<div align="center">

Won't You Be My Neighbor?
Norms of Cooperation, Public Broadcasting and the Collective Action Problem

Appendix B: Methodological Report

</div>

     Kansas State University's Institute for Social and Behavioral Research (ISBR) administered this telephone survey created by Martha Kropf in June and July 1997. The sample disposition is indicated below. The disposition of the membership list samples (the "givers") and the random digit dial sample (the "non-givers") are reported separately, since the samples are independently derived.

Table A1: Disposition of Non-Givers Random Digit Dial Sample ("Non-Givers")

Disposition	Washington, DC	Chicago, IL	Phoenix, AZ
Non-Sample Number (number not in service/business/fax)	197	295	336
Households Never Screened (Results of Final Call) No Answer/ Busy/Answering Machine	157	194	176
Refusals	89	141	162
Person not a PBS Viewer	2	8	8
Eligible Households Completed Interviews	100	93	98
Partial Interviews	1	1	2
Total Telephone Numbers	546	732	782

     The response rate in Washington, DC may have ranged from 36.1%-50%.[1] In Chicago, the response rate may have ranged from 28.27%-50.48%.[2] In Phoenix, the response rate may have ranged from 26.85-47.95%.[3] A response rate range is given because there is no way to determine whether the households never screened had a PBS viewer. Further, if the respondent or informant (the person who answered the phone) refused to answer the survey, he/she never

answered the screening question for PBS viewership. According to Roper, about 56% of the adult population viewed PBS during the week before the Roper omnibus survey—if the designated respondent[4] in every household viewed PBS, then the response may have been at the lower bound. If only 56% of the households had a PBS viewer, the response rate may be at the upper bound. Total viewing households for the upper bound of the response rate are computed by taking a percentage of all eligible households, including those interviewed for the study.[5] These response rates are not ideal, and neither is the distribution of the sample in terms of age and gender.[6] However, post-stratification weighting is a common adjustment made to compensate for non-response, and they are an accepted practice in most telephone surveys (Massey and Botman, 1988). Thus, to compensate for non-response bias, the RDD "non-givers" sample was weighted by age and gender. Those who are older are often less likely to respond to surveys (Massey and Botman, 1988), and women are more likely to cooperate with survey interviewers, making men underrepresented. Since the population considered in this survey is PBS viewers, Nielson ratings data from the May 1997 book were used to compute the weights. That information was provided by the PBS Research Director, John Fuller. While weighting by education and income may also have been desirable, obtaining these data from Nielson would have been prohibitively expensive, since the PBS Research Department obtained only the age and gender statistics. However, since the population is PBS viewers, one may expect that they be, for the most part, highly educated and with incomes above the national median income. In the analysis which follows, the non-givers sample, and not the givers sample, is weighted by age and gender, unless otherwise noted.

The disposition of the givers' sample is listed in Table A-2.

Table A2: The Disposition of the Non-Respondents Givers' Sample

Disposition	Washington, DC	Chicago, IL	Phoenix, AZ
Non-Sample Number (number not in service/business/fax)	4	2	3
No Answer/ Busy/Answering Machine (Results of Final Call)	18	22	27
Refusals	52	57	63
Eligible Respondent not a PBS Viewer	NA	NA	NA
Eligible Households Completed Interviews	26	24	20
Partial Interviews	0	0	0
Total Telephone Numbers	100	105	113

The response rate in Washington, DC is 34.45%, the response rate in Chicago is 37.84%, and the

response rate in Phoenix is 33.45%. A low response rate is a concern. However, since no

figures exist on the gender and age breakdown of givers in these three communities, weights

cannot be constructed in this case to correct for non-response. Thus, rather than weighting the

data to adjust for nonresponse, the respondents and non-respondents were compared. ISBR

administered a significantly shortened follow-up survey to those givers who initially refused to

answer, using the key questions representing the variables of most *theoretical importance*. This

allowed comparison of the respondents and non-respondents to see if there were any significant

differences between the two groups, in terms of the variables of interest in the theoretical model.

In particular, the two samples may differ on levels of trust (for example, refusing to trust a

strange interviewer calling) or social cooperation (not wanting to help out with academic

research). However, a series of difference of means and difference of proportions tests indicate

that this is **not** a problem for these samples. Respondents and non-respondents do not differ

significantly on the variables of theoretical interest. (This information is available from the author.)

Sources Cited

Keeter, Scott and Kevin Fisher. 1997-98. "Comparison of Two Respondent Selection

    Procedures." *National Network of State Polls Newsletter*. Number 31, Winter 1997-98,

    pages 1-3.

Massey, James T. and Steven L. Botman. 1988. "Weighting Adjustments for Random Digit

    Dialed Surveys." In Robert M. Groves, et al., eds. *Telephone Survey Methodology*. New

    York: John Wiley and Sons.

---

[1] A more conservative estimate by the CASRO (Council of American Survey Research

Organizations) formula is 31.95%-45.45%. In the CASRO formula, one multiplies the number

of unidentified households in the sample by the percentage of the sample that are identified

households (279/546). This is an estimate of how many of the "no answer" phone numbers are

households. The table shows that 70 phone numbers in Washington, DC were never screened for

household status because there was no answer at that number.

Thus: Lower Bound $RR_{CASRO}=100/[(70)(51.1\%)+100+89+1+87]=31.95\%$

Thus Upper Bound $RR_{CASRO}=100/[(313)(56\%)]=45.45\%$

[2] Again, a more conservative estimate using the CASRO formula yields a response rate ranging

from 24.8%-44.29%. The percentage of phone numbers identified as households =

337/732=46.04%.

Lower Bound $RR_{CASRO}= 93/[(100)(46.04\%)+93+141+1+94]= 24.8\%$

Upper Bound RR_{CASRO}=93/[(375)(56%)]=44.29%.

[3] The CASRO response rate for Phoenix ranges from 24.5-43.75%. This is based on 47.7% eligible households (373/782).

Lower Bound RR_{CASRO}=98/[(73)(47.70%)+98+162+2+103]=24.5%.

Upper Bound RR_{CASRO}=98/[(400)(56%)]=43.75%

[4] The respondent is selected according to the "Most Recent Birthday" method, a quasi-probability respondent selection procedure.

[5]Please note that the numbers completed in this chart, and the numbers indicated in the tables in the survey are not the same. This is the result of a computer error at the Institute for Social and Behavioral Research. Randomly, 140 observations were lost, and were unrecoverable.

[6] One potential problem with the "Most Recent Birthday" respondent selection method is that it tends to oversample women (Keeter and Fisher 1998). However, this method has the benefit of lower cost and potentially higher response rates than traditional probability selection procedures, such as the Kish method, which begins the survey with household enumeration (Kish 1965).