2005 NATIONAL SURVEY ON DRUG USE AND HEALTH

RELIABILITY STUDY PRETEST ANALYSIS

Prepared for the 2005 Methodological Resource Book

Contract No. 283-2004-00022
RTI Project No. 0209009.124

Authors:

Project Director: Thomas G. Virag

Susan Hunter
Moshe Feder
Becky Granger
Lanny Piper
Jim Chromy

Prepared for:

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
Rockville, Maryland 20857

Prepared by:

RTI International
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709

March 2006

2005 NATIONAL SURVEY ON DRUG USE AND HEALTH

RELIABILITY STUDY PRETEST ANALYSIS

Prepared for the 2005 Methodological Resource Book

Contract No. 283-2004-00022
RTI Project No. 0209009.124

Authors:

Project Director: Thomas G. Virag

Susan Hunter
Moshe Feder
Becky Granger
Lanny Piper
Jim Chromy

Prepared for:

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
Rockville, Maryland 20857

Prepared by:

RTI International
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709

March 2006

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (continued)

List of Tables

1. Introduction

To assess the reliability of the data in the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), a Reliability Study employing an interview/reinterview methodology will be conducted in 2006 by RTI International[1] for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), Office of Applied Studies (OAS). In January through May 2005, RTI conducted a pretest of the Reliability Study. This report presents the analysis of the combined first and second phases of the pretest data.

There were two main objectives for the analysis of the pretest data: (1) to identify any unforeseen problems in the general field procedures of the reliability testing, and (2) to prepare for the analysis of the data from the full Reliability Study. In the analysis of the pretest data, we obtained initial information on the range of the reliability measures, the overall response rates, and the response rates in subgroups of interest (e.g., by gender, age groups, by race/ethnicity, and by State). We determined that there were no significant unanticipated problems with our approach.

For brevity, we refer to the first interview as T1 and to the second (reinterview) as T2.

1.1   Data Used

The main data source for this report is the computer-assisted interviewing (CAI) pretest responses from Quarters 1 and 2 of 2005, including the field interviewer (FI) debriefing questions and the respondent follow-up questions at T2. Three additional data sources were the status code data on the iPAQ, the refusal report data on the iPAQ, and the verification data.

In the normal NSDUH process, extensive editing and imputation procedures are applied to the raw data in order to correct errors and account for missing data. For the purpose of the pretest, especially the identification of unforeseen problems, the analysis of raw data can be more useful than the analysis of data that have undergone editing and imputation, which may blur differences between T1 and T2 data. Furthermore, the small donor set does not allow appropriate imputation. However, strictly raw data needed to be lightly edited or recoded to make them suitable for analysis (such as assignment of numerical codes to certain classes of responses). All data in this report are unweighted and are not heavily edited or imputed, but they may be lightly edited or recoded.

1.2   Variables

To preserve the differences in data between the T1 and T2 interviews, recodes of the raw data were kept to a minimum. However, several useful recodes were necessary for the drug use, demographic, and timing variables. All drug use variables and some demographic variables were recoded using raw recodes from 6-month data processing for 2004. Variables for which raw 6-month recodes did not exist in 2004 were, in general, used directly from the questionnaire.

---

[1] RTI International is a trade name of Research Triangle Institute.

1.2.1   Substance Use Variables

The analysis focuses on lifetime use, past year use, and age of first use of the following key substances:

1. cigarettes,
2. alcohol,
3. marijuana,
4. cocaine, and
5. illicit drugs.

The 6-month recodes for lifetime use and past year use are coded as dichotomous (0,1) variables where a "yes" is considered a 1 and all other responses are coded as 0. Thus, a 0 for a past year measure is imputed when there is a 0 for the lifetime measure. Past month measures are not included in the report because the timing difference between the T1 and T2 interviews can significantly change the reference period for past month measures.

Four of the age of first use variables were taken directly from the respondent input values in the questionnaire: (1) age of first use of cigarettes from the CAI variable age1stcg, (2) age of first use of alcohol from the CAI variable age1stal, (3) age of first use of marijuana from the CAI variable age1stmj, and (4) age of first use of cocaine from the CAI variable age1stcoc. The age of first use variable for illicit drugs was calculated as the minimum value of all core CAI age of first use variables for illicit drugs taken directly from the questionnaire, provided that the respondent reported having used at least one core illicit drug in his or her lifetime.

1.2.2   Demographic Variables

Demographic information, such as age, date of birth, gender, marital status, education (highest year of school completed), and employment, was taken directly from the CAI variables calcage, age1, QD01, QD07, QD11, and QD29, respectively. For income, the five-level raw recode of family income from the 6-month analysis for 2004 was used (recode of QI20, QI21A, QI21B, QI22, QI23A, and QI23B). All race/ethnicity variables were left in the original format from the questionnaire (QD03-QD05). For the purpose of calculating response rates by race, the demographic variable HBORace with three levels (Hispanic, non-Hispanic black, and other) was created from the screening data file and then merged onto the reliability pretest CAI data file.

1.2.3   Timing Variables

To assess whether the amount of time that the respondents needed to complete the CAI instrument and the audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (ACASI) was significantly shorter in T2 than in T1 due to learning effects, several timing variables were taken from the CAI data file. Also, data on the number of days between interviews were calculated from these variables.

1.3   Assumptions about the Design

Due to their limited scope, the analyses presented in this report treat the sample design as a simple random sample. Thus, conclusions from the results do not directly generalize to the population at large. The analyses of the full reliability study conducted in 2006 will account for the sample's complex design.

2. Response Rates

The assessment of response rates in the pretest will help adjust sample selection for the full 2006 Reliability Study. Table 1 shows the anticipated response rates for T1 and T2 by age group from the Reliability Study Pretest sample design, and Table 2 shows the actual T1 and T2 response rates by age group, gender, and race.

Table 1.   Anticipated Response Rates, by Age Group

Age	T1[1]	T2
12-17	0.89	0.92
18-25	0.85	0.88
26+	0.76	0.78
Overall	0.82	0.86

[1] T1 response rates are based on actual experience in the District of Columbia, Maryland, Texas, and Florida in the 2003 NSDUH.

Table 2.   Actual Unweighted Pretest Response Rates at T1 and T2, by Demographics

	T1[1]			T2		
	Total			**Total**		
Category	**Sel**	**Resp**	**Rate**	**Sel**	**Resp**	**Rate**
Age						
12-17	88	77	0.88	77	71	0.92
18-25	73	66	0.90	66	63	0.95
26+	125	88	0.70	88	78	0.89
Gender						
Male	153	125	0.82	125	114	0.91
Female	133	106	0.80	106	98	0.92
Race						
Hispanic	49	37	0.76	37	36	0.97
Non-Hispanic Black	55	47	0.85	47	45	0.96
Other	182	147	0.81	147	131	0.89
Total	**286**	**231**[2]	**0.81**	**231**	**212**	**0.92**

Resp = responded.

Sel = selected.

[1] Does not include Quarter 2 interviews that were designated as nonreliability cases.

[2] Does not include one respondent with a breakoff for T1 because the respondent could not be selected for T2.

2.1   T1 Response Rates

The anticipated T1 overall response rate from Table 1 is similar to the observed response rate in Table 2 (0.82 anticipated, 0.81 actual). This response rate is consistent with prior data even though the response rates for T1 could have been lower than previously expected for several reasons. First, the time frame for the follow-up was much smaller than in the main study. In the reliability pretest, field interviewers (FIs) had slightly less than 2 months to follow up,

while the main study allows 3 months. In addition, there were fewer FIs to send back to the dwelling units because only FIs who had been specially trained for the pretest could be sent. Although segments with a low Hispanic population were selected, the lack of a Spanish-language interview also reduced the response rate among Hispanics. Assuming a Spanish-language interview had been available and that all Spanish-language barrier cases would have completed a T1 interview, the T1 response rate for Hispanics would have risen from 0.76 to 0.84, but the overall response rate would only have been raised from 0.81 to 0.82. Thus, the observed T1 response rates are consistent with past data and are good considering the smaller time frame and lack of a Spanish-language questionnaire.

2.2   T2 Response Rates

We achieved an overall T2 response rate of 92 percent in this pretest, which was significantly higher than the expected T2 response rate of 86 percent. Table 2 shows that we obtained higher response rates than the expected 86 percent response rate in all the demographic categories. Because of this experience in the pretest, we adjusted the T2 response rate parameter for the 2006 Reliability Study, which will allow a smaller sample size to be selected to achieve the desired number of respondents for the T2 interview.

3. Measures of Agreement

Table 3 shows the possible outcomes when conducting two interviews for a dichotomous variable called "substance use." This simple case is typical of most of the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) measures to be addressed in the 2006 Reliability Study. Values in the table represent population proportions. For example, "A" represents the proportion of the population who do not report substance use in either the first or the second interviews, "B" represents the proportion of the population who do not report substance use in the first interview but report substance use in the second interview, "C" represents the proportion of persons in the population who report substance use in the first interview but do not report substance use in the second interview, and "D" represents the proportion of the population who report substance use in both the first and second interviews. Capital letters are used in Table 3 to distinguish them from the lowercase sample count tables often used in the literature when simple random sampling (with no weighting) is the assumed sample design.

Table 3.   Example Two by Two Contingency Table for Substance Use

	T2		
T1	**Nonuse**	**Use**	**Total**
Nonuse	A	B	A + B
Use	C	D	C + D
Total	A + C	B + D	A + B + C + D = 1

Measures of agreement calculated for the pretest key measures include Percent Agreement, Cohen's Kappa, and the Index of Inconsistency. First, Percent Agreement in its simplest form for a dichotomous variable such as substance use is defined as follows:

$$P_{Agree} = 100(A + D).$$

Before defining Cohen's Kappa, it is useful to define the estimate of percent chance agreement as

$$P_{Chance} = 100[(A + C)(A + B) + (B + D)(C + D)].$$

Then Kappa is defined as

$$\kappa = \frac{P_{Agree} - P_{Chance}}{100 - P_{Chance}}.$$

For continuous variables, Percent Agreement can be defined as the number of responses for a continuous variable that agree between T1 and T2, divided by the total number of responses. In addition to the Percent Agreement, the Index of Inconsistency is calculated for continuous variables. The Index of Inconsistency is defined by Pritzker and Hanson (1962) as the ratio of the response variance to the total variance. However, for continuous variables, the Index of Inconsistency can be written as follows:

$$I = \frac{\sigma_R^2}{\sigma_R^2 + \sigma_S^2},$$

where σ_R^2 is the response variance and σ_S^2 is the sampling variance, assuming that the variance of the variable at T1 is equal to the variance of the variable at T2 and that there is no correlation between the response errors at T1 and T2 for the same respondent (Cochran, 1977). It also is approximately the complement of the intracluster correlation coefficient when the cluster is defined in terms of repeated measurements on the same respondent. In addition, Reliability (R) is equal to 1 – Index of Inconsistency. Reliability will be reported with the Index of Inconsistency. The Index of Inconsistency is not reported with Kappa for dichotomous variables because for the data in this report the Index of Inconsistency is equal to 1 – Kappa.

3.1   Consistency of Categorical Measures

The Percent Agreement between responses at T1 and T2 has been calculated for categorical measures in Table 4. For common substance measures, such as lifetime use of cigarettes and lifetime use of alcohol, the Percent Agreement between T1 and T2 in Table 4 tends to be high (96.2 percent for lifetime cigarette use, 96.7 percent for lifetime alcohol use). Also, the least commonly used substance, cocaine, has the highest Percent Agreement for both lifetime and past year measures (98.1 percent for lifetime cocaine use, 99.1 percent for past year cocaine use). The lowest Percent Agreement occurs for past year alcohol use (92.0 percent), followed by past year cigarette use (94.3 percent) and lifetime illicit drug use (93.9 percent). However, overall, the Percent Agreement tends to be high, with all measures achieving a Percent Agreement higher than 90 percent.

For key categorical measures, Table 4 also shows substance use prevalence estimates at T1 and T2, a calculated value for Cohen's Kappa, and a 95 percent confidence interval for Kappa, as well as an indicator for a significant McNemar's test of homogeneity of the marginal distributions. Note that only one substance, lifetime cigarette use, has a *p* value below 0.05 for McNemar's test. A significant *p* value indicates that the marginal distributions of the two by two table are significantly different.

Table 4. Prevalence Rates, Percent Agreement, Kappa, and 95 Percent Confidence Bounds for Kappa for Key Measures ($n = 212$)

Variable	Prevalence Rate T1 #	T1 %	T2 #	T2 %	# Agree	% Agree	Kappa	95% Lower Bound for Kappa	95% Upper Bound for Kappa
Lifetime Use									
Cigarettes[1]	125	59.0	133	62.7	204	96.2	0.9209	0.8673	0.9745
Alcohol	161	75.9	160	75.5	205	96.7	0.9102	0.8449	0.9755
Marijuana	87	41.0	82	38.7	201	94.8	0.8918	0.8297	0.9540
Cocaine	27	12.7	27	12.7	208	98.1	0.9151	0.8329	0.9973
Illicit Drugs	103	48.6	96	45.3	199	93.9	0.8770	0.8124	0.9417
Past Year Use									
Cigarettes	57	26.9	63	29.7	200	94.3	0.8607	0.7844	0.9369
Alcohol	134	63.2	133	62.7	195	92.0	0.8281	0.7498	0.9064
Marijuana	38	17.9	35	16.5	205	96.7	0.8842	0.8002	0.9682
Cocaine	4	1.9	4	1.9	210	99.1	0.7452	0.4046	1.0000
Illicit Drugs	49	23.1	46	21.7	201	94.8	0.8508	0.7653	0.9363

[1] Indicates that McNemar's test was significant at the .05 level for this measure.

As with the Percent Agreement, the highest Kappa values occur with lifetime use of the most prevalent substances, lifetime cigarette use (0.9209) and lifetime alcohol use (0.9102), and the rarest substance, lifetime use of cocaine (0.9151). A high Percent Agreement tends to correspond with a high Kappa, with the exception of less prevalent measures, such as past year cocaine use. The low prevalence estimate and small sample size cause past year cocaine use to have a lower Kappa even though past year cocaine use had the highest Percent Agreement ($\kappa = 0.7452$, Percent Agreement = 99.1). Also note that the upper 95 percent confidence bound for the cocaine Kappa was 1. In Table 4, all reported Kappas other than cocaine use are greater than 0.8000, indicating a high level of agreement among these measures.

3.2 Consistency of Age of First Use Measures

Table 5 shows the Percent Agreement, Index of Inconsistency, and Reliability for the age of first use of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and illicit drugs. The Percent Agreement was calculated in two ways: (1) where responses must be identical to be considered in agreement, and (2) where the age of first use may vary by up to 1 year before the T1 and T2 responses are considered different. For example, in the second method, a T1 age of first use response of 18 is considered in agreement with a T2 age of first use of either 17 or 19. For both methods of calculating Percent Agreement, any records with missing values for T1 or T2 were not included.

Table 5. **Percent Agreement, Index of Inconsistency (I), and Reliability (R) for Age of First Use Measures (*n* = 212)**

Age of First Use	*n*	Identical Match				May Vary by 1 Year			
		# Agree	% Agree	I	R	# Agree	% Agree	I	R
Cigarettes	124	74	59.7	0.109	0.891	100	80.6	0.101	0.899
Alcohol	153	87	56.9	0.169	0.831	117	76.5	0.160	0.840
Marijuana	77	43	55.8	0.127	0.873	64	83.1	0.116	0.884
Cocaine	24	12	50.0	0.041	0.959	16	66.7	0.039	0.961
Illicit Drugs	90	44	48.9	0.157	0.843	68	75.6	0.152	0.848

As can be seen from Table 5, allowing a difference of 1 year on reported age of first use drastically increases the Percent Agreement by up to 25 percentage points. Because age of first use can be influenced by recollection error, allowing a 1-year difference in age of first use is a reasonable approach for calculating the Percent Agreement. Although the age of first use variables have an overall lower Percent Agreement than the dichotomous responses in Table 4, the Percent Agreement that allows a 1-year variation in responses is still high, with most values ranging between 70 and 80 percent.

Table 5 also shows the Index of Inconsistency and Reliability for the age of first use of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and illicit drugs. The Index of Inconsistency was calculated in the same two ways that the prevalence rate was calculated: (1) where the original data values and all differences between T1 and T2 were preserved, and (2) where if the values varied by only 1 year between T1 and T2, the T1 value overwrote the T2 value before the Index of Inconsistency was computed. Thus, the second way "allows" for a 1-year difference in T1 and T2. Although allowing the age of first use to vary by 1 year between T1 and T2 had a large impact on the Percent Agreement, this change had little to no effect on the Index of Inconsistency. Also, as with the Percent Agreement, any respondents with missing data for either T1 or T2 were eliminated from the analysis.

Overall, the Index of Inconsistency is quite good with all values lower than 0.20 and, consequently, all values of Reliability greater than 0.80. Although the Percent Agreement for cocaine that allows 1 year of variation was still much lower than the other similarly calculated Percent Agreement values (66.7 vs. all others at 75.6 or higher), in Table 5 cocaine achieves a Reliability of 0.961. This discrepancy can likely be explained by the smaller number of people who have an age of first use of cocaine than the number of people who have an age of first use of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, or illicit drugs.

3.3   Consistency of Demographic Data

To assess the consistency of demographic data, 29 demographic variables were compared at T1 and T2:

1. *Date of Birth:* Date of birth as entered by the respondent.

2. *Calculated Age:* Age calculated from date of birth.

3. *Gender:* Male or female.

4. *Marital Status:* Married, widowed, divorced or separated, or have never married.

5. *Education:* Highest grade or year of school completed (0 to 17).

6. *Employment Status:* Usually does/does not work 35 hours or more per week at all jobs.

7. *Five-Category Family Income Variable:* 1 = less than $20,000, 2 = $20,000-$49,999, 3 = $50,000-$74,999, 4 = $75,000-$99,999, 5 = $100,000 or more.

8. *Twenty-Two Race/Ethnicity Variables:* Eight variables for specifying Hispanic origin; seven variables for non-Hispanic origin, including white, black/African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Asian, and other; and seven variables for specifying type of Asian origin.

No "other/specify" variables were included in the comparison, although the selection of the "other" category is included.

Table 6 gives the frequency of differences for the first seven demographic variables at T1 and T2. Because marital and employment status questions are asked of respondents aged 15 or older, differences in marital and employment status responses were counted only if the respondent's calculated age was greater than or equal to 15 during both the T1 and T2 interviews. These demographic variables are consistent between the T1 and T2 interviews except for the family income variable, which is the only variable that requests information about someone other than the respondent. Of the 40 respondents who had a difference between T1 and T2 family income, 11 had differences because of a missing response in either T1 or T2. Of the 29 respondents with both T1 and T2 answers nonmissing, 13 (or 44.8 percent) were aged 12 to 17. Of the 16 respondents aged 18 or older who answered the income question at both T1 and T2, only 3 reported a T2 income different by more than one income bracket from their T1 response.

Table 6. Frequency of Differences at T1 and T2 among First Seven Demographic Variables ($n = 212$)

Variable	# Different	%
Date of Birth	2	0.9
Calculated Age	3	1.4
Gender	1	0.5
Marital Status	3	1.4
Education	16	7.5
Employment Status	15	7.1
Family Income	40	18.9

For the 22 race/ethnicity variables, only 7 respondents selected different race choices in T1 than in T2 (3.3 percent). Of these seven respondents, six reported Hispanic origin at both T1 and T2. Table 7 shows the differences in race/ethnicity responses for those who had different answers in T1 and T2. Overall, the race and other demographic variables tend to have a high level of consistency across T1 and T2.

Table 7.   T1 and T2 Responses to Race/Ethnicity Questions, by Respondents with Different T1 and T2 Responses

#	Hispanic Origin	T1 Hispanic Group	T2 Hispanic Group	T1 Race	T2 Race
1	No	N/A	N/A	White, American Indian/Alaska Native	American Indian/ Alaska Native
2	Yes	Cuban/Cuban American, Spanish (from Spain)	Spanish (from Spain)	White	White
3	Yes			Other, "Hispanic"	White
4	Yes	Mexican/ Mexican American/ Mexicano/Chicano	Mexican/ Mexican American/ Mexicano/Chicano	White	Other, "Mexican American"
5	Yes			Other Pacific Islander	White
6	Yes			American Indian/Alaska Native	Other, "Mexican"
7	Yes			White	Other, "Mexican"

4. Overall Consistency

As a measure of overall consistency, Table 8 shows the number of respondents with 0 to 6 variables different between T1 and T2 out of 44 variables compared. Of these 44 variables, 29 were the demographic variables listed in the previous chapter (date of birth, calculated age, gender, marital status, education, employment status, family income, and 22 race/ethnicity variables); 5 were the age of first use variables of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and illicit drugs; and 10 were substance use variables (lifetime and past year use of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and illicit drugs). Because marital and employment status questions are asked of respondents aged 15 or older, differences in marital and employment status responses were counted only if the respondent's calculated age was greater than or equal to 15 during both the T1 and T2 interviews. For the substance use variables, a difference in past year use was counted as a difference only if the lifetime use measure was the same in T1 and T2. For the age of first use variables, only respondents with both T1 and T2 nonmissing could be considered for a difference, and among those respondents, only an age of first use difference of 2 or more years between T1 and T2 was considered a difference. Given these conditions, none of the 212 T1 and T2 respondents had more than five variables different.

Table 8.   Frequency of Respondents with 0 to 6+ Variables Different Out of 44 Variables Compared

# Variables Different	Frequency of Respondents	% Respondents	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative %
0	76	35.9	76	35.9
1	58	27.4	134	63.2
2	37	17.5	171	80.7
3	26	12.3	197	92.9
4	14	6.6	211	99.5
5	1	0.5	212	100.0
6+	0	0.0	212	100.0

About 36 percent of respondents had no differences in these variables between T1 and T2, and about 81 percent had two or fewer variables different. On a respondent level, these numbers show high overall consistency.

5. Modeling

The primary purpose of the Reliability Study Pretest was to identify potential problems with the interview-reinterview approach rather than obtain statistical results that would be generalizeable to the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) target population. Nevertheless, it was important to explore patterns in nonresponse and failure to complete both T1 and T2 interviews. To this end, logistic regression modeling of the propensity of response was performed.

Although the measures of agreement, such as Cohen's Kappa, provide information on the reliability of the responses, they do not show the dependence of the reliability upon personal attributes (e.g., demographics and education). Moreover, although some notion of this dependence can be attained by calculating these measures by subgroups defined by cross-classification of the personal attributes, the small sample size within each subgroup is not sufficient to obtain accurate reliability measures. To address the question of how reliability varies across the subgroups, logistic regression modeling of the propensity to give similar responses on both occasions, T1 and T2, was carried out.

Due to the small sample size, fitting models with many regressors and all their interactions resulted in semicomplete separation.[2] Thus, we fitted models with main effects only. (However, the much larger sample size in the full Reliability Study should allow for more complex models.)

5.1   Model 1: Probability of Completing Both T1 and T2 Interviews

In this section and in Table 9, we present the results of a logistic regression model fitted to the probability of completing both T1 and T2 interviews where the explanatory variables are race/ethnicity, gender, the five-category age group, and State from the screening data file. The race/ethnicity variable hisprace has three categories: Hispanic, non-Hispanic black, and other. In this model, other is the reference category for hisprace. Reference levels for the other variables include male for the gender variable, 50+ for the age group variable, and Texas for State.

The logistic regression model was as follows:

$$\log\left[\frac{pr(y=1)}{1-pr(y=1)}\right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 H + \beta_2 B + \beta_3 F + \beta_4 Age_1 + \beta_5 Age_2 + \beta_6 Age_3 + \beta_7 Age_4 +$$
$$\beta_8 FL + \beta_9 MD + \beta_{10} NC,$$

where the dependent variable y is a 0-1 indicator of having completed both interviews ($y = 1$ if completed both, 0 otherwise); H, B, and F, respectively, are dummy variables for Hispanic race (1 if Hispanic, else 0), race (1 if black, else 0), and gender (1 if female, 0 if male); Age_1, Age_2, Age_3, and Age_4 are dummy variables for age group (Age_1, Age_2, Age_3, and Age_4 are 1 if in age

---

[2] Complete separation is characterized by the regressors in the data predicting the outcome with certainty. Under such a case, the maximum likelihood estimation fails to converge.

group 12-17, 18-25, 26-35, or 35-49, respectively, and 0 otherwise); and FL, MD, and NC are dummy variables for the States Florida, Maryland, and North Carolina, respectively.

Table 9.   Logistic Regression Model Predicting the Completion of Both the T1 and the T2 Interviews

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	*p* Value
Intercept	-0.0605	0.4524	0.8936
Race/Ethnicity			
Hispanic	0.1537	0.3977	0.6991
Non-Hispanic Black	0.1436	0.4250	0.7355
Other (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Gender			
Female	-0.1250	0.2891	0.6655
Male (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Age Group			
12-17	1.0646	0.4659	0.0223
18-25	1.4815	0.5107	0.0037
26-34	0.3764	0.5621	0.5031
35-49	0.1977	0.4577	0.6658
50+ (RC)	0.0000	.	.
State			
Florida	0.1362	0.3666	0.7102
Maryland	0.9943	0.4527	0.0281
North Carolina	0.8224	0.4207	0.0506
Texas (RC)	0.0000	.	.

(RC): Reference Category.

Source: SAMHSA, Office of Applied Studies, National Survey on Drug Use and Health, reliability pretest data, 2005.

The test for overall significance for race/ethnicity was highly insignificant ($p = 0.8909$). The test for overall significance for age group was significant ($p = 0.0067$). The test for overall significance for State was insignificant at the 5 percent level ($p = 0.0676$).

5.2   Model 2: Probability of Completing T1 Interview

In this section and in Table 10, we present the results of a logistic regression model fitted to the probability of completing the T1 interview. The model was similar to the one developed for Model 1:

$$\log\left[\frac{pr(y=1)}{1-pr(y=1)}\right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 H + \beta_2 B + \beta_3 F + \beta_4 Age_1 + \beta_5 Age_2 + \beta_6 Age_3 + \beta_7 Age_4 +$$

$$\beta_8 FL + \beta_9 MD + \beta_{10} NC,$$

where the dependent variable y now is an indicator of having completed T1 interview ($y = 1$ if completed T1, 0 otherwise), and where the independent variables and their reference levels are the same as in Model 1.

Table 10. Logistic Regression Model Predicting the Completion of the T1 Interview

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	*p* Value
Intercept	0.1200	0.4748	0.8005
Race/Ethnicity			
Hispanic	-0.1646	0.4242	0.6980
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.2250	0.4793	0.6388
Other (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Gender			
Female	-0.2228	0.3242	0.4920
Male (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Age Group			
12-17	1.3852	0.5153	0.0072
18-25	1.6565	0.5670	0.0035
26-34	0.3038	0.5896	0.6064
35-49	0.4338	0.4900	0.3760
50+ (RC)	0.0000	.	.
State			
Florida	0.4463	0.3969	0.2609
Maryland	1.4109	0.5355	0.0084
North Carolina	1.2608	0.4852	0.0094
Texas (RC)	0.0000	.	.

(RC): Reference Category.

Source: SAMHSA, Office of Applied Studies, National Survey on Drug Use and Health, reliability pretest data, 2005.

The test for overall significance for race/ethnicity was again highly insignificant ($p = 0.851709$). The test for overall significance for age group was significant ($p = 0.0065$). The test for overall significance for State was significant at the 5 percent level ($p = 0.0165$).

5.3   Model 3: Probability of Completing T2 Interview, Conditional on Having Completed T1 Interview

In this section and in Table 11, we present the results of a logistic regression model fitted to the probability of completing the T2 interview, given that the respondent has completed T1. In addition to Models 1 and 2, the length of the T1 interview and the education level reported at T1 were added as predictors. Thus, the model was as follows:

$$\log\left[\frac{pr(y=1)}{1-pr(y=1)}\Big|T1\right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 H + \beta_2 B + \beta_3 F + \beta_4 Age_1 + \beta_5 Age_2 + \beta_6 Age_3 + \beta_7 Age_4 +$$

$$\beta_8 FL + \beta_9 MD + \beta_{10} NC + \beta_{11} T1duration + \beta_{12} T1education,$$

where the dependent variable *y* is an indicator of having completed the T2 interview ($y = 1$ if completed T2, 0 otherwise); *T1duration* and *T1education*, respectively, are the duration of T1 and the level of education reported at T1; and the other independent variables and their reference levels are the same as in Models 1 and 2.

Table 11. Logistic Regression Model Predicting the Completion of the T2 Interview, Conditional on Having Completed the T1 Interview

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	*p* Value
Intercept	1.2422	2.1947	0.5714
Race/Ethnicity			
Hispanic	0.7789	1.1400	0.4944
Non-Hispanic Black	0.8201	0.8122	0.3126
Other (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Gender			
Female	0.5816	0.5281	0.2707
Male (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Age Group			
12-17	-0.0065	1.1376	0.9954
18-25	0.7145	0.9898	0.4704
26-34	0.6431	1.3191	0.6259
35-49	-0.4827	0.8978	0.5908
50+ (RC)	0.0000	.	.
State			
Florida	-0.7191	0.7736	0.3526
Maryland	-0.3345	0.8595	0.6971
North Carolina	-0.6414	0.8741	0.4631
Texas (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Length of T1 Interview	0.0199	0.0180	0.2686
Education Level (T1)	-0.0025	0.1256	0.9844

(RC): Reference Category.

Source: SAMHSA, Office of Applied Studies, National Survey on Drug Use and Health, reliability pretest data, 2005.

None of the overall tests for significance of race/ethnicity, age group, and State was significant at the 5 percent level.

5.4   Models of the Probability of Giving Similar Responses on Both Occasions

Probably due to the small sample size, none of the models of probability of giving similar responses at T1 and T2 showed significance at the 0.05 level. The much larger sample size in the full Reliability Study will likely yield significance of some covariates. However, for the sake of illustration, the results of one of these models are shown below and in Table 12. The outcome variable *y* in this case was defined as 1 if the age of first use of cigarettes was similarly reported at T1 and at T2. The independent variables were race/ethnicity (as specified at the T1 screening), which has categories Hispanic, non-Hispanic black, and other (reference category); gender (as reported at T1, with male as the reference level); the respondent-reported education level reported at T1, treated as a continuous variable; age category (as reported at T1, with 50+ as reference level); and State (Texas as reference level). The model's formula is given as follows:

$$\log\left[\frac{pr(y=1)}{1-pr(y=1)}\right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 H + \beta_2 B + \beta_3 F + \beta_4 Age_1 +$$

$$\beta_5 Age_2 + \beta_6 Age_3 + \beta_7 Age_4 +$$

$$\beta_8 FL + \beta_9 MD + \beta_{10} NC + \beta_{11} T1 education.$$

Table 12. Logistic Regression Model Predicting Giving Similar Responses on Both Occasions

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	*p* Value
Intercept	3.0050	1.7990	0.0948
Race/Ethnicity			
Hispanic	0.3021	0.8557	0.7241
Non-Hispanic Black	-1.2667	0.6886	0.0658
Other (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Gender			
Female	-0.4304	0.4985	0.3880
Male (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Age Group			
12-17	0.9100	1.3902	0.5127
18-25	-0.2029	0.7972	0.7991
26-34	0.2173	1.0032	0.8285
35-49	0.2095	0.8072	0.7952
50+ (RC)	0.0000	.	.
State			
Florida	1.3435	0.7412	0.0699
Maryland	0.7189	0.7342	0.3275
North Carolina	1.5363	0.8423	0.0681
Texas (RC)	0.0000	.	.
Education (T1)	-0.1606	0.1240	0.1951

(RC): Reference Category.

Source: SAMHSA, Office of Applied Studies, National Survey on Drug Use and Health, reliability pretest data, 2005.

None of the overall tests for significance of race/ethnicity, age group, and State was significant at the 5 percent level.

6. Timing Data

Table 13 shows statistics for the number of days between the initial interview (T1) and the reinterview (T2). The average number of days between the initial interview and the reinterview was just over 8 days, with a median of 7 days. These data correspond to the interviewers' reports in the debriefing calls that the second interview was usually scheduled about 1 week after the first interview. Most T2 interviews were able to be scheduled within the 5- to 15-day range.

Table 13. Time between T1 and T2 Interviews, in Days (n = 211)

Measure	Mean	Minimum	Median	Maximum	Range
Days between T1 and T2	8.34	4	7	16	12

Note: Excludes one respondent who had a T2 interview beginning and ending on different days.

As expected, the average length of time to complete the second interview was less than the first interview by 8.68 minutes (see Tables 14 and 15). About 7.70 minutes of this reduction was in the audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (ACASI) portion of the interview. Both of these differences are significantly different from 0, indicating that T2 is likely to be a shorter interview than T1.

Table 14. Time to Complete T1 and T2 Interviews, in Minutes (n = 211)

Measure	n	Mean	Minimum	Median	Maximum	Range
Interview						
T1	211	58.99	24.42	54.40	122.95	98.53
T2	211	50.31	23.15	46.67	137.07	113.92
ACASI						
T1	211	38.16	12.42	35.18	100.53	88.12
T2	211	30.45	9.05	27.85	101.87	92.82

Note: Excludes one respondent who had a T2 interview beginning and ending on different days.

Table 15. Difference in Time to Complete Interview and ACASI at T1 and T2, Including p Value for Test of Mean Different from Zero (n = 211)

Measure	n	Mean	Minimum	Median	Maximum	Range	p Value
Interview							
T1 – T2	211	8.68	-43.03	9.23	52.58	95.62	<.0001
ACASI							
T1 – T2	211	7.70	-36.75	7.63	34.40	71.15	<.0001

Note: Excludes one respondent who had a T2 interview beginning and ending on different days.

7. Follow-Up Questions

Persons who completed the reinterview were asked an additional set of audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (ACASI) questions. The questions and frequency of responses are given in Table 16 below. The table gives frequencies and percentages for each level of each follow-up question by two groups defined by the number of days between T1 and T2: less than 10 days and 10 days or more. Most respondents (over 70 percent) reported that they remembered most or all of their answers to the tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana use questions from the first interview. Respondents reported that most or all of their answers to the tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana use questions were the same for both interviews. The table also provides a p value for a chi-square test of the equality of the distribution across the levels between the group of those where there were less than 10 days between T1 and T2 and the group where T2 occurred 10 days or more after T1. (A small p value indicates significance of the differences between the two groups.) Some of the p values are marked with an asterisk (*), indicating that at least 25 percent of cells have counts less than 5. In this case, the chi-square may not be a valid test. None of the other comparisons in Table 16 yielded a significant difference between the two groups.

Table 16. Follow-Up Questions, by Number of Days between T1 and T2

Question	Total		Less Than 10 Days ($n = 154$)		10 Days or More ($n = 58$)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
FOLLW01 (Chi-Square p value = 0.5991) During the time between the first and second interviews, did you think about your use or nonuse of tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs more than usual, about the same as usual, or less than usual?						
FOLLW01= 1: More than Usual	52	24.5	38	24.7	14	24.1
FOLLW01= 2: About the same as usual	117	55.2	88	57.1	29	50.0
FOLLW01= 3: Less than usual	36	17.0	24	15.6	12	20.7
FOLLW01=94: Don't know	5	2.4	3	2.0	2	3.5
FOLLW01=98: Blank	2	0.9	1	0.7	1	1.7
FOLLW02 (Chi-Square p value = 0.2351) How many of the questions in this interview do you think were the **same** as the questions in the first interview?						
FOLLW02= 1: All of them	77	36.3	61	39.6	16	27.6
FOLLW02= 2: Most of them	114	53.8	80	52.0	34	58.6
FOLLW02= 3: Some of them	19	9	12	7.8	7	12.1
FOLLW02=98: Blank	2	0.9	1	0.7	1	1.7

(continued)

21

Table 16. Follow-Up Questions, by Number of Days between T1 and T2 (continued)

Question	Total		Less Than 10 Days (*n* = 154)		10 Days or More (*n* = 58)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
FOLLW03 (Chi-Square *p* value = 0.1354*) Please think about the questions on your use or nonuse of tobacco. How many of your answers to the tobacco questions do you remember from the **first** interview?						
FOLLW03= 1: All of them	64	30.2	48	31.2	16	27.6
FOLLW03= 2: Most of them	94	44.3	69	44.8	25	43.1
FOLLW03= 3: Some of them	48	22.6	35	22.7	13	22.4
FOLLW03= 4: None of them	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	3.5
FOLLW03=94: Don't know	2	0.9	1	0.7	1	1.7
FOLLW03=98: Blank	2	0.9	1	0.7	1	1.7
FOLLW04 (Chi-Square *p* value = 0.2315) [If Q3=1-3] How many of your answers to the tobacco questions in the second interview were the same as your answers to the tobacco questions in the first interview?						
FOLLW04= 1: All of them	105	49.5	82	53.3	23	39.7
FOLLW04= 2: Most of them	84	39.6	58	37.7	26	44.8
FOLLW04= 3: Some of them	13	6.1	8	5.2	5	8.6
FOLLW04=94: Don't know	4	1.9	4	2.6	0	0.0
FOLLW04=98: Blank	6	2.8	2	1.3	4	6.9
FOLLW05 (Chi-Square *p* value = 0.3796*) Please think about the questions on your use or nonuse of alcohol. How many of your answers to the alcohol questions do you remember from the **first** interview?						
FOLLW05= 1: All of them	67	31.6	50	32.5	17	29.3
FOLLW05= 2: Most of them	97	45.8	73	47.4	24	41.4
FOLLW05= 3: Some of them	42	19.8	29	18.8	13	22.4
FOLLW05= 4: None of them	3	1.4	1	0.7	2	3.5
FOLLW05=94: Don't know	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	1.7
FOLLW05=98: Blank	2	0.9	1	0.7	1	1.7
FOLLW06 (Chi-Square *p* value = 0.1186) [If Q5=1-3] How many of your answers to the alcohol questions in the second interview were the same as your answers to the alcohol questions in the first interview?						
FOLLW06= 1: All of them	89	42	70	45.5	19	32.8
FOLLW06= 2: Most of them	101	47.6	68	44.2	33	56.9
FOLLW06= 3: Some of them	14	6.6	12	7.8	2	3.5
FOLLW06=94: Don't know	2	0.9	2	1.3	0	0.0
FOLLW06=98: Blank	6	2.8	2	1.3	4	6.9

(continued)

Table 16. Follow-Up Questions, by Number of Days between T1 and T2 (continued)

Question	Total		Less Than 10 Days (*n* = 154)		10 Days or More (*n* = 58)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
FOLLW07 (**Chi-Square *p* value = 0.0239***) Please think about the questions on your use or nonuse of marijuana. How many of your answers to the marijuana questions do you remember from the **first** interview?						
FOLLW07= 1: All of them	93	43.9	71	46.1	22	37.9
FOLLW07= 2: Most of them	80	37.7	56	36.4	24	41.4
FOLLW07= 3: Some of them	32	15.1	25	16.2	7	12.1
FOLLW07= 4: None of them	3	1.4	0	0.0	3	5.2
FOLLW07=94: Don't know	2	0.9	1	0.7	1	1.7
FOLLW07=98: Blank	2	0.9	1	0.7	1	1.7
FOLLW08 (**Chi-Square *p* value = 0.8304***) [If Q7=1-3] How many of your answers to the marijuana questions in the second interview were the same as your answers to the marijuana questions in the first interview?						
FOLLW08= 1: All of them	130	61.3	96	62.3	34	58.6
FOLLW08= 2: Most of them	67	31.6	49	31.8	18	31.0
FOLLW08= 3: Some of them	7	3.3	6	3.9	1	1.7
FOLLW08= 4: None of them	1	0.5	1	0.7	0	0.0
FOLLW08=98: Blank	7	3.3	2	1.3	5	8.6
FOLLW09 (**Chi-Square *p* value = 0.4789**) Now think about all of the questions in both interviews. Overall, would you say that your answers were more accurate in the first interview, more accurate in the second interview, or about as accurate each time?						
FOLLW09= 1: More accurate 1st interview	18	8.5	11	7.1	7	12.1
FOLLW09= 2: More accurate 2nd interview	46	21.7	33	21.4	13	22.4
FOLLW09= 3: Accurate in each interview	145	68.4	108	70.1	37	63.8
FOLLW09=94: Don't know	1	0.5	1	0.7	0	0.0
FOLLW09=98: Blank	2	0.9	1	0.7	1	1.7

Note: All *p* values exclude the categories 94 = Don't know, 98 = Blank, and "**.**" = missing value.

*At least 25 percent of cells have counts less than 5. Therefore, chi-square may not be a valid test.

Availability of respondents for the reinterview is likely to be dependent on their employment status and may also be related to the family income. Table 17 below supports that hypothesis. The table shows the T2 total frequencies and percentages of the responses to the employment status and family income questions, along with the distributions of the responses by the two groups defined by the number of days between T1 and T2: less than 10 days and 10 days or more. The hypothesis that the distributions are the same for the two groups was tested by a chi-square test statistic. Indeed, the distributions of employment status in the two groups were significantly different (p value < 0.02). In the group where T2 occurred 10 days or more after T1, 53.5 percent worked at least 35 hours per week, compared with only 39.2 percent among those who had T2 within 9 days of T1. The family income comparison between the two groups was marginally significant (p value = 0.044).

Table 17. Employment and Family Income Responses to the T2 Interview, by Number of Days since T1

Question	Total		Less Than 10 Days (n = 154)		10 Days or More (n = 58)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
T2 Employment Status (Chi-Square p value = 0.0197)						
QD29=1: works 35+ hrs/wk	83	39.2	52	33.8	31	53.5
QD29=2: does not work 35 hrs/wk	33	15.6	28	18.2	5	8.6
QD29=98: employment legit skip	96	45.3	74	48.1	22	37.9
T2 Family Income (Chi-Square p value = 0.0439)						
Family Income: missing value	22	10.4	15	9.7	7	12.1
Family Income: less than $20,000	30	14.2	21	13.6	9	15.5
Family Income: $20,000 to $49,999	72	34.0	55	35.7	17	29.3
Family Income: $50,000 to $74,999	33	15.6	28	18.2	5	8.6
Family Income: $75,000 to $99,999	26	12.3	20	13.0	6	10.3
Family Income: $100,000 or more	29	13.7	15	9.7	14	24.1

Note: All p values exclude the categories 94 = Don't know, 98 = Blank, and "**.**" = missing value.

*At least 25 percent of cells have counts less than 5. Therefore, chi-square may not be a valid test.

8. Interviewer Observations and Feedback

8.1 T1 Debriefing Questions

Interviewers were asked a series of questions following the initial interview (T1) to gauge the reaction of respondents to the request for a second interview (T2). These questions, as well as the frequency of responses given, are shown below.

Over 70 percent of parents of youths aged 12 to 17 did not ask any questions about the second interview. About 11 percent of parents asked about the content of the second interview, and about 7 percent asked why we wanted to do another interview. Over 80 percent of the respondents did not ask any questions about the reinterview. Just over 6 percent asked about the content of the second interview and 5 percent asked about the length of the second interview. Over 85 percent of the respondents made no comment about the $50 incentive for the second interview. Of those who did comment, just over 80 percent thought the amount was "about right."

Table 18. Response Frequencies for the Interviewer Debriefing Questions for T1

Question	#	%
T1DBF1 [IF THIS IS A T1 RELIABILITY CASE AND LANG = 1 AND AGE = 12-17] When you read the recruitment script **to the parent or guardian**, what questions did he/she ask about the **re-interview**? (More than one category can be selected.)		
1 The content of the re-interview questions	9	11.0
2 The reasons for the re-interview study	6	7.3
3 The length of the re-interview	3	3.7
4 Whether the 5-15 day window could be changed	1	1.2
5 Whether a different child in the household could respond	0	0.0
6 Some other question	2	2.4
7 Did not ask questions	61	74.4
Total	**82**	**100.0**
T1DBF1S [IF ANY RESPONSE IN T1DBF1 = 6] What other questions did the **parent or guardian** ask about the **re-interview**?		
• She said it is up to R • Would specific date be set		
T1DBF2 [IF THIS IS A T1 RELIABILITY CASE AND LANG = 1 AND AGE = 12-17] What other comments did the **parent or guardian** make about the **re-interview**?		
• Great • None • She wanted to know if I was to be the one to come back • Does it only pick teens • Family will be traveling to California during reinterview period • Happy for child • It's up to R • She did not r had to ask to question because she speaks only spanish • Nothing		

(continued)

25

Table 18.   Response Frequencies for the Interviewer Debriefing Questions for T1 (continued)

Question	#	%
T1DBF3 [IF THIS IS A T1 RELIABILITY CASE AND LANG = 1] When you read the recruitment script **to the respondent**, what questions did he/she ask about the **re-interview**? (More than one category can be selected.)		
1 The content of the re-interview questions	16	6.7
2 The reasons for the re-interview study	10	4.2
3 The length of the re-interview	12	5.0
4 Whether the 5-15 day window could be changed	3	1.3
5 Some other question	3	1.3
6 Did not ask questions	196	74.4
Total	**240**	**100.0**
T1DBF3S [IF ANY RESPONSE IN T1DBF1 = 5] What other questions did the **respondent** ask about the **re-interview**?		
• Does the incentive always go up? • What type of question would ask again • Will there be more interviews		
T1DBF4 [IF THIS IS A T1 RELIABILITY CASE AND LANG = 1] Did the respondent make any comments that indicated how [he/she] felt about the **amount** of the **$50** incentive payment to be given for the **re-interview**?		
1 Yes	31	13.4
2 No	199	86.2
BL Blank	1	0.4
Total	**231**	**100.0**
T1DBF5 [IF T1DBF4 = 1] Did the respondent's comments suggest [he/she] thought the amount of the **re-interview** incentive payment was too high, about right, or too low?		
1 Too High	4	12.9
2 About Right	25	80.6
3 Too Low	0	0.0
DK Don't Know	2	6.5
Total	**31**	**100.0**
T1DBF6 [IF T1DBF4 = 1] What other comments did the respondent make about the incentive payment for the **re-interview**?		
• Great she said is good money • He said that was ok. He got suspicious • She needed money it was prom time. • Cash not important • Eee-oh! 50! • Cash not important • Great • Just smiled • Lot of $ for a kid • Just smiled • Not doing it for the money – but it's nice to get it • Perfect • That's great • Why do we pay for the interview? • Wow I'll do this every week • Wow yeah alright		

8.2 T2 Debriefing Questions

Interviewers were asked another set of questions for those persons who completed the reinterview. These questions, as well as the frequencies of responses, are shown below. About 24 percent of respondents commented that they thought the initial and reinterviews were the same. However, of this group, less than 15 percent made any comment about a strategy for answering the reinterview questions.

Table 19. Response Frequencies for the Interviewer Debriefing Questions for T2

Question	#	%
T2DBF01 [IF THIS IS A T2 RELIABILITY CASE] Did the respondent make any comments showing that [he/she] noticed the first interview and the re-interview were the same?		
1 YES	51	24.1
2 NO	159	75.0
BL Blank	2	0.94
Total	**212**	**100.0**
T2DBF02 [IF T2DBF01 = 1] Did the respondent make any comments about [his/her] strategies for answering the re-interview questions?		
1 YES	7	13.7
2 NO	44	86.3
Total	**51**	**100.0**
T2DBF02S [IF T1DBF02 = 1] What comments did the respondent make about [his/her] strategies for answering the re-interview questions?		
• Questions were about the same content • R thought about the mental health questions • Wanted to make sure she was doing it correctly • Answered '04' or '03' to some. Got impatient. • He was concerned that he might not give the same answers as on 1st interview • Remembered questions, didn't have to think about them as much • She said most of the questions were the same		
T2DBF03 [IF T2DBF01 = 1] What other comments did the respondent make about the similarity between the two interviews?		
• At the end, she said that it was easy, the same as the first one • He asked why the same questions again • He noticed that the questions seemed the same • He said that he remembered most of his answers from the first interview • In the beginning: "are they going to ask me all the same questions?" • The questions were almost the same • The mother commented on redundancy • After reading the study description he said same • All I had to do is look at the highlighted words & hit 'no' • Are all these questions the same? What is this for? • If there was a form to see the difference in her answers only for herself • Is the second interview the same • Thought it was the same interview and could not understand why • (7) Said that they were the same questions • Respondent asked if the questions were the same • Seemed annoyed that the questions were the same • She said the questions were similar and she had different answers • (2) Went through interview a lot faster the 2nd time because the questions were the same		

8.3   FI Observations

In this section, we summarize the key interview findings from the field observations of the Reliability Study Phase I Pretest.[3] A total of 10 field interviewers (FIs) were observed completing seven initial interviews (T1) and seven reinterviews (T2). Observations were conducted by four RTI staff and two field supervisors (FSs) using the observation checklists shown in Appendices A and B.

8.3.1   T1 Interviews

Observers noted that all FIs used the correct beige materials for the initial interviews and obtained parental consent to talk with minors about the reinterview by reading the parental consent recruitment screen (RECRUIT1) verbatim. The respondent recruitment screen (RECRUIT2) was not read verbatim to two of the seven respondents. One FI was interrupted by the respondent and did not finish the last sentence on the screen, and the other FI paraphrased the respondent recruitment screen after reading the parental consent recruitment screen verbatim to the respondent's father. As instructed, none of the FIs mentioned the second interview or the additional $50 incentive payment until they read the parental consent recruitment screen and/or the respondent recruitment screen.

General observer comments regarding the initial interview included the following:

- Respondents were very cooperative due to the $50 incentive and wanted to schedule the reinterview within 5 to 7 days.

- For different FI substudy cases, respondents did not express any concerns about a different FI returning to administer the reinterview or providing a phone number.

- Three respondents and two parents had questions or concerns about the 5- to 15-day time window for completing the reinterview. The FIs were able to address these questions and concerns and schedule the reinterview within the 5- to 15-day time window.

- The observers suggested revising the text on the parental consent recruitment screen to make it similar to the respondent recruitment screen by stressing the voluntary nature of the study first. Then, after the respondent agrees, the observers suggested mentioning that the FI (or a different FI) will come back to complete the interview.

8.3.2   T2 Interviews

FIs conducting reinterviews had no problems following the protocols for administering the reinterview, including using the correct peach materials for informed consent. All FIs read the $50 incentive payment instruction screen (INCENT01) verbatim to respondents and completed the peach quality control form and $50 reinterview payment receipt. All FIs read the second audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (ACASI) introduction screen (FOLLWINT) verbatim to introduce the second ACASI section, but two respondents were confused by this

---

[3] There were no field observations in Phase II of the reliability pretest.

second ACASI section because they had already been paid the $50 incentive and had been thanked for their time.

General observer comments regarding the reinterview process included the following:

- Two respondents and a proxy noticed some similarities between the initial interview and reinterview, especially when viewing showcards and answering questions in the computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) back section of the interview.

- Two respondents made comments about their strategy for completing the interview. One respondent noticed the beginning of many ACASI questions were the same, so he mentioned that he only read the end of the questions. This respondent also indicated that he used a "fast buzzer" system of placing his hands on the laptop answer keys to complete the ACASI. The other respondent voiced some concerns before the interview started about "getting the answers right."

- For two interviews, thanking the respondent for participation and then asking him or her to complete a second ACASI portion did not flow well. To reduce respondent confusion, it is recommended that the second ACASI section be moved to precede the screen where the FI enters the verification ID from the quality control form (VERIFID).

In conclusion, the Reliability Study Pretest field observations confirmed that FIs will be able to follow procedures and protocols during the 2006 Reliability Study.

8.4 FI Debriefing Call Findings

In this section, we summarize key findings from FI debriefing calls conducted at the end of each phase of the Reliability Study Pretest. A total of 18 FIs participated in the Phase I debriefing calls, and 16 FIs participated in the Phase II debriefing calls. The moderator's guide for each of these debriefing calls is included in Appendices C and D for reference.

8.4.1 Reinterview Recruitment

Overall, the FIs reported that the reinterview recruitment process flowed smoothly. The most common question that FIs received from respondents about the reinterview was whether the second interview "would be the same as the first interview." A few parents also asked about the purpose of the second interview. The FIs were able to easily address these respondent questions based on answers reviewed and discussed at training and provided in the reliability FI handbook.

The FIs agreed that the parental consent recruitment script (RECRUIT1) and the respondent recruitment script (RECRUIT2) worked well for recruiting respondents for reinterviews, but they offered a few suggestions to improve the text:

- Be more specific about the number of times the FI will be coming back to complete interviews by inserting the word "one" in the script, so the text would be "…the person has been randomly selected to participate in one additional study…"

- Be more specific about the window of time for completing the reinterview on the respondent recruitment screen. FIs recommended updating the text from "one to two weeks" for completing the reinterview to "5 to 15 days." This would help clarify why specific dates for completing the reinterview are later provided in the script.

- The parental consent recruitment screen text states that the FI will be coming back, and then mentions that participation is voluntary. It was recommended to revise the text on the parental consent recruitment screen to make it similar to the respondent recruitment screen by stressing the voluntary nature of the study first. Then, after the respondent agrees, mention that the FI (or a different FI) will come back to complete the interview.

For different FI substudy cases, FIs reported that respondents did not voice any concerns about providing a phone number or having a different FI return to complete the reinterview. Because we do not collect names, a few FIs noted that it was sometimes awkward identifying who to ask for in the household when making the phone call to schedule a reinterview. A short script will be developed for FIs to use as a guide when making these phone calls during the 2006 Reliability Study.

For the full Reliability Study, we also will develop some procedures specific to the different FI substudy cases based on pretest experiences reported during these calls. For example, the identity of the second FI may not yet be known when the respondent is being recruited for the reinterview, so the first FI should not give out any information to the respondent as to the gender or name of the second FI. Another example will be having a standard protocol for situations where the parent is there at the beginning of the interview, but then leaves during the interview before the reinterview recruitment process (without notifying the FI).

Most FIs did not have a problem scheduling the reinterviews within the 5- to 15-day window of time. However, there were some broken appointments by respondents who found it difficult to commit to an appointment or know their availability a week in advance. Most respondents wanted to schedule the reinterview appointment for 5 to 7 days later. The majority of the FIs used a hard-copy calendar to keep track of their interview appointments. For FIs who prefer using the iPAQ calendar, it was recommended to update the iPAQ calendar with an "S/I Other" category that can be used for special field situations, such as including an appointment for the different FI phone call to remind the FI to call the respondent. Unlike the current "Other" category in the calendar, this new category would automatically load the CaseID into the appointment. It also was recommended to add a reminder in the iPAQ for cases nearing the end of the reinterview window of time.

8.4.2 Incentive Payment

All FIs agreed that the $50 incentive payment made respondents eager to complete the reinterview. However, some adults were more interested in the purpose and benefits of the study than the $50 incentive payment.

Although FIs thought that some respondents might complete the reinterview for $30, they generally felt that offering less of an incentive would likely result in respondents asking more questions and having to be persuaded to participate in the reinterview, as well as some

respondents more easily breaking their appointments. Overall, the $50 incentive payment combined with the specific time window helped to finalize a reinterview appointment time and complete the reinterview at that time.

8.4.3 Reinterview Reactions

Generally, respondent's reactions to the reinterview were positive. FIs reported that many respondents mentioned that the interviews were the same or similar, but that respondents were not annoyed by completing the interview a second time. Respondents mentioned the similarities between the two interviews at different times throughout the interview—some mentioned it at the beginning of the ACASI, some after the ACASI, and some at the end of the interview.

Most respondents did not mention a strategy for answering the questions during the reinterview. However, a few of the respondents who mentioned that the interview was the same stated the approach they were using, whether it was trying to remember their previous answers or, in one instance, telling the FI when they were knowingly answering differently from before. One FI noted that some respondents referred to the calendar more frequently during the reinterview.

In summary, the FI debriefing calls for the Reliability Study Pretest confirmed that the procedures developed for the 2006 Reliability Study were feasible when used in the field. FIs agreed that even with the addition of nonreliability cases to their assignments, they had no problems following the procedures as long as they read the screens verbatim and used the tools provided to them, such as the materials reference guide. The FIs also provided valuable feedback on suggestions for improvements to procedures and instrumentation for the 2006 Reliability Study.

9. Verification Questions

The frequency of responses to the verification follow-up questions for three types of nonresponse is given in Table 16. Eight people refused at the end of the initial interview (T1), four people refused at the reinterview (T2), and five people were unable to be contacted for T2. Of these 17 nonresponders, there are no verification data for 6 respondents who were unable to be contacted for the verification interview and one respondent who did not provide a phone number for verification contact. Data for the other 10 people are shown in Table 16. In addition, the other reasons for not completing a second interview are given following the table.

The three people who were unable to be contacted at T2 and completed the verification interview responded that they would have participated if they had been available. Interestingly, one of these persons reported that she lives somewhere else. Of the seven persons who refused to do the T2 interview but who responded to the verification interview, only one responded that the $50 payment was not enough. Of the refusals at the end of T1, three people responded in the verification interview that they could not take the time to do another interview, and one person reported not wanting to complete a T2 interview because of content. However, two of the T1 respondents who refused the T2 interview indicated that they would have participated if they had been available.

Table 20. Number of Respondents Who Agree with the Verification Statements

Statement	Refusal at End of T1 ($n = 6$)		Subsequent Refusal ($n = 1$)		Unable to Contact at T2 ($n = 3$)	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
You did not agree to complete the second interview because you know you would not be available for the dates mentioned	2	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
You would have participated in the second interview if you had been available	2	.	N/A	N/A	3	.
The $50 payment for the second interview was not enough	1	3	.	1	.	3
The first interview questions were too personal	1	.	.	1	.	3
The first interview took too much of your time and you did not want to spend that much time again	2	2	.	1	1	2
You could not take the time to do another interview	3	1	.	1	N/A	N/A
You were not available when the interviewer called or came to do the second interview	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	.
You have other reasons for not completing the second interview	3	1	1	.	1	2

Note: "**.**" indicates missing data.

Note: "N/A" indicates verification question was not asked of respondents in this category.

The following reasons were given by those who refused to complete a verification interview:

- **Refusal at End of T1: Other reasons for not completing second interview:** (a) don't want to be bothered, (b) respondent was going on a trip, and (c) learned from previous study not wanting to participate in the other study due to content.

- **Refusal at T2: Other reasons for not completing second interview:** had to go to Charlotte because her grandmother was in the hospital.

- **T2 Unable to Contact: Other reasons for not completing second interview:** no one called to remind her of the second interview because she forgot about it and she also lives somewhere else.

10. Conclusion

In conclusion, the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) Reliability Study Pretest achieved higher than expected reinterview (T2) response rates, successfully completed T2 interviews within the 5- to 15-day window, displayed a high level of consistency in responses to substance use and demographic questions between the initial interview (T1) and the reinterview, received a positive response from respondents, and demonstrated that field interviewers will be able to follow the procedures and protocols in the 2006 Reliability Study. The full Reliability Study is feasible as proposed for 2006 with only minor changes to the protocols.

References

Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Pritzker, L., & Hanson, R. (1962). Measurement errors in the 1960 census of population. In *Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section of the American Statistical Association* (pp. 80-89). Washington, DC: American Statistical Association.

Appendix A: Pretest T1 Observation Checklist

Directions: Complete **one** Initial Interview Observation Checklist for **each** initial interview you observe. For each Interview Procedure and Summary item listed below, place a mark in the "Correct," "Error," or "N/A" column. For each Error or N/A response, provide a brief description in the space just below that item. If you observe an error that does not fit any of the categories below, describe that error in item 19. You should complete this checklist in hard copy using a clipboard or hard binder while at the household observing an interview. Within 24 hours, you should enter this information into the electronic version of the checklist and send it to [NSDUH] 2005 Pre-test Field Observations.

Interview Case ID	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ **A**		
Quarter:	☐ Qtr1 ☐ Qtr2		
Date of Observation:	☐☐ / ☐☐ / ☐☐☐☐		
Time Started	☐☐ : ☐☐	☐ AM ☐ PM	(When FI first spoke to interview respondent about interview)
Time Ended	☐☐ : ☐☐	☐ AM ☐ PM	(When FI last spoke to interview respondent)
FI ID	☐☐☐☐☐		

FI Name: _____

Observer Name: _____

Observer Title:

☐ FS   ☐ RS   ☐ RD   ☐ SS   ☐ SAMHSA Staff   ☐ Other

Census Region: (Choose one of the following):

☐ Northeast   ☐ South   ☐ Midwest   ☐ West

Location (Choose one of the following):

☐ Urban   ☐ Suburban   ☐ Rural

Type of dwelling unit (Choose one of the following):

☐ Single family   ☐ Apartment   ☐ GQU   ☐ College housing

INITIAL INTERVIEW PROCEDURES OBSERVED	Correct	Error	N/A
1. If IR was a minor, FI first obtained consent from parent or legal guardian using the BEIGE INTRO TO CAI in the PEACH Jobs Aids Booklet	☐	☐	☐
2. If interview respondent was not screening respondent, explained purpose of study and visit thoroughly	☐	☐	☐
3. Handed WHITE STUDY DESCRIPTION to the respondent	☐	☐	☐
4. Read BEIGE INTRO TO CAI from PEACH Job Aids Booklet verbatim to the respondent	☐	☐	
5. Chose a private location to conduct interview	☐	☐	
6. Set up equipment efficiently	☐	☐	
7. Asked initial (front-end CAPI) questions verbatim	☐	☐	
8. Completed CALENDAR accurately with respondent while reading CAI script and kept calendar where respondent could see it	☐	☐	
9. Read INTRO TO ACASI screen verbatim	☐	☐	
10. Explained HEADPHONE usage, offered headphones to R, and plugged in	☐	☐	
11. Kept ACASI portion private (did not read ACASI), but remained attentive	☐	☐	
12. Asked demographic (back-end CAPI) questions verbatim.	☐	☐	
13. For industry & occupation questions, listened to responses and probed appropriately	☐	☐	☐
14. Read Quality Control Form and $30.00 Incentive Payment instructions verbatim	☐	☐	☐
15. Completed BEIGE Quality Control Form	☐	☐	☐
16. Entered Activation Code when prompted on the IPAQCODE screen	☐	☐	☐

INITIAL INTERVIEW PROCEDURES OBSERVED	Correct	Error	N/A
17. If IR was a minor, FI obtained parental consent to talk to the child about the re-interview by reading the RECRUIT1 screen verbatim.	☐	☐	☐
18. FI read the RECRUIT2 screen verbatim.	☐	☐	☐
19. OTHER PROCEDURAL VIOLATION NOT NOTED ON THIS CHECKLIST:			

INITIAL INTERVIEW SUMMARY	Correct	Error	N/A
20. Presented SHOWCARDS when prompted by the CAI	☐	☐	
21. Was punctual	☐	☐	☐
22. Was organized	☐	☐	
23. Demonstrated a thorough knowledge of study	☐	☐	
24. Kept paper forms accessible	☐	☐	
25. Spoke in a clear voice	☐	☐	
26. Maintained a pace comfortable for the R	☐	☐	
27. Was courteous and respectful of R and surroundings	☐	☐	
28. Did not divulge R's confidential info to others	☐	☐	
29. Made no biasing or inappropriate remarks	☐	☐	
30. Did not mention the second interview or additional $50.00 incentive payment until read verbatim at the RECRUIT1 and/or RECRUIT2 screen.	☐	☐	

INITIAL INTERVIEW SUMMARY (continued)
31. Did the FI have any problems entering the Activation Code for the re-interview? If YES, describe:
32. How did the respondent behave while waiting for the FI to enter the Activation Code for the re-interview?
33.   If the respondent was 12-17 years old, did the parent have any questions about the re-interview? If YES, describe:
34. Did the respondent have any questions about the re-interview? If YES, describe:
35. Did the respondent make any comments about the $50 incentive payment for the re-interview?
36. Did the respondent have any concerns about the window of time for completing the re-interview?
37.   If different FI interview, did the respondent have any concerns about a different FI returning for the re-interview? If YES, describe:
38.   If different FI interview, did the respondent have any concerns about providing a phone number? If YES, describe:

INITIAL INTERVIEW SUMMARY (continued)

39. Was there any respondent confusion due to something the FI said or did? If YES, describe:

40. Was there any respondent confusion due to a procedure OR due to the CAI instrument itself? If YES, describe:

41. Enter any additional comments about Reliability Study procedures that worked well or didn't work well.

Appendix B: Pretest T2 Observation Checklist

Directions: Complete **one** Re-interview Observation Checklist for **each** re-interview you observe. For each Re-interview Procedure and Summary item listed below, place a mark in the "Correct," "Error," or "N/A" column. For each Error or N/A response, provide a brief description in the space just below that item. If you observe an error that does not fit any of the categories below, describe that error in item 18. You should complete this checklist in hard copy using a clipboard or hard binder while at the household observing an interview. Within 24 hours, you should enter this information into the electronic version of the checklist and send it to [NSDUH] 2005 Pre-test Field Observations.

Re-interview Case ID	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ **R** **A**	
Quarter:	☐ Qtr1 ☐ Qtr2	
Date of Observation:	☐☐ / ☐☐ / ☐☐☐☐	
Time Started	☐☐ : ☐☐ ☐ AM ☐ PM	(When FI first spoke to interview respondent about interview)
Time Ended	☐☐ : ☐☐ ☐ AM ☐ PM	(When FI last spoke to interview respondent)
FI ID	☐☐☐☐☐	

FI Name: _____

Observer Name: _____

Observer Title:

☐ FS   ☐ RS   ☐ RD   ☐ SS   ☐ SAMHSA Staff   ☐ Other

Census Region: (Choose one of the following):

☐ Northeast   ☐ South   ☐ Midwest   ☐ West

Location (Choose one of the following):

☐ Urban   ☐ Suburban   ☐ Rural

Type of dwelling unit (Choose one of the following):

☐ Single family   ☐ Apartment ☐ GQU   ☐ College housing

RE-INTERVIEW PROCEDURES OBSERVED	Correct	Error	N/A
1. If IR was a minor, FI first obtained consent from parent or legal guardian using the PEACH INTRO TO CAI in the PEACH Jobs Aids Booklet	☐	☐	☐
2. Handed PEACH STUDY DESCRIPTION to the respondent	☐	☐	☐
3. Read PEACH INTRO TO CAI from PEACH Job Aids Booklet verbatim to the respondent	☐	☐	
4. Chose a private location to conduct interview	☐	☐	
5. Set up equipment efficiently	☐	☐	
6. Asked initial (front-end CAPI) questions verbatim	☐	☐	
7. Completed CALENDAR accurately with respondent while reading CAI script and kept calendar where respondent could see it	☐	☐	
8. Read INTRO TO ACASI screen verbatim	☐	☐	
9. Explained HEADPHONE usage, offered headphones to R, and plugged in	☐	☐	
10. Kept ACASI portion private (did not read ACASI), but remained attentive	☐	☐	
11. Asked demographic (back-end CAPI) questions verbatim.	☐	☐	
12. For industry & occupation questions, listened to responses and probed appropriately	☐	☐	☐
13. Read Quality Control Form and $50.00 Incentive Payment instructions verbatim	☐	☐	☐
14. Completed PEACH Quality Control Form	☐	☐	☐
15. Completed $50 Re-interview Payment Receipt	☐	☐	☐
16. Read FOLLWINT screen verbatim	☐	☐	☐

RE-INTERVIEW PROCEDURES OBSERVED	Correct	Error	N/A
17. Kept second ACASI portion private (did not read ACASI), but remained attentive	☐	☐	☐
18. OTHER PROCEDURAL VIOLATION NOT NOTED ON THIS CHECKLIST:			

RE-INTERVIEW SUMMARY	Correct	Error	N/A
19. Presented SHOWCARDS when prompted by the CAI	☐	☐	
20. Was punctual	☐	☐	☐
21. Was organized	☐	☐	
22. Demonstrated a thorough knowledge of study	☐	☐	
23. Kept paper forms accessible	☐	☐	
24. Spoke in a clear voice	☐	☐	
25. Maintained a pace comfortable for the R	☐	☐	
26. Was courteous and respectful of R and surroundings	☐	☐	
27. Did not divulge R's confidential info to others	☐	☐	
28. Made no biasing or inappropriate remarks	☐	☐	
29. Did the respondent make any comments indicating that he/she noticed that the re-interview was the same as the first interview? If YES, describe:			
30. Did the respondent make any comments about his/her strategy for answering the re-interview questions? If YES, describe:			

RE-INTERVIEW SUMMARY (continued)
31. If different FI interview, did the respondent make any comments about a different FI returning for the re-interview? If YES, describe:
32. Was there any respondent confusion due to something the FI said or did? If YES, describe:
33. Was there any respondent confusion due to a procedure OR due to the CAI instrument itself? If YES, describe:
34. Enter any additional comments about the re-interview procedures that worked well or didn't work well.

Appendix C: Phase I FI Debriefing Call Moderator Guide

2005 NSDUH Reliability Study Pretest – Phase I

Debriefing Call Moderator Guide

Group ID # _____

Date: _____

Moderator: _____

Note taker: _____

Location: _____

Number of Recruited Participants: _____

Number of Actual Participants: _____

Agenda:

I.   Welcome and Introductions (5 minutes)

II.   Pre-test FI Debriefing Questions (80 minutes)

    A. Overview (*5 minutes*)

    B. Re-interview Activation (*10 minutes*)

    C. Re-interview Recruitment (*35 minutes*)

    D. Re-interview (*15 minutes*)

    E. General (*15 minutes*)

III.   Closing (5 minutes)

I.   Welcome and Introductions (5 minutes)

I want to thank everyone for attending this call today. My name is Donna Hewitt. I work for RTI on the NSDUH instrumentation development team. Some of you may remember me from the Reliability Study Pre-test FI Training in Houston. I'll be the moderator for our discussion.

Assisting me today is Beth Riggsbee. Beth also works for RTI on the instrumentation development team. She will be taking notes for us today.

The objective of today's focus group is to discuss your experiences and gather your opinions on Phase I of the Reliability Study Pre-test. We will discuss many aspects of the data collection process, including re-interview case activation, re-interview recruitment, respondents' reaction to the re-interview, and case management. Your reported experiences during the pre-test will be considered when planning the design for Phase II of the pre-test and the 2006 Reliability Study, so please offer your candid feedback. Also, I welcome any suggestions you have for improvement.

So that we all know who we have onboard for this discussion, let's have everybody on the line introduce themselves. Give your first name only, the state in which you work, and the type of sub-study you worked on the reliability study, that is, the same FI or different FI sub-study.

[FIs INTRODUCE THEMSELVES. BETH NOTES THE INFORMATION IN THE TABLE BELOW.]

First name	State	Sub-study

I look forward to hearing from all of you.

II.   Pre-test FI Debriefing Questions (80 minutes)

A. Overview *(5 minutes)*

Before we get started, let me go over a few things:

- Please don't mention specific addresses of sampled dwelling units, like always, we want to keep this information as well as our discussion today confidential.

- Since we don't have the luxury of seeing each other, it's easy to accidentally interrupt each other. Please be patient and let each person finish their comment. When you do speak, please state your first name before making your comment (for example, "This is Jenny … my comment is …").

- Please be courteous and give everyone a chance to speak before speaking a second time about a particular question. This will ensure that everyone gets to voice their opinion and will help us take more accurate notes. I may call on you by name if you haven't commented on a topic.

- We want everyone to participate, so please feel free to express your thoughts and opinions openly.

- I may interrupt occasionally, either to bring us back into focus if we get off target, or to move us along to the next topic.

- We will be referencing your Reliability Study Pre-test FI Handbook throughout this call, so all of you should have your handbook within reach.

- Please remember that everything you say during this session will be kept completely confidential by the NSDUH team and RTI.

- Your time for this focus group should be charged in the Conference column of a regular ePTE under task 9009.124. Please type "FI Debriefing Call" in the notes section.

Does anyone have any questions before we get started?

I'll guide us through some topics and gather your feedback. I will ask specific questions about your pre-test experiences. Let's get started by discussing the re-interview activation process first.

B. Re-interview Activation *(10 minutes)*

Please turn to page 4-6 in your handbook. You should see the laptop IPAQCODE CAI screen, which provides the instructions for activating the re-interview in the iPAQ.

Question 1: Did you have any problems entering the re-interview activation code using these instructions?

> [Call on each FI and ask for response.]

> [If not raised by FIs in discussion, ask the follow-up questions below.]

> *Follow up questions:*
> *a. Do you have any suggestions for improving the instructions on this screen?*

Question 2: How did your respondents behave while you were entering the re-interview activation code?

> *Follow up question:*
> *a. Was it awkward for you to enter the re-interview activation code at this point in the interview? How did you keep your respondent's attention?*

Question 3: Do you have any suggestions for improving the re-interview activation process?

Thank you for your feedback on the re-interview activation process. Next, we are going to discuss re-interview recruitment.

C. Re-interview Recruitment *(35 minutes)*

Please turn to P. 4-8 and P. 4-9 in your handbook. You should see the Same FI RECRUIT1 CAI screen on the left side and the Different FI RECRUIT1 CAI screen on the right side.

Question 1: What questions or concerns did parents of youth respondents have about the re-interview?

>   [Call on each FI and ask for response.]

>   [If not raised by FIs in discussion, ask the follow-up questions below.]

>   *Follow up questions:*
>   a. *For the cases in the different FI sub-study, did the parents of the youth respondents have any concerns with a different FI returning to complete the re-interview?*
>   b. *For the cases in the different FI sub-study, did the parents of the youth respondents have any concerns with the youth providing a phone number?*

Question 2: Do you have any suggestions for improving the text on the Same FI RECRUIT1 CAI screen on P. 4-8?

Question 3: Do you have any suggestions for improving the text on the Different FI RECRUIT1 CAI screen on P. 4-9?

Please turn to P. 4-10 and P. 4-11 in your handbook. You should see the Same FI RECRUIT2 CAI screen on the left side and the Different FI RECRUIT2 CAI screen on the right side.

Question 4: What questions or concerns did adult respondents have about the re-interview?

>   [Call on each FI and ask for response.]

>   [If not raised by FIs in discussion, ask the follow-up questions below.]

>   *Follow up questions:*
>   a. *For the cases in the different FI sub-study, did adult respondents have any concerns with a different FI returning to complete the re-interview?*
>   b. *For the cases in the different FI sub-study, did adult respondents have any concerns with providing a phone number?*

Question 5: What questions or concerns did youth respondents have about the re-interview?

[Call on each FI and ask for response.]

Follow up questions:
a. *For the cases in the different FI sub-study, did youth respondents have any concerns with a different FI returning to complete the re-interview?*
b. *For the cases in the different FI sub-study, did youth respondents have any concerns with providing a phone number?*

Question 6: Do you have any suggestions for improving the text on the Same FI RECRUIT2 CAI screen on P. 4-10?

Question 7: Do you have any suggestions for improving the text on the Different FI RECRUIT2 CAI screen on P. 4-11?

Question 8: What were respondent's reactions to the $50 incentive payment for the re-interview?

Follow up question:
a. *Do you think respondents would have completed the re-interview for a $30 incentive payment?*

Question 9: Did you have any problems scheduling the re-interviews within the 5-15 day time window?

Follow up questions:
a. *For those of you in the same FI sub-study, would it have been helpful to gather the respondent's phone number considering the window of time?*
b. *For those of you in the different FI sub-study, what was your experience with gathering the information from the original FI and scheduling the re-interview with the respondent?*

Question 10: Do you have any other comments on the recruitment process?

Next, we are going to discuss respondents' reactions during the re-interview.

D. Re-interview *(15 minutes)*

Question 1: Did any of your respondents mention that the first interview and second interview were the same or similar?

[Call on each FI and ask for response.]

[If not raised by FIs in discussion, ask the follow-up questions below.]

Follow up questions:
a. *At what point in the re- interview did the respondent mention the interview was the same as or similar to the first interview?*
b. *Did the respondent mention any strategy for answering the questions for a second time?*

c. What other comments, if any, did the respondents have?

Question 2: Did you have any problem using the correct materials for the re-interview?

> *Follow up questions:*
> *a. Was the Materials Reference Guide in the back of your Jobs Aids booklet helpful?*
> *b. Do you have any suggestions for improvements to the materials?*
> *c. How did you organize your pre-test materials?*

[If time permits] **Question 3: Do you have any other comments on the re-interview administration experience?**

We will now discuss some general items related to the pre-test, such as case management.

E. General *(15 minutes)*

[Call on each FI and ask for response.]

Question 1: Did you use the *Reliability Cases* and *Re-interviews* views on the iPAQ Select Case screen when working on your pre-test cases?

Question 2: How did you keep track of your interview appointments?

Question 3: While working the Reliability Study Pre-test, what did you have the most difficulty with? Include any aspect of protocols, materials, field situations, etc.

Question 4: Using your experience so far, what suggestions do you have to enhance training on the pre-test?

III. Closing *(5 minutes)*
Thank you all for your input! Before we end our call, does anyone have any other comments or feedback on the Reliability Study Pre-test?

We sincerely appreciate you taking the time to speak with us today on this topic. Please remember that your time for this focus group should be charged in the Conference column of a regular ePTE under task 9009.124, with "FI Debriefing Call" typed in the notes section.

Appendix D: Phase II FI Debriefing Call Moderator Guide
2005 NSDUH Reliability Study Pretest – Phase II

Debriefing Call Moderator Guide

Group ID # _____

Date: _____

Moderator: _____

Note taker: _____

Location: _____

Number of Recruited Participants: _____

Number of Actual Participants: _____

Agenda:

I.   Welcome and Introductions (5 minutes)

II.   FI Debriefing Questions (80 minutes)

     F. Overview (5 *minutes*)

     G. Phase II Experience (*15 minutes*)

     H. Re-interview Recruitment (*30 minutes*)

     I. Re-interview (*10 minutes*)

     J. General (*20 minutes*)

III.   Closing (5 minutes)

I.   Welcome and Introductions (5 minutes)

I want to thank everyone for attending this call today. My name is Donna Hewitt. I work for RTI on the NSDUH instrumentation development team. Some of you may remember me from the Reliability Study Pre-test FI Training in Houston and the Phase I FI debriefing calls. I'll be the moderator for our discussion.

Assisting me today is Beth Riggsbee. Beth also works for RTI on the instrumentation development team and assisted me with the Phase I FI debriefing calls. She will be taking notes for us today.

First, I would like to share our plans for the 2006 Reliability Study. It is currently scheduled to be conducted in every quarter in 2006. We expect to complete approximately 3100 re-interviews nationwide, except in Alaska and Hawaii. All interviewers will be trained on Reliability Study procedures at the 2006 Veteran FI Training Conference.

The 2006 Reliability Study will be an embedded sample. This means that the reliability cases will be located in the main study segments and the initial reliability interview will be included in the main study data and analysis. The only difference between a main study interview and a reliability initial interview will be that a reliability interview will display the recruitment scripts at the end of the interview. You and the respondents will not know if the case is a reliability or main study case until the respondent is recruited for the re-interview at the end of the initial interview.

The objective of today's focus group is to discuss your experiences and gather your opinions on Phase II of the Reliability Study Pre-test. Your reported experiences during the pre-test will be considered when updating the procedures and instrumentation for the 2006 Reliability Study, as well as the training materials, so please offer your candid feedback. Also, I welcome any suggestions you have for improvement.

So that we all know who we have onboard for this discussion, let's have everybody on the line introduce themselves. Give your first name only, the state in which you work, and the type of sub-study you worked on the reliability study, that is, the same FI or different FI sub-study.

[FIs INTRODUCE THEMSELVES. BETH NOTES THE INFORMATION IN THE TABLE BELOW.]

First name	State	Sub-study

I look forward to hearing from all of you.

II.   Pre-test FI Debriefing Questions (80 minutes)

A. Overview *(5 minutes)*

Before we get started, let me go over a few things:

- Please don't mention specific addresses of sampled dwelling units, like always, we want to keep this information as well as our discussion today confidential.

- Since we don't have the luxury of seeing each other, it's easy to accidentally interrupt each other. Please be patient and let each person finish their comment. When you do speak, please state your first name before making your comment (for example, "This is Jenny … my comment is …").

- Please be courteous and give everyone a chance to speak before speaking a second time about a particular question. This will ensure that everyone gets to voice their opinion and will help us take more accurate notes. I may call on you by name if you haven't commented on a topic.

- We want everyone to participate, so please feel free to express your thoughts and opinions openly.

- I may interrupt occasionally, either to bring us back into focus if we get off target, or to move us along to the next topic.

- We will be referencing your Reliability Study Pre-test FI Handbook throughout this call, so all of you should have your handbook within reach.

- Please remember that everything you say during this session will be kept completely confidential by the NSDUH team and RTI.

- Your time for this focus group should be charged in the Conference column of a regular ePTE under task 9009.124. Please type "FI Debriefing Call" in the notes section.

Does anyone have any questions before we get started?

B. Phase II Experience *(15 minutes)*

First, let's discuss issues specific to your Phase II experience.

[Call on each FI and ask for response.]

Question 1: Did you have any difficulty with the addition of non-reliability cases to your assignment? For example, did it interrupt your flow when the recruitment scripts appeared or didn't appear at the end of the interview?

Question 2: How effective was the Phase II refresher training? Did it help you recall the reliability study procedures and protocols prior to working your Phase II assignment? This includes the teleconference conducted with your FS and the individual practice exercise.

Question 3: We are considering quarterly refresher trainings for the 2006 Reliability Study. Would you recommend a similar format as the Phase II refresher training?

C. Re-interview Recruitment *(30 minutes)*

Please turn to P. 4-8 and P. 4-9 in your handbook. You should see the Same FI RECRUIT1 CAI screen on the left side and the Different FI RECRUIT1 CAI screen on the right side.

Question 1: What questions or concerns did parents of youth respondents have about the re-interview?

> [Call on each FI and ask for response. If not raised by FIs in discussion, ask the follow-up questions below.]
>
> ***Follow up questions:***
> a. (***For different FI sub-study FIs***), *did the parents of the youth respondents have any concerns with a different FI returning to complete the re-interview?*
> b. (***For different FI sub-study FIs***), *did the parents of the youth respondents have any concerns with the youth providing a phone number?*

Question 2: (*For same FI sub-study FIs*), do you have any suggestions for improving the text on the Same FI RECRUIT1 CAI screen on P. 4-8?

Question 3: (*For different FI sub-study FIs*), do you have any suggestions for improving the text on the Different FI RECRUIT1 CAI screen on P. 4-9?

Please turn to P. 4-10 and P. 4-11 in your handbook. You should see the Same FI RECRUIT2 CAI screen on the left side and the Different FI RECRUIT2 CAI screen on the right side.

Question 4: What questions or concerns did adult respondents have about the re-interview?

> ***Follow up questions:***
> a. (***For different FI sub-study FIs***), *did adult respondents have any concerns with a different FI returning to complete the re-interview?*
> b. (***For different FI sub-study FIs***), *did adult respondents have any concerns with providing a phone number?*

Question 5: What questions or concerns did youth respondents have about the re-interview?

> ***Follow up questions:***
> a. (***For different FI sub-study FIs***), *did youth respondents have any concerns with a different FI returning to complete the re-interview?*
> b. (***For different FI sub-study FIs***), *did youth respondents have any concerns with providing a phone number?*

Question 6: (*For same FI sub-study FIs*), do you have any suggestions for improving the text on the Same FI RECRUIT2 CAI screen on P. 4-10?

Question 7: (*For different FI sub-study FIs*)**, do you have any suggestions for improving the text on the Different FI RECRUIT2 CAI screen on P. 4-11?**

Question 8: What were respondent's reactions to the $50 incentive payment for the re-interview?

Follow up question:
a. Do you think respondents would have completed the re-interview for a $30 incentive payment?

Question 9: Did you have any problems scheduling the re-interviews within the 5-15 day time window?

Follow up questions:
a. *(For different FI sub-study FIs), what was your experience with gathering the information from the original FI and scheduling the re-interview with the respondent?*
b. *(For different FI sub-study FIs), do you have any suggestions for improving the Different FI Re-interview Contact Script that you received for review during Phase II?*

[If time permits] **Question 10: Do you have any other comments on the re-interview recruitment process?**

Next, we are going to discuss respondents' reactions during the re-interview.

D. Re-interview *(10 minutes)*

Question 1: Did any of your respondents mention that the first interview and second interview were the same or similar?

[Call on each FI and ask for response. If not raised by FIs in discussion, ask the follow-up questions below.]

Follow up questions:
a. *At what point in the re- interview did the respondent mention the interview was the same as or similar to the first interview?*
b. *Did the respondent mention any strategy for answering the questions for a second time?*
c. *What other comments, if any, did the respondents have?*

Question 2: Did you have any problem using the correct materials for the re-interview?

Follow up questions:
a. *Was the Materials Reference Guide in the back of your Jobs Aids booklet helpful?*
b. *Do you have any suggestions for improvements to the materials?*
c. *How did you organize your pre-test materials?*

[If time permits] **Question 3: Do you have any other comments on the re-interview administration experience?**

We will now discuss some general items related to the pre-test.

E. General *(20 minutes)*

[Call on each FI and ask for response.]

Question 1: Did you have any problems with the administrative aspects of the reliability study, such as keeping track of re-interview appointments or incentive reimbursements?

Question 2: Considering your experiences on the Reliability Study Pre-test, what do you think will be most challenging for FIs when working on the Reliability Study next year, and what would be your recommendation for overcoming that challenge?

Question 3: If FIs only have 1-2 re-interviews a quarter in the 2006 Reliability Study, do you think it will be difficult to remember the reliability study procedures? If so, which procedures will be most difficult for FIs to recall?

Question 4: Using your experience on the Reliability Study Pre-test, what suggestions do you have to enhance training for the 2006 Reliability Study?

III. Closing *(5 minutes)*

Thank you all for your input! Before we end our call, does anyone have any other comments or feedback on the Reliability Study Pre-test?

We sincerely appreciate you taking the time to speak with us today on this topic. Your pre-test experiences and feedback will be considered when updating the procedures, instrumentation, and training program for the 2006 Reliability Study.

Please remember that your time for this focus group should be charged in the Conference column of a regular ePTE under task 9009.124, with "FI Debriefing Call" typed in the notes section.