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Today's Objectives

- Research and Review of Nonresponse Literature
- Development of RRRT Work Plan
- Most Notable & Noteworthy Accomplishments
- Lessons Learned
- Q&A
A report from the American Academy of Political & Social Science - January 2013 edition:
  - Article: Explaining Rising Nonresponse Rates in Cross-Sectional Surveys (Brick and Williams)

The common practice in surveys is to group the reasons for nonresponse into 3 major categories:
  - Noncontact (inaccessible), refusals, and other reasons

“Other reasons” category typically are: (Consistent w/Groves & Couper 1998)
  - Language problems
  - Being away during data collection
  - Poor health

More recent research on cell phones shows growth in cell-phone only population may effect the extent of coverage and nonresponse (Brick et al. 2006)
Nonresponse Literature Review

Six reasons for nonresponse:

(1) Failure of the data collector to locate or identify the sample unit
(2) Failure to make contact with the sample unit
(3) Refusal of the sample unit to participate
(4) Inability of the sample unit to participate
(5) Inability of the data collector and sample unit to communicate
(6) Accidental loss of the data or questionnaire

(Lynn, 2008)
The Nonresponse Tidal Wave

Crops APS Non-Response, 2002-2017, by quarter
Our Goal

We are working to improve response rates by:

- Strengthening survey processes
- Decreasing respondent burden
- Leveraging relationships
- Improving enumerator training
- Communicating more accurately and consistently with all stakeholders
- Adding value by listening to producers and stakeholders

Team Membership

The team has been in existence since 2016. All NASS Divisions are represented on the team.
RRRT created a survey with 13 questions related to response rate:

- 85 pages of feedback from our 12 Regional Field Offices (RFOs)
- 588 pages of feedback from 158 (NASDA) National Association State Departments of Agriculture - Field & Phone Supervisor Enumerators
- 41 pages of feedback from 62 NASS Headquarters and National Operations Division staff
- Completed 6 Farmer Feedback Listening Sessions (CA, ID, MI, MO, ND, & MO)
13 Sub-Teams

- Undeliverable As Addressed (UAA)/Disconnect Team
- Stakeholder Relations Team
- NASDA Training Team
- Survey Timeline Team
- Respondent Burden Index Team
- Deadwood Team
- Sample Review Team
- Callout Review Team
- Strategic Optimized Sample Selection Team
- Enhanced Data Collection Team
- Increasing Cooperation & Engagement (ICE) Team
- Farmer’s Feedback Team
- Inaccessible Investigative Team
Most Notable Accomplishments

Deadwood Sub-Team
Deadwood – Records on our sample frame that are active, but in reality there is some evidence they could be out of business or scope.

Approved Operational Decision – DM-02-18, Decision Memorandum from NASS Administrator, January 24, 2018.

UAA/Disconnect Sub-Team
Investigating the Effect of Distributing a Brochure to Boost Response Rates

For more information...
For help in filling out the survey, call or email the National Ag Data Service.
800-727-9540 | info.nass.usda.gov
For more about the APS survey program, see www.nass.usda.gov/SurveysGuides/NASS_Surveys/Crops_States/index.php

In their words...

"Farm programs and commodity markets depend on accurate data from NASS. We encourage farmers and ranchers to take the time to complete these important surveys."

-Chip Bowling, National Corn Growers Association

"Our job is to develop export markets all around the world, and the cornerstone of that is knowing where we are competitively. How many acres. We use (NASS data) every day."

-Tom Slaght, U.S. Grains Council

"We look at supply and demand estimates for our short-term and long-range decision-making. NASS tends to be a very reliable source of accurate data."

-Richard Wilkins, American Soybean Association

"We use NASS's service frequently in business planning. We need unbiased third party sources of information that we can rely on to build these business plans."

-Duane Martin, Syngenta Seeds

"We rely on data from NASS almost on a daily basis... really the full spectrum of data products that NASS offers. We are end users of that data just to help inform our decision making."

-Greg Cooper, Renewable Fuels Association

"NASS has the strongest data for calculating the payments issued to those who participate in the Agriculture Risk Coverage (ARC) - County program. The more producers who respond to the confidential NASS surveys, the stronger our calculations become."

-Arm Service Agency

Confidentiality

Our relationship is to produce timely, accurate, and useful statistics in service to U.S. agriculture. In doing so, we are fully committed to protecting your privacy and your data. The information you provide will be used for statistical purposes only. Your responses will be kept confidential and any person who willfully discloses any identifiable information about you or your operation is subject to a fine, a fine, or both. This survey is conducted in accordance with the Confidentiality Information Protection provisions of Title 6. Subtitle A, Public Law 107- 347, and other applicable federal laws. For more information on how we protect your information, please visit www.nass.usda.gov/confidentiality.

If USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service asks you to fill out the Acreage, Production, and Stocks (APS) quarterly survey you might wonder whether it matters that you take the time to respond and return the survey. It does. Farmers and ranchers, USDA, businesses, exporters, researchers, economists, policymakers, and others use this information to make better decisions for you and your industry. Let's see how you and others use the data.

The United States Department of Agriculture National Agricultural Statistics Service

United States Department of Agriculture National Agricultural Statistics Service

Acreage, Production, and Stocks Surveys: Why They Matter

APS Quarterly Survey

What We Ask

Who Uses the Data?

March

Provides the first indication of acreage and stock levels for the year.

- Acres you have planned and intend to plant
- Commodity and/or stored on your operation
- Cash rents (if any)

June

Provides the first estimates of that year's expected production and supply of major commodities.

- Acres you have planned and intend to plant
- Acres harvested and to be harvested for small grains
- Use of genetically modified (GMO) or engineered seeds
- Commodity and/or stored on your operation
- Economic data

September

Provides the basis for official USDA estimates of the year's acreage, production, and yield for small grains.

- Acres planted and harvested for small grains
- Yield for small grains
- Commodity and/or stored on your operation
- Unharvested production for small grains (barley, oats, rye, and wheat)

December

Provides the basis for official USDA estimates of the year's acreage, production, and yield for other crops, as well as supply estimates for the following year.

- Acres planted and harvested for row crops
- Yield for row crops
- Commodity and/or stored on your operation
- Unharvested production for row crops (corn, cotton, hay, peanuts, potatoes, soybeans, striped, sugarcane, swine and tobacco)
Investigating the Effect of Distributing a Brochure to Boost Response Rates

Stakeholder Relation Sub-Team Split-Plot Sample Design

- Mailed a brochure title “Why They Matter” with survey questionnaires for half the sample
- Rated the previous year’s response rates levels (low, medium, high) as a block factor
- States within each level were randomized to either receive a brochure or not
- The response variable focus is the current year’s total useable response rate
- The predictor variables: (Brochure: 1 = Yes, 0 = No), % response rate comparison, and capture differences of brochure use comparison to 2016
- Data analysis: (1) A random intercept logistic model fitted for the 2017 total useable response rate; (2) A regression model fitted for the difference in response rates between 2016 and 2017
Investigating the Effect of Distributing a Brochure to Boost Response Rates

Figure 1: Plots of least-squares means from the random intercept logistic regression model

Figure 2: Plots of residuals from the regression model

2017 March Prospective Acreage Planting Survey
Sample Review Sub-Team

- Developed and streamlined aggregate and detail level response history data
- $HR_{PCT\_XYR}$ = % of complete responses for 1 year, 3 year, and 5 years respectively
- $HR_{Surveys\_Xyr}$ = Total number of surveys for 1 year, 3 year, and 5 years respectively
- $HR_{Mode\_Xyr}$ = Preferred mode of completion for 1 year, 3 year, and 5 years respectively
- The team is working on new propensity score models:
  - Model #1 – Identify records most likely to be completed via field enumeration
  - Model #2 – Identify records most likely to be completed via Mail/CATI
- Discovering ways to incorporate impact: quantiles, variables/strata, breakpoints
- Benefit: Provides a clear cutoff for potential high impact operations
Respondent Burden Index (RBI) Sub-Team

- Review the old Joint Burden Index process
- Implemented and integrated an RBI calculation
- A high burden indicator will be loaded in Survey Management Service
- This will reduce staff time to determine best data collection strategy
- The burden is indicated with the use of these variables x1 (number of surveys), x2 (number of contacts), x3 (total OMB survey time)
- Based on level of burden, surveys involved, and response history the best data collection strategy can be planned
- Other possible things that could help in the decision process:
  - Create a profile of your high burden records
  - Ask field supervisors/ enumerators what they know about these operations
  - Review existing record level comments
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Crops APS Useable Response, 2002-2017, by quarter
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Useable Response March 2002-2017

Useable Response June 2002-2017
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Useable Response September 2002-2017

Useable Response December 2002-2017
“Routine is the enemy of instinct. So break the mold! While it’s important to establish routines, schedules, and systems of operation, it’s just as important to know when to change them. Routines without ongoing assessment lead to stagnation and mediocrity. Most individuals, teams, and organizations rise to a challenge or fall to the familiar. It’s better to change and fail than to settle for the status quo.”

(Bishop TD Jakes, 2014)
### RRRT Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jill Bishop</th>
<th>Barbara Rater</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
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<tr>
<td>Andrew Dau</td>
<td>Jamila Sani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Gerald Tillman</td>
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<td>Dan Lofthus</td>
<td>Tyler Wilson</td>
</tr>
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Over 150 NASS employees participated as Members of the 13 RRRT Sub-Teams

*NASDA Supervisors (Field & Phone)
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