2%	92%	13	2%
Female / 25-34	0	0%	0%	38	6%	100%	38	5%
Female / 35-49	2	1%	2%	93	16%	98%	95	13%
Female / 50-64	18	12%	15%	100	17%	85%	118	16%
Female / 65+	72	48%	44%	92	15%	56%	164	22%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	1	1%	100%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Female Total	94	62%	22%	335	56%	78%	429	57%
TOTAL	151		20%	600		80%	751	

REGION	LAND LINE	REGION (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	REGION (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	TOTAL	REGION (%)
Auckland	40	26%	14%	241	40%	86%	281	37%
North	47	31%	25%	140	23%	75%	187	25%
Central	22	15%	19%	91	15%	81%	113	15%
South	42	28%	25%	125	21%	75%	167	22%
Unknown Region	0	0%	0%	3	1%	100%	3	0%
TOTAL	151		20%	600		80%	751	

TABLE 19: Final Counts Sweden

GENDER / AGE	PHONE	GENDER / AGE (%)	PHONE (%)	WEB	GENDER / AGE (%)	WEB (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	0	0%	0%	54	2%	100%	54	2%
Male / 25-34	0	0%	0%	81	4%	100%	81	4%
Male / 35-49	0	0%	0%	200	9%	100%	200	9%
Male / 50-64	0	0%	0%	289	13%	100%	289	13%
Male / 65+	22	43%	6%	364	16%	94%	386	17%
Male Total	22	43%	2%	988	45%	98%	1010	45%
Female / 18-24	0	0%	0%	82	4%	100%	82	4%
Female / 25-34	0	0%	0%	126	6%	100%	126	6%
Female / 35-49	0	0%	0%	254	11%	100%	254	11%
Female / 50-64	2	4%	1%	361	16%	99%	363	16%
Female / 65+	27	53%	6%	404	18%	94%	431	19%
Female Total	29	57%	2%	1227	55%	98%	1256	55%
TOTAL	51		2%	2215		98%	2266	

TABLE 20: Final Counts Switzerland

GENDER / AGE	PHONE	GENDER / AGE (%)	PHONE (%)	WEB	GENDER / AGE (%)	WEB (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	0	0%	0%	67	3%	100%	67	3%
Male / 25-34	0	0%	0%	133	6%	100%	133	6%
Male / 35-49	2	2%	1%	263	12%	99%	265	12%
Male / 50-64	8	7%	2%	339	16%	98%	347	15%
Male / 65+	29	26%	11%	237	11%	89%	266	12%
Male Total	39	35%	4%	1039	48%	96%	1078	47%
Female / 18-24	0	0%	0%	81	4%	100%	81	4%
Female / 25-34	0	0%	0%	124	6%	100%	124	5%
Female / 35-49	3	3%	1%	302	14%	99%	305	13%
Female / 50-64	3	3%	1%	362	17%	99%	365	16%
Female / 65+	67	60%	23%	222	10%	77%	289	13%
Female Total	73	65%	6%	1091	50%	94%	1164	51%
Other or Unknown Total	0	0%	0%	50	2%	100%	50	2%
TOTAL	112		5%	2180		95%	2292	

LANGUAGE	PHONE	LANG- UAGE (%)	PHONE (%)	WEB	LANG- UAGE (%)	WEB (%)	TOTAL	LANG- UAGE (%)
German	52	46%	5%	1049	48%	95%	1101	48%
Italian	19	17%	5%	353	16%	95%	372	16%
French	41	37%	5%	778	36%	95%	819	36%
TOTAL	112		5%	2180		95%	2292	

REGION	PHONE	REGION (%)	PHONE (%)	WEB	REGION (%)	WEB (%)	TOTAL	REGION (%)
Zurich	9	8%	3%	298	14%	97%	307	13%
Bern	13	12%	7%	177	8%	93%	190	8%
Luzern	3	3%	4%	64	3%	96%	67	3%
Uri	0	0%	0%	5	0%	100%	5	0%
Schwyz	1	1%	4%	24	1%	96%	25	1%
Obwalden	0	0%	0%	1	0%	100%	1	0%
Nidwalden	0	0%	0%	4	0%	100%	4	0%
Glarus	1	1%	20%	4	0%	80%	5	0%
Zug	0	0%	0%	14	1%	100%	14	1%
Fribourg	1	1%	1%	85	4%	99%	86	4%
Solothurn	2	2%	4%	46	2%	96%	48	2%
Basel-Stadt	2	2%	8%	23	1%	92%	25	1%
Basel- Landschaft	3	3%	7%	42	2%	93%	45	2%
Schaffhausen	0	0%	0%	15	1%	100%	15	1%
Appenzell Ausserrhoden	1	1%	9%	10	0%	91%	11	0%
Appenzell Innerrhoden	0	0%	0%	4	0%	100%	4	0%
St. Gallen	6	5%	8%	70	3%	92%	76	3%
Graubunden	3	3%	6%	47	2%	94%	50	2%
Aargau	6	5%	5%	114	5%	95%	120	5%
Thurgau	4	4%	10%	38	2%	90%	42	2%
Ticino	16	14%	5%	309	14%	95%	325	14%
Vaud	16	14%	5%	291	13%	95%	307	13%
Valais	20	18%	6%	343	16%	94%	363	16%
Neuenburg / Neuchatel	0	0%	0%	54	2%	100%	54	2%
Geneva	4	4%	4%	89	4%	96%	93	4%
Jura	1	1%	10%	9	0%	90%	10	0%
TOTAL	112		5%	2180		95%	2292	

TABLE 21: Final Counts United Kingdom

GENDER / AGE	LAND LINE	GENDER / AGE (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	GENDER / AGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	PANEL	GENDER / AGE (%)	PANEL (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	0	0%	0%	97	7%	57%	72	4%	43%	169	5%
Male / 25-34	3	1%	1%	170	12%	57%	126	8%	42%	299	9%
Male / 35-49	10	3%	3%	178	13%	49%	179	11%	49%	367	11%
Male / 50-64	36	10%	10%	146	10%	40%	186	12%	51%	368	11%
Male / 65+	84	24%	22%	115	8%	30%	189	12%	49%	388	12%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	5%	17	1%	77%	4	0%	18%	22	1%
Male Total	134	38%	8%	723	52%	45%	756	47%	47%	1613	48%
Female / 18-24	1	0%	1%	82	6%	47%	90	6%	52%	173	5%
Female / 25-34	2	1%	1%	141	10%	50%	137	9%	49%	280	8%
Female / 35-49	7	2%	2%	169	12%	43%	213	13%	55%	389	12%
Female / 50-64	41	12%	10%	138	10%	35%	216	13%	55%	395	12%
Female / 65+	163	47%	33%	140	10%	28%	192	12%	39%	495	15%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	2	1%	14%	8	1%	57%	4	0%	29%	14	0%
Female Total	216	62%	12%	678	48%	39%	852	53%	49%	1746	52%
Other or Unknown Total	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	2	0%	100%	2	0%
TOTAL	350		10%	1401		42%	1610		48%	3361	

REGION	LAND LINE	REGION (%)	LL (%)	CELL PHONE	REGION (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	PANEL	REGION (%)	PANEL (%)	TOTAL	REGION (%)
North East	30	9%	17%	81	6%	46%	64	4%	37%	175	5%
Yorks & Humber	17	5%	8%	63	4%	29%	135	8%	63%	215	6%
East Midlands	22	6%	9%	111	8%	45%	111	7%	45%	244	7%
Eastern	15	4%	7%	35	2%	16%	170	11%	77%	220	7%
London	24	7%	5%	287	20%	54%	221	14%	42%	532	16%
South East	75	21%	14%	233	17%	43%	232	14%	43%	540	16%
South West	37	11%	13%	127	9%	45%	116	7%	41%	280	8%
West Midlands	30	9%	11%	117	8%	41%	135	8%	48%	282	8%
North West	35	10%	10%	121	9%	36%	179	11%	53%	335	10%
Wales	17	5%	13%	48	3%	35%	71	4%	52%	136	4%
Scotland	34	10%	13%	86	6%	34%	133	8%	53%	253	8%

Northern Ireland	14	4%	15%	35	2%	38%	43	3%	47%	92	3%
Unknown Region	0	0%	0%	57	4%	100%	0	0%	0%	57	2%
TOTAL	350		10%	1401		42%	1610		48%	3361	

TABLE 22: Final Counts United States

GENDER / AGE	CELL PHONE	GENDER / AGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	ABS	GENDER / AGE (%)	ABS (%)	PANEL	GENDER / AGE (%)	PANEL (%)	TOTAL	GENDER / AGE (%)
Male / 18-24	19	6%	22%	35	2%	40%	34	3%	39%	88	2%
Male / 25-34	24	8%	8%	148	6%	50%	125	13%	42%	297	8%
Male / 35-49	32	11%	8%	220	10%	53%	160	16%	39%	412	11%
Male / 50-64	45	15%	12%	235	10%	65%	82	8%	23%	362	10%
Male / 65+	48	16%	13%	307	13%	81%	26	3%	7%	381	11%
Male / Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Male Total	169	56%	11%	945	41%	61%	427	43%	28%	1541	43%
Female / 18-24	11	4%	7%	81	4%	54%	58	6%	39%	150	4%
Female / 25-34	18	6%	4%	223	10%	51%	193	19%	44%	434	12%
Female / 35-49	33	11%	6%	353	15%	60%	199	20%	34%	585	16%
Female / 50-64	31	10%	7%	303	13%	70%	96	10%	22%	430	12%
Female / 65+	34	11%	8%	367	16%	88%	18	2%	4%	419	12%
Female / Exact Age Unknown	1	0%	100%	0	0%	0%	0	0%	0%	1	0%
Female Total	128	43%	6%	1327	58%	66%	564	56%	28%	2019	56%
Other or Unknown Total	3	1%	9%	23	1%	68%	8	1%	24%	34	1%
TOTAL	300		8%	2295		64%	999		28%	3594	

LANGUAGE	CELL PHONE	LANG-UAGE (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	ABS	LANG-UAGE (%)	ABS (%)	PANEL	LANG-UAGE (%)	PANEL (%)	TOTAL	LANG-UAGE (%)
English	265	88%	8%	2141	93%	64%	960	96%	29%	3366	94%
Spanish	35	12%	15%	152	7%	67%	39	4%	17%	226	6%
TOTAL	300		8%	2293		64%	999		28%	3592	

REGION	CELL PHONE	REGION (%)	CELL PHONE (%)	ABS	REGION (%)	ABS (%)	PANEL	REGION (%)	PANEL (%)	TOTAL	REGION (%)
Northeast	45	15%	8%	361	16%	63%	166	17%	29%	572	16%
South	130	43%	9%	846	37%	61%	411	41%	30%	1387	39%
Midwest	56	19%	8%	475	21%	66%	191	19%	26%	722	20%
West	69	23%	8%	613	27%	67%	231	23%	25%	913	25%
TOTAL	300		8%	2295		64%	999		28%	3594	

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. In addition, the SSRS project team conducted an independent check to confirm that all variables were created correctly, had the correct number of cases, and were coded according to specifications.

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.

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 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.

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 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.

At the close of Kantar’s fieldwork, they sent SSRS an SPSS file containing the survey data. After ensuring that all of the variables were contained in the dataset, SSRS’s project team and back-end data processor reformatted the dataset to align with the data map, so Kantar’s data could be integrated into the full dataset.

As described in the Data Memo provided to all partners in August 2023, 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, and trending questions where applicable.

Response Rates

The response rates for this study (shown in Tables 23-27 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 23: Response Rates by Country by Frame

	Landline	Cellphone ⁹	ABS	Probability Panel ¹⁰	TOTAL
Australia	7.3%	10.4%	--	--	9.7%
Canada	9.3%	13.0%	--	--	11.7%
France	7.5%	12.1%	--	--	10.7%
Germany	18.2%	30.7%	--	--	22.9%
Netherlands	14.4%	8.9%	--	--	10.0%
New Zealand	11.2%	8.1%	--	--	8.7%
Sweden	--	--	29.2%	--	29.2%
Switzerland	--	--	48.8%	--	48.8%
United Kingdom	7.3%	10.5%	--	1.3%	5.8%
United States	--	4.9%	13.9%	2.4%	9.9%

⁹ The US cellphone sample included prepaid cell phones, exclusively.

¹⁰ Probability Panel response rates are calculated by multiplying the survey completion rate among panel sample (36.9% in the UK, 39% in the US) by the respective panel’s recruitment survey response rate.

TABLE 24: Landline Response Rates by Country

	Australia	Canada	France	Germany	Nether-lands	New Zealand	UK
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)							
Complete	150	1,638	225	1,253	150	150	350
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)							
Refusal and breakoff	2	71	1,209	1,473	620	0	1,565
Break off	0	21	153	0	103	0	366
Non-contact/interview with eligible case	0	0	0	3,067	0	0	0
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)							
Always busy	134	3,597	62	0	42	73	157
No answer	1,266	16,561	7,978	16,413	1,520	2,311	4,456
Answering machine-don't know if household	2,481	42,115	3,855	0	1,400	928	9,068
Call blocking	0	496	0	0	1	0	6
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	91	1,832	1,169	0	165	105	324
No screener completed	783	11,836	2,144	27	1,163	737	1,889
Not eligible (Category 4)							
Fax/data line	28	3,011	83		32	9	79
Non-working number	110,748	70,244	29,850	81,052	26,460	143,715	34,180
Business, government office, other organizations	0	1,564	481		193	0	263
No eligible respondent	122	1,619	352	1,365	153	78	220
Quota filled	3	19	0		0	0	0
Response Rate 3	7.3%	9.3%	7.5%	18.2%	14.4%	11.2%	7.3%

TABLE 25: Cellphone Response Rates by Country

	Australia	Canada	France	Germany
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)				
Complete	601	3,182	526	752
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)				
Refusal and breakoff	0	163	2,055	607
Break off	0	45	451	0
Non-contact/interview with eligible case	0	0	0	46
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)				
Always busy	332	15,353	111	0
No answer	1,820	77,046	2,928	13,202

Answering machine-don't know if household	2,253	59,982	9,811	0
Call blocking	0	969	0	0
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	1,133	2,888	369	0
No screener completed	5,112	30,321	1,997	762
Not eligible (Category 4)				
Fax/data line	9	195	13	0
Non-working number	6,898	412,968	36,029	40,430
Business, government office, other organizations	0	988	326	0
No eligible respondent	413	3,353	539	866
Quota filled	7	45	0	0
Response Rate 3	10.4%	13.0%	12.1%	30.7%

TABLE 25 Cont'd: Cellphone Response Rates by Country

	Netherlands	New Zealand	UK	US
Eligible, Interview (Category 1)				
Complete	601	600	1,401	300
Eligible, non-interview (Category 2)				
Refusal and breakoff	3,325	4	7,519	42
Break off	704	0	2,022	18
Unknown eligibility, non-interview (Category 3)				
Always busy	1,663	265	2,792	25
No answer	4,578	1,822	22,887	8,198
Answering machine-don't know if household	16,661	3,715	50,179	7,507
Call blocking	12	0	14	595
Housing unit, unknown if eligible respondent	495	1,178	1,393	136
No screener completed	3,509	3,720	2,569	2,319
Not eligible (Category 4)				
Fax/data line	121	4	37	150
Non-working number	56,832	1,788	639,971	8,116
Business, government office, other organizations	293	0	318	126
No eligible respondent	1,382	161	1,336	566
Quota filled	0	0	0	
Response Rate 3	8.9%	8.1%	10.5%	4.9%

TABLE 26: ABS Response Rate for Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States

	Sweden	Switzerland	United States
Total records	9,045	4,981	27,148
Ineligibles	387	158	1,665
Valid sample	6,392	2,531	23,186
Completes	2,266	2,292	2,297
Response Rate	29.2%	48.8%	13.9%

TABLE 27: Probability Panel Response Rate for the United Kingdom and the United States

	United Kingdom	United States
Total records	4,364	2,621
Ineligibles	0	25
Valid sample	2,754	1,597
Completes	1,610	999
Survey Completion Rate	36.9%	39.0%
Response Rate	1.3%	2.4%

Weighting

Data from each country were weighted to ensure the final outcome was representative of the adult population, ages 18 and older¹¹. 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 2020 weighting protocol.

Table 28 shows the post-stratification parameters per country and outlines the oversampling, if any, that was put in place.

TABLE 28: Post-Stratification Parameters per country

	Post-stratification Variables	Oversamples
Australia	age by gender, region, education, urban status	None
Canada	age by gender, region (province distribution), education, knowledge of official language ¹²	Minimum samples per province/territory, with larger sample sizes for Ontario and Quebec
France	age by gender, region, education	None
Germany	age by gender, region, education, household size	None
The Netherlands	age by gender, region, education	None
New Zealand	age, gender, region, education	None
Sweden ¹³	age by gender, education	Higher sampling fractions for strata containing records flagged with low level of education, foreign background, and living in thinly populated areas

¹¹ 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).

¹² Knowledge of Official Language was a benchmark only for Quebec, New Brunswick, and for Canada as a whole

¹³As in IHP 2020-2021, Sweden's data were not weighted by region upon consultation with Vårdanalys. SSRS checked to ensure that the region distribution was aligned with population parameters.

Switzerland	age by gender, region, education	Cantons of Zurich, Ticino, Vaud, and Valais
The UK	gender, age by gender ¹⁴ , region, education, nativity	Probability Panel sample stratified to oversample economically inactive adults in the UK
	race by age, race by education, race by sex, race by region, sex by age, sex by education, age by education, race/ethnicity, population density, Internet use	ABS and Probability Panel sample stratified to oversample low-income, Hispanic, Black, and younger (less than 50 years old) adults in the US
US		

How to Analyze Data with Oversamples

It is a common practice to oversample certain groups of interest to provide larger sample sizes for analysis. When groups are oversampled, weighting will correct for the oversampling by “weighting down” the groups to their proper proportion of the sample.

It is important for researchers to understand the weighting implications of these oversamples. SSRS typically computes “balancing weights” which means that the weights across the entire sample sum to the total number of interviews. If we have oversampled a group, the sum of that group’s balancing weight will then be less than the number of interviews we completed with the group because that group has been weighted down in the aggregate. If such data were analyzed with a basic statistics package like SPSS, the margin of error for the oversample population would reflect the weighted n-size and not the number of interviews which would lead to an overestimate of the sample variance.

The following table shows an example of population and interview n-sizes when an oversample is used. For this example, a main cross-section sample of 1,000 was combined with an oversample of 800 among some subpopulation of interest. While the researcher did 920 interviews with the oversample population, the statistical software will run statistical tests as though only 216 interviews were completed.

¹⁴ Separate age-groups (18-24, 25-49, 50-64, and 65+) were each raked to population parameters and a combined, age-adjusted calibration weight was calculated for the total UK sample. For the 25-49 age-group, gender by age was utilized as a benchmark.

TABLE 29: Example of Oversample N-sizes

	Natural Population Distribution (%)	Example Study Sample Completes			Weighted N-size
		Main Sample	Over-sample	Total	
Non-oversample population	88%	880 (88%)	0	880 (49%)	1,584 (88%)
Oversample population	12%	120 (12%)	800	920 (51%)	216 (12%)
Total	100%	1,000	800	1,800	1,800

There are two solutions to this problem. The first is to utilize a statistics package that can apply a Taylor Series Linearization to the data. Under this procedure, the researcher would enter a strata variable¹⁵ into the statistics package that indicates the sample selections upon which under/oversampling occurred. In effect, this will allow the statistics package to calculate proper margins of error for estimates based on the true sample sizes of groups. Taylor Series Linearization will also account for the impact of any complex sample design features, such as stratification, on sample variances. The researcher will also attain a margin of error appropriate to the number of interviews rather than the weighted N-size, which can be a problem in some statistical software packages such as SPSS. Statistics packages with the capability to compute linearized variances estimates include SAS with the survey procedures module, R with the *survey* package, Stata, and SPSS with the Complex Samples module.

If one does not have access to such a package, SSRS will provide a secondary weight to be used to conduct analyses within oversampled groups or between oversampled groups and other respondents, as the main weight supplied with the data will be appropriate for analysis of the overall population only.

Researchers should be aware that these two methods will obtain equivalent point estimates; however, they may not obtain equivalent sample variances, meaning that results of statistical tests could differ depending on the method used. In general, when the two methods differ, Taylor Series Linearization will obtain the most accurate sample variances and statistical tests, both overall and within subgroups. Therefore, if the researcher has access to software that can conduct Taylor Series Linearization, this is the preferred method.

Regardless, SSRS will identify the strata and PSU variables whenever they are applicable, so that researchers can properly analyze their data with the correct margins of error.

¹⁵ Or a Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) for a multi-stage sample design

Detailed Weighting Procedures by Country¹⁶

Australia

The weighting procedure for Australia needed to address the following:

1. 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.
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:

Population parameters were derived from the 2021 Census data, and generated using the Australian Bureau of Statistics TableBuilder function.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 30, below, compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Australia as a whole.

¹⁶ Missing data for gender, age and other variables were imputed using a Hot Deck procedure prior to raking.

TABLE 30: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Australia

	Australia - Unweighted	Australia - Weighted	Australia - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male 18-24	5.1%	5.6%	5.5%
Male 25-34	8.7%	9.1%	9.0%
Male 35-49	10.5%	12.8%	12.7%
Male 50-64	9.3%	11.4%	11.3%
Male 65+	14.6%	10.4%	10.3%
Female 18-24	4.1%	5.4%	5.3%
Female 25-34	7.7%	9.1%	9.2%
Female 35-49	8.3%	12.5%	13.1%
Female 50-64	11.3%	12.0%	11.9%
Female 65+	20.4%	11.8%	11.7%
Education			
High School or Less	28.2%	45.5%	46.1%
Some Post- Secondary	25.8%	26.7%	26.5%
University Degree or more	45.9%	27.8%	27.5%
Urban Status			
Major City	71.2%	71.0%	71.3%
Not Major City	28.8%	29.0%	28.7%

Region			
NSW	26.1%	31.8%	31.8%
Victoria	27.3%	26.0%	25.7%
Queensland	22.6%	20.1%	20.1%
South Australia	6.5%	6.9%	7.1%
Western Australia	10.8%	10.2%	10.4%
Tasmania	3.1%	2.2%	2.2%
Northern Territory	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Australian Capital Territory	2.8%	1.8%	1.8%

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 Canada's 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 2021 Census. SSRS obtained population estimates from Statistics Canada for the adult population (age 18 or older) for each of the provinces and for Canada as a whole.

Three weights were developed for varying analytical purposes:

Weight is to be used for total country estimates. This weight excludes the territory oversamples. Including those cases would have made the design effect too high and weights would not converge.

CAN_WEIGHTPROVINCES is valid for all cases in the data, including the territory oversamples. This is the weight that should be used for estimates within each province or territory. This weights each province and territory within, but does not rebalance at the end to, the distribution each brings to the total population in Canada.

CAN_POPWEIGHT was developed where the weights within each province were adjusted to sum to the adult (18+) population size. This weight can be used for either total country estimates or those within provinces or territories.

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. Both **Weight** and **CAN_POPWEIGHT** include this adjustment.

Tables 31 through 37 and compare the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters. The per-provinces tables utilize **CAN_POPWEIGHT** and the overall Canada table utilizes **Weight**.

TABLE 31: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island

	NL- Unweighted	NL- Weighted	NL- Adults	PEI- Unweighted	PEI- Weighted	PEI- Adults
Gender By Age						
Male 18-24	2.0%	4.4%	4.4%	3.6%	6.0%	5.8%
Male 25-34	4.4%	6.1%	6.1%	4.8%	6.9%	7.2%
Male 35-49	5.6%	10.8%	10.7%	7.6%	11.0%	10.7%
Male 50-64	17.1%	14.3%	14.2%	10.8%	13.2%	12.8%
Male 65+	16.7%	13.2%	13.1%	12.8%	12.1%	11.8%
Female 18-24	2.0%	4.2%	4.2%	2.0%	5.3%	5.3%
Female 25-34	2.8%	6.4%	6.3%	2.8%	5.3%	7.3%
Female 35-49	8.0%	10.8%	11.6%	12.8%	12.0%	11.7%
Female 50-64	20.7%	15.2%	15.0%	16.0%	14.3%	13.9%
Female 65+	20.7%	14.6%	14.4%	26.8%	13.9%	13.5%
Education						
High School or Less	25.1%	46.5%	46.1%	24.0%	41.0%	42.1%
Some Post-Secondary	21.1%	36.0%	36.6%	16.8%	35.5%	35.0%
University Degree or more	53.8%	17.5%	17.3%	59.2%	23.6%	22.9%

TABLE 32: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick

	NS- Unweighted	NS- Weighted	NS- Adults	NB- Unweighted	NB- Weighted	NB- Adults
Gender By Age						
Male 18-24	3.8%	5.0%	5.0%	4.4%	5.0%	4.8%
Male 25-34	5.0%	7.5%	7.5%	3.6%	5.8%	6.8%
Male 35-49	12.6%	10.4%	10.4%	13.2%	11.5%	11.0%

Male 50-64	8.0%	13.1%	13.1%	12.0%	14.3%	13.6%
Male 65+	8.4%	12.1%	12.1%	11.6%	11.9%	12.6%
Female 18-24	5.7%	4.7%	4.7%	2.8%	4.6%	4.4%
Female 25-34	7.7%	7.5%	7.6%	4.4%	6.4%	6.8%
Female 35-49	14.2%	11.3%	11.3%	10.8%	12.3%	11.7%
Female 50-64	16.5%	14.2%	14.2%	15.2%	13.3%	14.3%
Female 65+	18.0%	14.0%	14.0%	22.0%	14.8%	14.1%
Education						
High School or Less	25.7%	41.7%	41.6%	29.6%	46.2%	46.8%
Some Post-Secondary	14.9%	33.2%	33.2%	14.8%	33.1%	33.5%
University Degree or more	59.4%	25.2%	25.1%	55.6%	20.7%	19.7%
Language						
English Only	-	-	-	64.4%	59.3%	58.4%
French Only	-	-	-	1.2%	4.6%	7.3%
Both	-	-	-	34.4%	36.1%	34.4%

TABLE 33: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Ontario and Quebec

	ON- Unweighted	ON- Weighted	ON- Adults	QC- Unweighted	QC- Weighted	QC- Adults
Gender By Age						
Male 18-24	4.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.2%	4.9%	4.8%
Male 25-34	8.3%	8.6%	8.6%	8.7%	8.1%	8.0%
Male 35-49	9.2%	11.7%	11.6%	13.2%	12.2%	12.2%
Male 50-64	11.0%	12.4%	12.5%	12.0%	12.6%	13.0%
Male 65+	13.4%	10.2%	10.2%	8.5%	11.3%	11.3%
Female 18-24	3.2%	5.2%	5.2%	4.2%	4.7%	4.6%
Female 25-34	6.5%	8.5%	8.6%	6.3%	8.0%	7.9%

Female 35-49	10.5%	12.5%	12.4%	13.5%	12.3%	12.3%
Female 50-64	14.8%	13.3%	13.3%	13.8%	13.2%	13.2%
Female 65+	18.5%	12.1%	12.0%	14.7%	12.8%	12.7%
Education						
High School or Less	22.5%	40.1%	40.0%	23.7%	37.0%	37.3%
Some Post-Secondary	13.2%	28.6%	28.7%	16.0%	38.1%	38.3%
University Degree or more	64.3%	31.3%	31.2%	60.3%	24.8%	24.5%
Language						
English Only	-	-	-	2.9%	4.4%	5.5%
French Only	-	-	-	40.5%	44.0%	43.6%
Both	-	-	-	56.6%	51.6%	50.9%

TABLE 34: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Manitoba and Saskatchewan

	MB- Unweighted	MB- Weighted	MB- Adults	SK- Unweighted	SK- Weighted	SK- Adults
Gender By Age						
Male 18-24	6.4%	6.3%	6.3%	4.8%	5.7%	5.6%
Male 25-34	7.2%	9.0%	8.9%	4.4%	8.7%	8.6%
Male 35-49	9.2%	12.4%	12.3%	12.0%	12.5%	12.7%
Male 50-64	10.4%	11.4%	12.0%	11.2%	12.3%	12.2%
Male 65+	10.8%	9.9%	9.8%	13.1%	10.4%	10.3%
Female 18-24	2.4%	5.7%	5.7%	3.6%	5.2%	5.2%
Female 25-34	5.6%	8.8%	8.8%	4.0%	8.8%	8.7%
Female 35-49	12.7%	12.7%	12.6%	12.4%	12.2%	12.8%
Female 50-64	14.3%	12.5%	12.4%	13.5%	12.5%	12.4%
Female 65+	21.1%	11.4%	11.3%	21.1%	11.6%	11.5%
Education						

High School or Less	25.5%	47.1%	47.4%	24.3%	47.4%	47.9%
Some Post-Secondary	14.3%	28.8%	28.6%	23.5%	30.9%	30.6%
University Degree or more	60.2%	24.1%	23.9%	52.2%	21.8%	21.6%

TABLE 35: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Alberta and British Columbia

	AB- Unweighted	AB- Weighted	AB- Adults	BC- Unweighted	BC- Weighted	BC- Adults
Gender By Age						
Male 18-24	1.9%	5.3%	5.4%	4.0%	5.0%	5.0%
Male 25-34	9.7%	9.2%	9.1%	8.8%	8.5%	8.5%
Male 35-49	8.9%	14.2%	14.1%	10.8%	11.7%	11.7%
Male 50-64	13.5%	12.3%	12.2%	14.3%	11.9%	12.2%
Male 65+	12.0%	8.8%	8.7%	12.4%	11.2%	11.2%
Female 18-24	2.3%	5.1%	5.1%	2.8%	4.7%	4.7%
Female 25-34	5.4%	8.9%	9.2%	4.8%	8.5%	8.5%
Female 35-49	15.8%	14.3%	14.2%	12.4%	12.3%	12.3%
Female 50-64	15.1%	12.5%	12.4%	10.8%	13.3%	13.2%
Female 65+	15.4%	9.6%	9.5%	19.1%	12.7%	12.6%
Education						
High School or Less	21.2%	41.5%	41.7%	19.9%	40.6%	40.8%
Some Post-Secondary	22.0%	31.5%	31.5%	21.9%	29.7%	29.6%
University Degree or more	56.8%	27.0%	26.8%	58.2%	29.7%	29.6%

TABLE 36: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, and Nunavut

	YK- Unwgt'd	YK - Wgt'd	YK - Adults	NWT- Unwgt'd	NWT - Wgt'd	NWT - Adults	NU- Unwgt'd	NU - Wgt'd	NU - Adults
Gender By Age									
Male 18-24	1.6%	4.7%	4.6%	1.4%	5.7%	5.7%	4.0%	9.1%	9.1%
Male 25-34	6.4%	9.5%	9.3%	7.0%	10.8%	10.7%	4.0%	12.9%	13.1%
Male 35-49	9.2%	13.5%	13.3%	10.5%	14.2%	14.1%	15.8%	14.1%	14.1%
Male 50-64	8.4%	12.7%	12.5%	18.2%	13.4%	13.3%	17.8%	10.7%	10.7%
Male 65+	14.3%	9.7%	9.5%	10.5%	6.7%	6.6%	7.9%	3.7%	3.7%
Female 18-24	0.8%	3.8%	4.5%	1.4%	4.7%	5.5%	5.0%	8.6%	8.6%
Female 25-34	4.8%	9.3%	9.9%	7.7%	11.0%	10.9%	5.9%	13.2%	13.2%
Female 35-49	14.3%	14.6%	14.6%	14.0%	14.5%	14.4%	16.8%	14.0%	14.0%
Female 50-64	12.7%	13.2%	13.0%	16.8%	12.8%	12.7%	15.8%	10.3%	10.3%
Female 65+	27.5%	8.9%	8.7%	12.6%	6.2%	6.1%	6.9%	3.3%	3.3%
Education									
HS or Less	16.3%	37.6%	37.9%	24.5%	48.1%	47.7%	46.5%	68.2%	68.0%
Some Coll.	24.7%	34.2%	33.6%	16.1%	29.3%	29.0%	19.8%	20.3%	20.5%
Coll.+	59.0%	28.2%	28.5%	59.4%	22.6%	23.2%	33.7%	11.5%	11.5%

TABLE 37: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Canada as a Whole

	Canada - Unweighted	Canada - Weighted	Canada - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male 18-24	4.1%	5.3%	5.3%
Male 25-34	7.3%	8.4%	8.4%
Male 35-49	10.4%	12.0%	12.0%
Male 50-64	11.9%	12.6%	12.6%
Male 65+	11.7%	10.6%	10.6%
Female 18-24	3.2%	5.0%	5.0%
Female 25-34	5.6%	8.4%	8.4%
Female 35-49	12.4%	12.5%	12.5%
Female 50-64	14.7%	13.2%	13.2%
Female 65+	18.7%	12.0%	12.0%
Education			
High School or Less	23.8%	40.5%	40.5%
Some Post-Secondary	16.8%	31.7%	31.7%
University Degree or more	59.3%	27.8%	27.8%
Language			
English Only	67.6%	70.8%	70.8%
French Only	9.1%	10.3%	10.3%
Both	23.3%	18.9%	18.9%
Region			
Newfoundland and Labrador	5.2%	1.4%	1.4%
Prince Edward Island	5.2%	0.4%	0.4%
Nova Scotia	5.4%	2.7%	2.7%
New Brunswick	5.2%	2.1%	2.1%

Quebec	20.8%	22.9%	22.9%
Ontario	27.0%	38.8%	38.8%
Manitoba	5.2%	3.5%	3.5%
Saskatchewan	5.2%	2.9%	2.9%
Alberta	5.4%	11.1%	11.1%
British Columbia	5.2%	13.9%	13.9%
Yukon	5.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Northwest Territories	3.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Nunavut	2.1%	0.1%	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 2022 data from the statistical office of the European Union (Eurostat).
 - Educational attainment was based on data from the 2019 Census and gathered through INSEE for people aged 15 and older. Adjustments were made to remove 15-17 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 38, below, compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for France as a whole.

TABLE 38: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for France

	France - Unweighted	France - Weighted	France - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male 18-24	3.9%	5.4%	5.3%
Male 25-34	6.5%	7.2%	7.2%
Male 35-49	9.6%	11.5%	11.7%
Male 50-64	11.9%	12.0%	11.9%
Male 65+	14.6%	11.7%	11.6%
Female 18-24	4.8%	5.1%	5.1%
Female 25-34	5.1%	7.2%	7.4%
Female 35-49	10.0%	11.8%	12.1%
Female 50-64	14.1%	12.6%	12.5%
Female 65+	19.6%	15.4%	15.2%
Education			
No diploma or at most BEPC, College certificate, DNB	12.9%	26.6%	27.3%
Certificate of professional skills, Certificate of professional studies	27.2%	25.0%	24.8%

General, technological or vocational baccalaureate	10.9%	17.2%	17.1%
Graduate Diploma	49.0%	31.2%	30.9%
Region			
Grand Est	9.9%	8.7%	8.6%
Nouvelle Aquitaine	8.4%	9.5%	9.5%
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes	13.7%	12.4%	12.3%
Bourgogne, Franche-Comté	4.1%	4.3%	4.3%
Bretagne	4.4%	5.2%	5.2%
Centre-Val de Loire	3.5%	3.9%	3.9%
Corse	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%
Île-de-France	19.7%	18.5%	18.4%
Occitanie	10.4%	9.4%	9.4%
Hauts-de France	7.5%	8.9%	8.9%
Normandie	4.9%	5.1%	5.1%
Pays de la Loire	5.5%	5.8%	5.9%
Provence-Alpes, Côte-d'Azur	7.6%	7.8%	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 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:

Population parameters used for the German sample were region, age-by-gender, educational attainment, and household-size.

 - Gender, age, and region and household size were derived from on Statistisches Bundesamt 2022 data.
 - Educational attainment and household size were derived from 2018 Microcensus data, and generated from Statistisches Bundesamt.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95th 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 Germany as a whole.

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

	Germany - Unweighted	Germany - Weighted	Germany - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male 18-24	2.8%	4.6%	4.6%
Male 25-34	4.0%	6.5%	7.8%
Male 35-49	7.6%	10.8%	11.2%
Male 50-64	12.5%	14.0%	13.5%
Male 65+	18.7%	12.7%	11.7%
Female 18-24	1.3%	3.4%	4.2%
Female 25-34	3.0%	5.9%	7.3%

Female 35-49	8.5%	11.1%	11.1%
Female 50-64	17.4%	14.8%	13.6%
Female 65+	24.1%	16.2%	14.9%
Education			
High School or Less	33.5%	20.4%	18.8%
Some Post-Secondary	26.5%	59.0%	62.3%
University Degree or more	40.0%	20.7%	19.0%
Household Size			
Single-Person Household	35.4%	25.3%	25.0%
Multiple-Person HH	64.6%	74.7%	75.0%
Region			
Schleswig-Holstein	3.4%	3.2%	3.5%
Hamburg	2.2%	2.3%	2.2%
Bremen	1.8%	0.9%	0.8%
Niedersachsen	9.1%	9.7%	9.6%
Nordrhein-Westfalen	18.8%	20.5%	21.4%
Rheinland-Pfalz	5.4%	5.0%	4.9%
Saarland	1.2%	1.3%	1.2%
Hessen	7.4%	7.8%	7.5%
Baden-Württemberg	13.2%	13.3%	13.3%
Bayern	15.0%	15.9%	15.8%
Berlin	5.8%	4.7%	4.5%
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	2.1%	2.1%	2.0%
Brandenburg	3.4%	3.0%	3.1%
Sachsen-Anhalt	3.0%	2.8%	2.6%
Thüringen	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%
Freistaat Sachsen	5.5%	4.7%	4.9%

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, and region were based on 2022 data from the statistical office of the European Union (Eurostat). Educational attainment was based on 2023 data from Eurostat.
 - Educational attainment 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 40, below, compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for The Netherlands as a whole.

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

	Netherlands - Unweighted	Netherlands - Weighted	Netherlands - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male 18-24	3.3%	5.0%	5.6%
Male 25-34	5.1%	7.9%	8.1%
Male 35-49	10.1%	11.4%	11.2%
Male 50-64	15.0%	13.3%	13.0%
Male 65+	16.6%	11.9%	11.5%
Female 18-24	2.7%	4.9%	5.4%
Female 25-34	5.5%	7.9%	7.9%
Female 35-49	10.7%	11.2%	11.2%
Female 50-64	16.0%	13.2%	13.0%
Female 65+	15.0%	13.4%	13.2%
Education			
High School or Less	11.6%	18.8%	20.5%
Some Post-Secondary	30.1%	34.5%	34.0%
University Degree or more	45.3%	35.6%	34.6%
Age 75 or older	13.0%	11.1%	10.9%
Region			
Drenthe	2.7%	2.9%	2.8%
Flevoland	3.2%	2.5%	2.4%
Friesland	3.6%	3.8%	3.7%
Gelderland	10.5%	12.0%	12.0%
Groningen	2.7%	3.3%	3.4%
Limburg	5.2%	6.4%	6.6%

Noord-Brabant	15.0%	15.1%	14.9%
Noord-Holland	17.2%	16.5%	16.6%
Overijssel	6.8%	6.4%	6.6%
Utrecht	8.4%	7.6%	7.6%
Zeeland	2.4%	2.3%	2.2%
Zuid-Holland	22.4%	21.3%	21.2%

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, 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 5th and 95th 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 New Zealand as a whole.

TABLE 41: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for New Zealand

	New Zealand - Unweighted	New Zealand - Weighted	New Zealand - Adults
Gender			
Male	42.8%	47.7%	48.8%
Female	57.2%	52.3%	51.2%
Age			
18-24 years	4.3%	10.1%	12.2%
25-34 years	9.6%	16.9%	18.4%
35-49 years	22.0%	26.1%	25.3%
50-64 years	27.9%	25.7%	24.3%
65+years	36.3%	21.2%	19.9%
Education			
High School or Less	22.8%	49.1%	52.1%
Some Post- Secondary	25.3%	21.7%	20.5%
University Degree or more	51.9%	29.2%	27.4%
Region			
Auckland	37.3%	34.0%	33.3%
North	25.2%	25.9%	26.6%
Central	15.1%	16.4%	16.0%
South	22.4%	23.7%	24.1%

Sweden

The weighting procedure for Sweden addressed several issues:

1. Differences in the probability of selection in the sample by:
 - a. Demographic stratification: prior to pulling the sample to be contacted to participate in the study, the sampling frame, itself, was stratified by urbanicity, Swedish nationality¹⁷, educational attainment, and age.
2. Systematic non-response along known demographic parameters.

To address this point, the following steps were taken:

1. Base-weighting: Respondents in the sample of completed interviews received a weight adjustment to account for the demographic stratification in the sampling frame.
 - a. This base-weight adjustment (bw_i) is equal to the number of records in the sampling frame (N) divided by the number of sampled records (n), per stratum (i), for each respondent in the sample of completed interviews.
2. Post-stratification weighting:

Parameters used for the Sweden sample were age-by-gender and educational attainment.¹⁸ Population parameters were derived from the following sources:

 - a. Gender, age, and educational attainment were based on Statistics Sweden's 2022 counts.
3. Weights were trimmed at the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

¹⁷ Foreign background refers to individuals who were born outside of Sweden and individuals who were born in Sweden but whose parents were both born outside Sweden.

¹⁸ As in IHP waves since 2020, Sweden data were not weighted by region, due to privacy concerns preventing the variable from being included in the data, upon consultation with Vårdanalys. SSRS, however, checked to ensure that the region distribution was reasonable relative to the official benchmark (within 2 percentage-points of the benchmark for the Sweden-wide sample).

Table 42, below, compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Sweden as a whole.

TABLE 42: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the Netherlands

	Sweden - Unweighted	Sweden - Weighted	Sweden - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male 18-24	2.4%	4.7%	5.2%
Male 25-34	3.6%	7.4%	8.9%
Male 35-49	8.8%	12.4%	12.3%
Male 50-64	12.8%	12.0%	11.6%
Male 65+	17.0%	12.5%	12.1%
Female 18-24	3.6%	4.8%	4.7%
Female 25-34	5.6%	8.3%	8.4%
Female 35-49	11.2%	12.1%	11.7%
Female 50-64	16.0%	11.8%	11.4%
Female 65+	19.0%	14.2%	13.7%
Education			
High School or Less	53.6%	58.5%	59.6%
Some Post- Secondary	16.6%	15.7%	15.4%
University Degree or more	29.7%	25.8%	25.0%

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).¹⁹
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). Oversampled cantons were separated as individual categories in the matrix. Data were weighted to the breakdown in the sampling frame (Statistics, Switzerland, 2022).

TABLE 43: Linguistic Region / Canton by Phone Status Base-weight

	Statistics Switzerland (%)	Unweighted Data (%)	Adjustment Weight Applied
Linguistic Regions/Oversampled Cantons With Phone-number in Registry			
German	22.5%	14.5%	1.55
French	4.2%	4.2%	1.01
Italian	0.1%	0.6%	0.13
Zurich	6.0%	5.4%	1.12
Ticino	1.5%	5.6%	0.27
Vaud	3.0%	5.0%	0.60
Valais	1.4%	5.9%	0.24
Linguistic Regions/Oversampled Cantons Without Phone-number in Registry			
German	30.0%	16.6%	1.80
French	7.7%	6.6%	1.16
Italian	0.1%	0.6%	0.15
Zurich	11.8%	8.0%	1.48

¹⁹ Outbound dialing was implemented only for sample-records flagged as being aged 70 years or older. However, the flag for age in the sample could not be shared with SSRS. For consistency's sake relative to prior waves of this study, and for an accurate representation of the registry, this adjustment was preserved for IHP 2023.

Ticino	2.6%	8.6%	0.31
Vaud	6.3%	8.4%	0.74
Valais	2.7%	10.0%	0.27

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 was derived from the official 2022 figures from the Statistic Office for the adult population in the Swiss Registry.
- Gender, age, educational attainment, and region (Canton) were derived from Statistics Switzerland data for 2021.

3. Weights were trimmed at the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 44, below, compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for Switzerland as a whole.

TABLE 44: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for Switzerland

	Switzerland - Unweighted	Switzerland - Weighted	Switzerland - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male 18-24	2.9%	4.3%	4.6%
Male 25-34	5.9%	8.1%	8.4%
Male 35-49	11.7%	12.7%	12.9%
Male 50-64	15.5%	13.1%	12.9%
Male 65+	11.9%	10.6%	10.4%
Female 18-24	3.6%	4.4%	4.3%
Female 25-34	5.6%	7.6%	8.1%
Female 35-49	13.7%	12.9%	12.7%
Female 50-64	16.4%	13.1%	12.8%
Female 65+	12.7%	13.1%	12.8%

Education			
High School or Less	60.3%	63.0%	61.9%
Some Post-Secondary	8.1%	14.7%	16.1%
University Degree or more	31.6%	22.3%	22.0%
Region			
Zürich	13.4%	18.0%	17.9%
Bern French speaking	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Bern German speaking	7.7%	11.6%	11.5%
Luzern	2.9%	4.8%	4.8%
Uri	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%
Schwyz	1.1%	1.8%	1.9%
Obwalden	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%
Nidwalden	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%
Glarus	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%
Zug	0.6%	1.3%	1.5%
Fribourg French speaking	3.4%	2.8%	2.7%
Fribourg German speaking	0.4%	0.8%	0.9%
Solothurn	2.1%	3.2%	3.2%
Basel-Stadt	1.1%	2.2%	2.3%
Basel-Landschaft	2.0%	3.4%	3.4%
Schaffhausen	0.7%	1.0%	1.0%
Appenzell Ausserrhoden	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%
Appenzell Innerrhoden	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
St. Gallen	3.3%	5.8%	5.9%
Graubünden	2.2%	2.2%	2.4%

Aargau	5.2%	8.0%	8.0%
Thurgau	1.8%	3.3%	3.3%
Ticino	14.2%	4.2%	4.1%
Vaud	13.4%	9.5%	9.2%
Valais French speaking	12.0%	3.2%	3.1%
Valais German speaking	3.9%	1.0%	1.0%
Neuchatel	2.4%	2.1%	2.0%
Geneva	4.1%	5.9%	5.8%
Jura	0.4%	0.8%	0.8%

The United Kingdom

The weighting procedure for the United Kingdom addressed several issues:

1. Differential sampling designs – dual-frame RDD and Probability Panel (Kantar Public Voice)
2. Differences in the probability of selection in the RDD sample 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. Difference in the probability of selection in the Probability Panel sample by:
 - a. Age and Economic Inactivity stratification: Panelists sampled for the study were stratified by economically inactive status and age-group (18-24, 25-49, 50-64, and 65+) in order to maximize response from younger adults and those who are economically inactive. Panelists flagged as being economically inactive were disproportionately sampled (oversampled) within age-group.
 - b. Panelist Status: To account for the recruitment procedure and the probability of being sample for the study
4. Systematic non-response along known geographic and demographic parameters.

To address these points, the following steps were taken:

1. Data from each sampling frame were separately base-weighted, so that each sub-sample (and the overall sample) accurately represents the corresponding population.

2. To address different probabilities of selection in the RDD sample:
 - 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).
3. To address different probabilities of selection in the Probability Panel sample:
 - a. Recruitment Correction: Panelists received a weight adjustment equal to their original recruitment survey weight divided by the probability of being sampled for the current survey.
 - b. Propensity Score Adjustment: Panelists received a weight adjustment equal to the estimated odds of both recruitment to the panel, itself, and response to the current survey – based on a number of recruitment survey variables. This step also corrects for the sample's stratification and oversampling of economically inactive panelists.

A final combined base-weight was calculated for the entire sample of interviews in the UK, that was normalized by sampling frame in order to preserve the above corrections in relation to the whole of the sample.

4. Post-stratification weighting:
 - a. With the base-weight applied, separate age-groups (18-24, 25-49, 50-64, and 65+) were each balanced to match known population parameters for region, gender or age-by-gender (for the 25-49 sub-group), educational attainment, and UK nativity. Population parameters were derived from the following sources:
 - Gender, age and region were based on 2021 Census data from the statistical office of the Office for National Statistics (ONS).
 - Education was based off the January-December 2021 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.

- b. A combined calibration weight was calculated across age-groups, using each sub-group's individual calibration weight. The combined weight was adjusted for age, in order for the overall distribution of age in the weighted sample to fall back into proportional alignment with the population's benchmark for age.
5. Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results, and normalized.

Tables 45 through 49, below, compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for the UK as a whole and per age-group.

TABLE 45: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the UK

	UK - Unweighted	UK - Weighted	UK - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male 18-24	5.1%	5.3%	5.3%
Male 25-34	9.0%	8.3%	8.3%
Male 35-49	11.1%	11.8%	11.9%
Male 50-64	11.2%	12.2%	12.1%
Male 65+	11.7%	10.8%	10.8%
Female 18-24	5.1%	5.2%	5.1%
Female 25-34	8.4%	8.8%	8.7%
Female 35-49	11.7%	12.4%	12.4%
Female 50-64	11.9%	12.6%	12.6%
Female 65+	14.8%	12.8%	12.8%
Education			
High School or Less	17.2%	23.9%	24.3%
Some Post-Secondary	21.8%	15.8%	15.6%
University Degree or more	34.5%	36.7%	36.6%
Adults 65 or older	26.5%	23.6%	23.6%
Region			
Northeast	5.3%	4.0%	4.0%
Yorks & Humber	6.4%	8.1%	8.2%

East Midlands	7.4%	7.4%	7.3%
East	6.6%	9.3%	9.4%
London	16.3%	13.1%	13.0%
South East	16.5%	13.8%	13.8%
South West	8.4%	8.7%	8.7%
West Midlands	8.5%	8.8%	8.8%
North West	10.1%	11.0%	11.0%
Wales	4.1%	4.7%	4.7%
Scotland	7.6%	8.3%	8.4%
Northern Ireland	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%
Nativity			
Born in the UK	76.2%	82.6%	82.8%
Born elsewhere	23.8%	17.4%	17.2%

TABLE 46: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for 18-24 year-olds in the UK

	UK 18-24 - Unweighted	UK 18-24 - Weighted	UK 18-24 - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male	49.7%	50.5%	50.6%
Female	50.3%	49.5%	49.4%
Education			
High School or Less	26.5%	39.4%	40.2%
Some Post-Secondary	39.5%	34.5%	34.1%
University Degree or more	34.0%	26.0%	25.7%
Region			
Northeast	4.4%	4.1%	4.0%
Yorks & Humber	7.6%	8.7%	8.6%
East Midlands	7.8%	7.7%	7.6%

East	4.7%	8.6%	8.5%
London	24.7%	14.2%	14.0%
South East	11.9%	12.8%	13.0%
South West	6.4%	8.5%	8.4%
West Midlands	9.9%	9.1%	9.1%
North West	11.9%	11.5%	11.3%
Wales	3.2%	4.5%	4.6%
Scotland	5.8%	7.4%	8.0%
Northern Ireland	1.7%	2.8%	2.8%
Nativity			
Born in the UK	68.9%	86.0%	86.2%
Born elsewhere	31.1%	14.0%	13.8%

TABLE 47: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for 25-49 year-olds in the UK

	UK 25-49 - Unweighted	UK 25-49 - Weighted	UK 25-49 - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male 25-34	22.4%	20.2%	20.1%
Male 35-49	27.6%	28.6%	28.8%
Female 25-34	20.9%	21.2%	21.1%
Female 35-49	29.1%	30.0%	30.1%
Education			
High School or Less	17.4%	24.5%	24.8%
Some Post-Secondary	26.6%	18.4%	18.2%
University Degree or more	56.0%	57.1%	57.1%
Region			
Northeast	4.7%	3.6%	3.7%
Yorks & Humber	6.1%	7.9%	7.9%

East Midlands	8.1%	7.1%	7.0%
East	6.2%	9.1%	9.3%
London	20.6%	16.3%	16.3%
South East	15.9%	13.6%	13.5%
South West	6.7%	7.7%	7.8%
West Midlands	8.0%	8.6%	8.6%
North West	10.1%	10.9%	10.8%
Wales	3.4%	4.2%	4.2%
Scotland	7.0%	8.1%	8.1%
Northern Ireland	3.2%	2.8%	2.8%
Nativity			
Born in the UK	64.6%	74.9%	75.2%
Born elsewhere	35.4%	25.1%	24.8%

TABLE 48: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for 50-64 year-olds in the UK

	UK 50-64 - Unweighted	UK 50-64 - Weighted	UK 50-64 - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male	48.4%	49.2%	49.1%
Female	51.6%	50.8%	50.9%
Education			
High School or Less	32.4%	39.3%	39.8%
Some Post-Secondary	30.8%	18.5%	18.3%
University Degree or more	36.8%	42.2%	41.9%
Region			
Northeast	5.0%	4.2%	4.2%
Yorks & Humber	7.1%	8.2%	8.2%
East Midlands	6.3%	7.5%	7.5%

East	7.6%	9.4%	9.5%
London	13.6%	11.5%	11.4%
South East	16.3%	13.9%	14.0%
South West	10.3%	9.0%	8.9%
West Midlands	8.6%	8.8%	8.7%
North West	9.8%	11.0%	11.2%
Wales	4.4%	5.0%	4.9%
Scotland	8.9%	8.8%	8.7%
Northern Ireland	2.1%	2.8%	2.8%
Nativity			
Born in the UK	83.8%	86.3%	86.4%
Born elsewhere	16.2%	13.7%	13.6%

TABLE 49: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for 65+ year-olds in the UK

	UK 65+ - Unweighted	UK 65+ - Weighted	UK 65+ - Adults
Gender By Age			
Male	44.1%	45.8%	45.8%
Female	55.9%	54.2%	54.2%
Region			
Northeast	7.0%	4.4%	4.3%
Yorks & Humber	5.8%	8.4%	8.4%
East Midlands	7.1%	7.5%	7.6%
East	7.1%	9.9%	10.0%
London	8.8%	8.4%	8.4%
South East	19.1%	14.6%	14.5%
South West	10.0%	10.2%	10.2%
West Midlands	8.7%	9.0%	9.0%
North West	9.9%	11.1%	11.1%

Wales	5.2%	5.3%	5.3%
Scotland	8.1%	8.6%	8.6%
Northern Ireland	3.3%	2.6%	2.6%
Nativity			
Born in the UK	90.0%	90.7%	90.8%
Born elsewhere	10.0%	9.3%	9.2%

The United States

Base Weights

The first step in the weighting of US data was to apply base weights to account for sampling probabilities. Base weights were computed separately for each of the three sample sources. After the base weighting, the sample was calibrated to match target population benchmarks.

ABS

Sample was drawn disproportionately across strata, oversampling records within each region that target low-income, Hispanic, and African-American households as well as oversampling the two modeled strata. The base weight for each piece of sample drawn from the stratum i is $d_{0,ABSi} = P_i/p_i$ where P_i is the proportion of the sample frame in stratum i and p_i is the proportion of sample released in stratum i .

SSRS Opinion Panel

The SSRS Opinion Panel sample was drawn to target specific groups that are typically under-represented in ABS samples. The base weight for the panel sample is $d_{0,PPi} = WTPPi \times P_i/p_i$ where $WTPPi$ is the panel base weight without the non-internet adjustment, P_i is the proportion of the entire panel in stratum i and p_i is the proportion of completed interviews in stratum i .

Prepaid Cell Sample

A simple random sample of prepaid cell phone numbers was drawn. All prepaid cell sample was assigned a base weight of 1.

Composite Adjustments

The next step in the weighting was to combine the samples using a compositing factor that corrects for the overlapping sample frames.

Compositing of Address-based and Prob Panel Samples

The ABS completes and probability panel completes were combined using a composite adjustment. This adjustment was made within each of the targeted strata listed in Table 3. The composite adjustment can be expressed as $\lambda_{i|ABS,PP} = P_{i|ABS}/P_{i|ABSUPP}$, where $P_{i|ABS}$ is the

proportion of ABS interviews in stratum i and $P_{i|ABS \cup PP}$ is the proportion of interviews from the combined ABS and probability panel sample in stratum i .

Compositing of Address-based and Prepaid Cell Samples

A second composite adjustment was applied to combine the ABS completes and prepaid cell sample completes.

The composite adjustment applied to cases with a prepaid cell phone is the proportion of ABS respondents with a prepaid cell (PPD_{ABS}) divided by the proportion of respondents from the address-based sample and the prepaid cell oversample with a prepaid cell (PPD_{ABS+OS}). The composite adjustment for cases without a prepaid cell is the proportion of ABS respondents without a prepaid cell phone ($1 - PPD_{ABS}$) divided by the proportion of respondents from the address-based sample and the prepaid cell oversample without a cell phone ($1 - PPD_{ABS+OS}$).

$$\lambda_{ABS,PPD} = \begin{cases} PPD_{ABS}/PPD_{ABS+OS}, & \text{respondents in HH with PPD cell} \\ (1 - PPD_{ABS})/(1 - PPD_{ABS+OS}), & \text{respondents in HH with no PPD cell} \end{cases}$$

Number of Adults Adjustment

Since this survey involves a random selection of one respondent after contact with a household in the address-based sample, the base weights include a within-household probability of selection adjustment.

Since we are sampling only one adult in each household, respondents' probability of selection is a function of the number of eligible household members (i.e., adults). If the number of survey eligible members in household i is denoted by EL_i , then the probability that any eligible person is targeted is $1/EL_i$ and the probability of selection adjustment, a_{1i} , would be $a_{1i} = (1/EL_i)^{-1} = EL_i$. EL_i was capped at three for this adjustment.

The cell sample respondents and the Probability Panel respondents were all assigned a probability of selection adjustment of 1.0.

Final Base Weight

The final base weight is the product of the initial base weight, the two composite adjustments and the number of adults adjustment.

$$d0_{FINAL} = d0 \times \lambda_{ABS,PP} \times \lambda_{ABS,PPD} \times a_1$$

The final base weight was trimmed at the 2nd and 97th percentiles and standardized overall to sum to the number of interviews.

Calibration

After applying the final base weight, the sample of completed interviews was calibrated to target population benchmarks. Benchmark distributions for race, age, education, sex and region were derived from the 2021 American Community Survey (ACS) Public Use Microdata (PUMS), the internet use distribution was derived from the Pew Research Center's National Public Opinion

Reference Survey (NPORS)²⁰, and the population density distribution was based on ACS 5-year estimates at the county level²¹.

Table 50, below, compares the distributions of weighted and unweighted data and the population parameters for the US.

TABLE 50: Weighted and Unweighted Distributions and Population Parameters for the US

	US - Unweighted	US - Weighted	US - Adults
Race by Age			
White/Other race, 18-34	15.2%	18.4%	18.3%
White/Other race, 35-54	22.2%	23.1%	22.8%
White/Other race, 55+	29.0%	30.6%	30.6%
Black, 18-34	4.6%	3.5%	3.6%
Black, 35-54	6.1%	3.9%	3.9%
Black, 55+	4.2%	3.7%	3.8%
Hispanic, 18-34	7.6%	6.3%	6.4%
Hispanic, 35-54	7.0%	6.5%	6.5%
Hispanic, 55+	4.0%	4.1%	4.1%
Race by Education			
White/Other race, HS or less	14.3%	23.2%	23.3%
White/Other race, Some college	21.0%	20.8%	21.0%
White/Other race, College+	31.1%	28.1%	27.5%
Black, HS or less	0.6%	1.1%	1.3%
Black, Some college	9.5%	7.1%	7.3%
Black, College+	4.8%	2.8%	2.7%
Hispanic, HS or less	2.3%	3.9%	4.3%
Hispanic, Some college	11.2%	9.8%	9.6%
Hispanic, College+	5.2%	3.2%	3.1%

²⁰ <https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/fact-sheet/national-public-opinion-reference-survey-npors/> - May 23 to Sept 6, 2022.

²¹ <https://www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/acs-5year.html>

Race by Gender			
White/Other race, Male	30.1%	35.0%	35.0%
White/Other race, Female	36.4%	37.2%	36.7%
Black, Male	5.3%	4.7%	5.1%
Black, Female	9.6%	6.3%	6.1%
Hispanic, Male	8.0%	8.2%	8.5%
Hispanic, Female	10.7%	8.6%	8.5%
Race by Region			
White/Other race, Northeast	10.8%	13.4%	13.3%
White/Other race, Midwest	15.4%	17.2%	17.2%
White/Other race, South	23.3%	25.3%	25.0%
White/Other race, West	16.9%	16.2%	16.2%
Black, Northeast	2.4%	1.7%	1.7%
Black, Midwest	3.2%	2.0%	1.9%
Black, South	7.8%	6.2%	6.6%
Black, West	1.5%	1.1%	1.0%
Hispanic, Northeast	2.7%	2.4%	2.4%
Hispanic, Midwest	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
Hispanic, South	7.5%	6.4%	6.5%
Hispanic, West	6.9%	6.5%	6.6%
Gender By Age			
Male, 18-24	2.6%	5.0%	5.5%
Male, 25-34	8.3%	8.8%	8.8%
Male, 35-44	8.0%	8.5%	8.5%
Male, 45-54	6.8%	7.9%	7.9%
Male, 55-64	7.0%	7.9%	8.2%
Male, 65+	10.6%	9.8%	9.8%
Female, 18-24	4.4%	5.4%	5.3%
Female, 25-34	12.2%	9.0%	8.8%
Female, 35-44	11.5%	8.8%	8.6%

Female, 45-54	9.0%	8.2%	8.1%
Female, 55-64	7.9%	8.8%	8.7%
Female, 65+	11.7%	11.8%	11.9%
Gender By Education			
Male, HS or less	11.4%	18.5%	19.4%
Male, Some college	13.1%	13.5%	13.7%
Male, College+	18.8%	15.9%	15.6%
Female, HS or less	15.2%	18.2%	18.2%
Female, Some college	19.2%	15.8%	15.5%
Female, College+	22.3%	18.1%	17.7%
Age By Education			
18-34, HS or less	8.8%	10.4%	10.6%
18-34, Some college	7.8%	9.0%	9.2%
18-34, College+	10.9%	8.8%	8.5%
35-54, HS or less	8.5%	11.1%	11.1%
35-54, Some college	11.1%	9.3%	9.2%
35-54, College+	15.6%	13.1%	12.9%
55+, HS or less	9.3%	15.2%	15.8%
55+, Some college	13.4%	11.0%	10.9%
55+, College+	14.6%	12.2%	11.9%
Race/Ethnicity			
White	56.5%	61.5%	61.1%
Black	14.9%	11.0%	11.3%
Hispanic, US-born	11.8%	9.4%	9.4%
Hispanic, Foreign-born	6.8%	7.4%	7.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.3%	6.0%	6.1%
Other/Mixed race	4.7%	4.6%	4.5%

Population Density			
Least densely populated US counties	19.3%	20.1%	20.0%
2	18.5%	19.5%	20.0%
3	20.6%	20.1%	20.0%
4	19.9%	20.0%	20.0%
Most densely populated US counties	21.7%	20.3%	20.0%
Internet Use			
Several times a day or more	87.7%	86.1%	86.0%
Less often	12.3%	13.9%	14.0%

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 51: Post-Stratification Parameters per country

	N-size	Design Effect	Margin of Error
Australia	751	1.50	4.4
Canada ²²	4,339	2.41	2.3
Newfoundland & Labrador	251	2.30	9.4
Prince Edward Island	250	2.07	8.9
Nova Scotia	261	1.91	8.4
New Brunswick	250	2.10	9.0
Quebec	1,001	1.76	4.1
Ontario	1,300	1.78	3.6

²² The design effect and margin of error reported for Canada, overall, is based on the all-country weight which includes the main sample for Canada ("Weight"). The design effects and margins of error for the individual provinces/territories within Canada are based on the population-scaled province weight ("CAN_POPWEIGHT").

Manitoba	251	1.94	8.6
Saskatchewan	251	1.86	8.4
Alberta	259	1.72	8.0
British Columbia	251	1.54	7.7
The Yukon	251	2.32	9.4
The Northwest Territories	143	2.00	11.6
Nunavut	101	1.81	13.1
France	751	1.51	4.4
Germany	2,005	1.89	3.0
The Netherlands	751	1.26	4.0
New Zealand	750	1.87	4.9
Sweden	2,266	1.34	2.4
Switzerland	2,292	1.51	2.5
The UK	3,361	1.29	1.9
Adults 18-24	344	1.58	6.6
Adults 25-49	1,351	1.26	3.0
Adults 50-64	777	1.25	3.9
Adults 65+	889	1.22	3.6
US	3,594	1.65	2.1

Deliverables

Preliminary

In May 2023, SSRS delivered a preliminary weighted dataset in both SPSS and Stata along with the all country banner in both Word and Excel and a memo reviewing the preliminary weighted data to The Commonwealth Fund. In June 2023, SSRS delivered an updated preliminary weighted dataset in SPSS and Stata containing the created variables to the Fund.

Final

SSRS delivered the following to the Commonwealth Fund and sponsoring organizations: (1) final weighted dataset^{23,24}, (2) final weighted all-country and country-specific banners in Microsoft Word and Excel format, (3) a trending banner that included results from 2013, 2016, 2020, and 2023 among questions that could be tracked in Word, (4) final weighting procedures memo, (5) a memo on the final survey data and trends, (6) final versions of the questionnaires in English as well as the translated versions, (7) final created variable and banner specification memos, and (8) final methodology report.

In addition, SSRS provided the Fund with a questionnaire crosswalk to compare the questions asked year over year.

²³ This was provided in SPSS and/or the preferred file format of the partner.

²⁴ After the initial final dataset was delivered, an error in the main Canada weights was discovered. SSRS reweighted the Canada data, and then delivered an updated dataset, as well as updated deliverables that were impacted by the Canada weights, to the Fund and all other sponsoring organizations.