



## Healthy Chicago Survey 2015

### Methodology Summary

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Time Frame</b>  | October 13, 2015 – January 30, 2016   |
| <b>Population</b>  | <p>Non-institutionalized adults age 18+ living in the City of Chicago that meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Have phone service</li> <li>▪ Have phone numbers that are associated with common Chicago area codes (312, 773, 872) and exchanges</li> <li>▪ Can speak Spanish or English well enough to complete the survey</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Sampling</b>    | <p>Samples were drawn from both landline and cell phone random digit dialing frames (overlapping dual frame design):</p> <p><b>Landline Telephone Sample:</b> The landline telephone sample for the study was provided by Survey Sampling, Inc. (SSI) with the coverage area defined by exchanges assigned to census tracts that fall within the city limits of Chicago.</p> <p><b>Cellular Telephone Sample:</b> The cellular telephone sample was also provided by SSI. The cellular frame included telephone numbers from the selected rate centers in Chicago. In the 2014 Healthy Chicago Survey, the cellular frame included a stratum of telephone numbers from rate centers in Chicago plus a stratum of telephone numbers from rate centers outside of Chicago but in Cook County. The rate centers outside of Chicago were included to evaluate whether they were necessary to reach a cross-section of Chicago residents. Only small number of interviews [47 out of 1,145, 4.1% (unweighted), 8.7% (weighted)] were completed from this stratum, and these interviews did not make up the majority of interviews in any single Community Area. Therefore, for the 2015 Healthy Chicago Survey, we included rate centers within the City of Chicago only. A random sample of telephone numbers were randomly selected from all telephone numbers in the frame. All survey participants confirmed that they were City of Chicago residents during the interview; non-residents did not complete the survey.</p> |
| <b>Incentives</b>  | Participants who completed the survey by cell phone were offered a \$10 incentive check   |
| <b>Sample Size</b> | 2,406   |

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Screening for Eligibility</b> | Potential respondents were screened for eligibility criteria: age 18 years or older, residency in Chicago, and live in a private residence. Telephone numbers for individuals who lived outside of Chicago and those that were non-residential were terminated as not eligible. Residency in Chicago was determined by the respondent's ZIP code. For respondents who prefer not to provide their ZIP code, or for respondents whose ZIP code extends beyond Chicago, interviewers asked whether they live in Chicago.  |
| <b>Survey Language</b>           | Interviews were administered in English and Spanish. Only respondents who were able to answer the survey in one of these languages were able to continue  |
| <b>Language proportion</b>       | 92.5% English (2,226 out of 2,406)<br>7.5% Spanish (180 interviews out of 2,406)  |
| <b>Frame proportion</b>          | 50.5% landline (1,216 out of 2,406)<br>49.5% cell phone (1,190 out of 2,406)  |
| <b>Weighting</b>                 | <p>Survey weights are collected to ensure that the sample is representative of Chicago's adult population aged 18+, per population estimates based on the 2014 American Community Survey (ACS). This is done in four steps, by calculating each of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Base weights:</b> Inverse of respondent's probably of being selected from the landline and cell frames</li> <li><b>2. Frame integrated weights:</b> Adjusts for higher probability of being selected if you have both a cell phone and landline</li> <li><b>3. Calibration weights:</b> To extrapolate to Chicago's adult population (based on 2014 ACS), raked weights were calculated based on gender, age, race, ethnicity, education, housing tenure, marital status, presence of children in the household, phone use, Public Use Microdata Area (PUMA). Missing data were imputed.</li> <li><b>4. Weight trimming:</b> The 2nd and the 98th percentile of the distribution of weights were then used as the hard limits on weights, and the raking procedure was repeated with trimming performed simultaneously with calibration (i.e., weights were trimmed to these hard levels, if necessary, within each cycle of raking)</li> </ol> <p>The final weighting variable incorporates each of the above weights and sums to 2,069,096</p> |
| <b>AAPOR Response Rates</b>      | <p>Response Rate 1 (RR1): 9.3%</p> <p>Response Rate 3 (RR3): 12.0%</p> <p>Cooperation Rate 1: 18.2%</p> <p>Cooperation Rate 3: 74.5%</p>  |