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The Consumer Expenditure Survey (CE) Program introduced the use of the Contact History Instrument (CHI) with the CE Interview Survey in April 2005 and for use with the CE Diary Survey in March 2006. The CHI is designed to capture information about the data collection efforts and the interviewer’s perceptions of interactions with the respondent when contact is made, regardless of whether an interview was conducted. Data from the CHI will be available for the first time with the 2009 CE Interview Survey public use microdata files. This article provides a brief overview of the CHI and a few illustrations of the insights that CHI data can provide about data collection efforts.

Background of the CHI

In 2002, the Census Bureau and the Interagency Household Survey Nonresponse Group sponsored a Response Rate Summit conference. The purpose of the summit was to provide a forum for discussion among experts in the field about how to address concerns related to the decreasing response rate trend in household surveys. One of the recommendations that came out of the summit was that surveys should collect contact history information. This would provide data for two primary purposes: 1) to provide feedback to field staff about patterns that indicate what leads to successful or unsuccessful contact attempts, and 2) to provide data for a close examination of reasons for refusals, successful contact strategies, and differences between types of nonrespondents (refusals v. noncontact).

The CHI was developed by the U.S. Census Bureau. It was designed to be a single instrument for use in all surveys that contract with the Bureau for data collection. The first version of the CHI was fielded for the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) in January 2004, and the NHIS CHI data were made available for public use with the release of the 2006 NHIS public use files. In addition to the NHIS and the CE, the Current Population Survey adopted the CHI in August 2009.

Description of the CHI

The CHI is a software application separate from the survey data collection instrument. The interviewer can access CHI via the survey’s case management system.


system, or can launch CHI whenever the survey instrument is closed. The interviewer is instructed to record in the CHI every attempt made to contact the sample unit, and to do so as close as possible to the time the contact attempt was made.

The CHI prompts the interviewer for the following information about each contact attempt: the date and time of the attempt, the mode of the attempt (by personal visit or by phone), strategies the interviewer may have used to attempt to reach the respondent, and whether contact was made with the sample unit at that attempt. If the interviewer is unable to speak to someone at the sample unit, he or she can record reasons for noncontact. Alternatively, if the interviewer makes contact with the sample unit, the interviewer records whether or not an interview was conducted, and if so, whether it was partial or complete. If an interview could not be conducted, the interviewer records one or more reasons. In addition, regardless of whether there was an interview, the interviewer can record observations about the contacted sample unit member’s behavior and/or concerns regarding survey participation. Exhibit 1 shows an overview of the flow of questions through the CHI.

Effort expended to resolve a case. The number of contact attempts made to resolve a case with a final disposition is an indicator of the amount of effort interviewers exert to close out a case. A "final disposition" means that the interviewer closed out the case by classifying it as a completed interview, a noninterview, or ineligible (because the sample unit did not belong to the target population for the survey). The level of effort varies, but tends to be associated with the final disposition of the case. Completed interview cases are usually associated with relatively more cooperative respondents, and, thus, generally require fewer contact attempts to resolve the case. This fact is reflected in the CHI data. About 70 percent of the 12,106 sample units in the 2009 sample (for which there were CHI data) had been resolved as completed interviews by the fourth contact attempt, as illustrated in chart 1. Ineligible cases were also resolved fairly quickly—about 90 percent of these cases were classified as such by the fourth contact attempt. In contrast, relatively more effort was expended to resolve cases as noninterview—less than half of these cases were resolved by the fourth contact attempt, an indication that interviewers have to try harder to reach residents of these sample units, or that more attempts are needed before giving up on securing an interview. The CHI data also show that a lot of effort is expended to resolve the last 1 or 2 percent of cases still in the field. (It takes 15 or more contact attempts to resolve these cases.)

“Good” day-and-time combinations for first attempt to contact sample unit. Since costs are associated with each contact attempt, especially attempts made by personal visit, it would be cost effective if interviewers attempted to contact sample units at times when successful contacts and interviews are most likely to occur. The CHI data indicate that of the 12,106 first attempts made to contact sample units, 38.4 percent were made between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. on Mondays through Thursdays, and 30.9 percent of those attempts resulted in contact with a sample unit member. (See chart 2.) However, it appears that evenings (4 p.m. to 9 p.m.) and weekends have slightly higher successful contact rates at first attempt. Therefore, interviewers may want to consider making a larger proportion of first attempts to contact sample units in the evenings and on weekends.

Contact strategies attempted prior to first contact with sample unit. Among the 9,465 first contacts made with sample unit members, 86.3 percent were made by personal visit. An average of 2.2 attempts was made to obtain a first contact by personal visit and 3.5 attempts to obtain a first contact by phone. An average of 1 strategy was used when a first contact with a sample unit member was made by personal visit (1.1 strategies), as well as by phone (1.2 strategies). The most frequently reported contact strategies used prior to first contact by both personal visit and phone were similar: “left appointment card or note with the sample unit,” “checked with neighbor,” and “advance letter given.” (See chart 3.)

Reasons for incomplete interview or noninterview at first contact with sample unit. The primary reasons cited for an incomplete interview or noninterview at first contact with a sample unit are similar, regardless of whether first contacts were made by personal visit or by phone. The most frequently reported reason—more than a third of

Illustrations of information describing data collection effort from CHI
In addition to interviewers’ notes recorded about a case, the CHI data constitute another source of information about interviewer-respondent interactions. The CHI data also provide insights to the overall data collection effort, and allow for the possibility of uncovering factors or behavior that promote or inhibit successful data collection. We offer a few illustrations of these insights, using CHI data from the CE Interview Survey for Interview 1 cases fielded in 2009. CHI information at Interview 1 is of methodological interest, because it provides a systematic description of interviewer effort, likelihood of contact, and the nature of interactions with sample unit members who are approached for the first time in the survey.

The reporting of contact attempt strategies (exhibit 2), reasons for noncontact by mode of attempt (exhibit 3 for personal visit, exhibit 4 for phone), reasons for why an interview could not be conducted at a specific contact (exhibit 5), and the interviewer’s observations about respondent behavior and concerns (exhibit 6) are made from “check all that apply” lists of options that accompany each of these questions. Exhibits 2 through 6 are screen shots from the CHI that show the response options for these characteristics of contact attempts.
the time—was “inconvenient time” for the sample unit. (See chart 4.) The next most frequently cited reason was reluctance on the part of the respondent.

Respondent concerns, attitude, and/or behavior at first contact with sample unit and final disposition. Interviewer observations about the contacted sample unit member, regardless of whether an interview was conducted, appear to be associated with final disposition of a case. For example, nearly two-thirds of cases where interviewers reported that respondents were concerned about time (“too busy”, “interview too time consuming”) or privacy had a final disposition of “completed interviews.” (See chart 5.) In contrast, fewer than a third of cases where interviewers reported the contacted sample unit member exhibited hostility (“hang up/slam door”, “hostile behavior”) had a final disposition of “completed interviews.” This is consistent with research studies supporting the usefulness of these interviewer-respondent interactions recorded in the CHI for predicting survey nonresponse.

Recent survey methodological studies on the Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey have drawn on CHI data in their analyses. For example, in a study that attempted to quantify the magnitude of relative nonresponse bias for key survey measures in the CE Interview Survey, respondents were classified as harder-to-contact when more than 45 percent of their contact attempts resulted in noncontact and were treated as proxies for nonrespondents. In a study of the effect of incentives, indicators of respondent cooperation and estimates of field collection costs in the study were based on contact attempt information from the CHI. In an exploratory study that examined trade-offs between fundamental survey performance measures for establishing the “optimal number” of contact attempts, CHI information were utilized to form comparison groups for analysis, and were inputs to the construction of a summary index for reporting quality. In another exploratory study, interviewer reported observations about respondent behavior and concerns about survey participation in the CHI were found to strongly differentiate between the risk of first occurrence of nonresponse between groups of respondents with different types of concerns.

Limitations of the CHI
A weakness of the CHI data is that it is based on each interviewer’s self reports. There is no mechanism to ensure that the interviewer enters every contact attempt for a case in the CHI, or that any contact attempt will be recorded for a case. For example, out of the 12,304 Interview 1 sample addresses fielded in 2009 for the CE Interview Survey, 1.6 percent (198 cases) did not have any CHI records. Of these cases without CHI, 58.1 percent were resolved as ineligible, 28.3 percent as completed interviews, 5.6 percent as noninterview because

...
Are you making a contact attempt or just looking at a case?
1. Contact attempt
2. Looking at a case. Exit

Enter date (mm/dd/yy) and time (hh:mm a.m./p.m.) of contact attempt

Are you entering the CHI at the time of a contact attempt?
1. Yes
2. No

Was this a personal visit or telephone contact attempt?
1. Visit
2. Phone

1 or 2

Outcome of contact attempt
1. Contact with sample unit member
2. Contact with nonsample unit member
3. Noncontact

Outcome of contact
1. Case final disposition assigned, ready to transmit
2. Partial interview
3. Unable to conduct interview

1

Reasons for partial interview, or unable to conduct interview. Enter all that apply:
1-8 for CE Diary Survey
1-7 for CE Interview Survey

Respondent concern/behavior/reluctance
Select categories that describe respondent concerns, behavior, or reluctance during this contact attempt. Enter all that apply 1-23.

Noncontact (personal visit attempt). Select reasons.
Enter all that apply 1-14.

Noncontact (phone attempt). Select reasons.
Enter all that apply 1-7.

Attempt made by personal visit

Attempt made by phone

Contact strategies attempted.
Select the categories that describe the strategies used on this contact attempt.
Enter all that apply 1-23.

Exit CHI
Exhibit 2. CHI: response options for contact attempt strategies attempted

- CONTACT STRATEGIES ATTEMPTED
  - Select the categories that describe the strategies used on this contact attempt.
  - Enter all that apply, separate with commas.

  1. Advance letter given
  2. Scheduled appointment
  3. Left note/appointment card
  4. Left promotional packet/informational brochure
  5. Called household
  6. Left message on answering machine
  7. PC will request No One-Home Letter
  8. FR will request Refusal Letter
  9. FR will request Letter Understanding Letter
  10. Called contact persons
  11. Staffed out
  12. Checked with neighbors
  13. Contacted other family members
  14. Contacted property manager
  15. Visited county assessor / post office / permit office
  16. On-line tracking database
  17. Sought help from SFR / RO
  18. Follow-up
  19. Offered incentive
  20. CED double placement
  21. Used MAF or ALMI
  22. None
  23. Other - specify

Exhibit 3. CHI: response options for contact attempt by personal visit resulting in noncontact

- NONCONTACT / PERSONAL VISIT
  - Select the categories that describe this personal visit noncontact.
  - Enter all that apply, separate with commas.

  1. No one home
  2. No one home – appointment broken
  3. No one home – previous note / letter taken
  4. Household does not answer door – evidence someone is home
  5. District
  6. Multiple drive-bys – specify
  7. Unable to reach locked gate / buzzer entry
  8. Address does not exist/unable to locate
  9. Occupancy, away from home / at second home
  10. Spoke with neighbor
  11. Building management / doorman contact
  12. Completed case (Type B or C)
  13. Sample respondent moved - specify
  14. Other - specify

Exhibit 4. CHI: response options for contact attempt by phone resulting in noncontact

- NONCONTACT / TELEPHONE
  - Select the categories that describe this telephone noncontact.
  - Enter all that apply, separate with commas.

  1. Got answering machine / service
  2. No answer
  3. Busy Signal
  4. Disconnected
  5. Wrong number
  6. FAQ number
  7. Other - specify

Note: Both CE Interview Survey and CE Diary use the same Contact History Instrument. Option 7 is valid only for the CE Diary.
Exhibit 5. CHI: response options for unable to conduct or complete interview when contact is made with sample unit

Exhibit 6. CHI: response options for respondent behavior or concerns perceived by the interviewer when contact is made with the sample unit

Note: Both CE Interview Survey and CE Diary use the same Contact History Instrument. Option 7 is valid only for the CE Diary.
Chart 1. **Number of contact attempts to final case disposition**
2009 Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey, Interview 1

---

Chart 2. **Day and Time of 1st Attempts and 1st Contact with Sample Unit**
2009 Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey, Interview 1

---

NOTE: Day: 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.  Evening: 4:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.  Overnight: 9:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m.
Chart 3. **Most frequently reported contact attempt strategies used prior to first contact with sample unit member**

*2009 Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey, Interview 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>First contact by personal visit (N=8,167)</th>
<th>First contact by phone (N=1,298)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left note/appointment card</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checked with neighbor</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance letter given</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left promotional information</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left message on answering machine</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested “No One Home” letter</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconvenient time</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant respondent</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible person unavailable</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke with someone</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language problem</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problem</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 4. **Reasons for incomplete interview or noninterview at first contact**

*2009 Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey, Interview 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>First contact by personal visit (N=4,574)</th>
<th>First contact by phone (N=794)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconvenient time</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant respondent</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible person unavailable</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke with someone</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language problem</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problem</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 5. Selected respondent concerns reported at first contact and completed interviews
2009 Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey, Interview 1

Percent reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Percent reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too busy</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too time consuming</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-government</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang up/slam door</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile behavior</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>