Welcome to the Disability Measurement and Eligibility Criteria module of the Disability Statistics training. In this topic, we will be talking about the operationalization of disability in surveys. When interpreting, calculating, or analyzing statistics on any topic, the researcher should give attention to how concepts are measured. This is particularly true of the concept of disability, and it's the focus of this module. Agenda. In this video, we will talk about the strengths and limitations of different survey modes. For example, internet surveys, mail surveys, phone surveys, and in-person surveys. Later, we will do a literature review of the existing disability-related survey data in the United States. In this topic, we will consider other methodological issues that may relate to the study of disability. One consideration is the mode of administration. Whether the survey is administered through in-person, telephonic interviews, paper and pencil, or online self-administered surveys this can impact measurement. Internet surveys, an increasingly common mode of data collection. There are a number of benefits to collecting data online, namely, internet surveys do not require interviewers to be present. And busy people often educated and well off, who systematically ignore taking part in a telephone survey, are willing to answer questions posted on the computer screens. This mode can also be useful for targeting people with specific characteristics such as disabilities or health conditions. It tends to have a higher response rate than phone surveys, at least when the response rate can be calculated. However, there are some disadvantages. We should note that relying on such modes which require initiative from respondents will likely lead to selective samples raising concerns about non-response bias. Samples used for large national and international face-to-face and telephone surveys are considered representative of the general population, while most online samples are often not representative of the entire sample. Finally, we should consider accessibility barriers and we should take into account that internet surveys are also used by people with vision difficulties who are dependent on screen readers to read out the internet surveys to them. Next, we have mail surveys. Self-administered mail surveys are a traditional data collection method used by many Federal surveys. One of the benefits is that for some large studies suggest the ACS, the samples in smaller geographic areas are also represented, creating an opportunity for an analysis at a more local level. Secondly, self-administered surveys also generally result in less bias reports when asking about sensitive or socially desirable behaviors compared to in-person interviews. Also, mail surveys are more convenient for recipients, allowing an opportunity for them to complete at a time, convenient for them, rather than on the spot at an interviewer's availability. In terms of weaknesses, the questionnaire design must be carefully tested and evaluated for success in self administration and interpretation. Survey design may not take into account people with visual or cognitive disabilities, which may impact results for researchers, especially for disability researchers. Mail surveys can also have accessibility issues. And often researchers do not have control over the completion of survey because it is on the respondent when and how they want to complete the survey and mail it to the agency or researcher conducting the research. Next, we describe the Don A Dillman's Total Design Method. The total design method as offered by D. A. Dillman promises guaranteed 80 percent return rate for mail and telephone surveys. In a survey conducted in London, Ontario, a booklet type questionnaire, introductory letter, return postcard, and return stamped envelope were mailed to 185 family physicians. Non-responders were followed up one week after the initial mail out with a reminder postcard, and three and seven weeks after the initial mail out with replacement questionnaires. A return rate of 92.8 % proved that the method was highly successful. Some of the key recommendations made by Don A. Dillman are creating a respondent friendly survey, including a stamped return envelope, providing a financial incentive to respondents and personalizing correspondence when conducting telephone and mail surveys. Next, we have telephone surveys. Phone surveys using random digit dialing, a method of random sampling have been declining in popularity over the last decade or so. Largely due to the lower response rates. When it's employed, with relatively high response telephone surveys can offer good geographic coverage without the cost of sending interviewers out into the field or mailing materials. This also creates a lower cost per interview compared to in-person surveys. However, interviewers themselves may introduce bias into the estimates. And this method may exclude the deaf and hard of hearing populations who may be less likely to be accommodated and, or to participate. Finally, in-person surveys are useful, particularly when there's a need to take health assessments as part of the survey data. This can be beneficial to disability researchers. Some strengths of in-person surveys is that they are clearly structured. Interviewers can be flexible and adaptable when conducting in-person surveys. And because there is a human conducting a face-to-face interview in these kind of surveys, there's a personal touch. However, like telephone surveys, this mode introduces interviewer bias. This approach also generally requires a higher cost per respondent and tends to induce a time pressure on the respondents. However, because respondents need to answer questions directly to the interviewer, in-person surveys are more susceptible to social desirability bias. Here's a think out loud for you. I encourage you to pause the video and think about this question. Who may be under-represented in each of these modes of surveys? We have included an answer key for your reference at the end of the slide deck if you wish to look at it. A literature review done between the US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Disability, Aging and Long-Term Care Policy and Mathematica Policy Research, concluded that the specific measures of disability and wording of questions designed to get information about a particular type of disability differ across surveys. Nearly all of the national surveys reviewed have questions that can be used to identify people with disabilities, but a few do not. An effort is being made to use a uniform set of disability indicators across surveys. The six-question series, included in most federal surveys, like the ACS, is part of this effort. A few surveys contain measures to specifically identify individuals with cognitive or intellectual disabilities. Measures to identify specific health conditions underlying disability also are uncommon. Many national surveys have longitudinal components, though most cover a specific subgroup, rather than a general population. In conclusion, in this topic, we have discussed different methods of conducting surveys and that they have different strengths and weaknesses, and statistics may vary depending on which method of data collection was used. We also conclude that there is an effort to use standard disability indicators across surveys in the United States. However, only few national surveys, contain measures to identify people with cognitive and intellectual disabilities. After completing this video, please see additional resources where you will find an assignment. Once the work for this module is completed, proceed to the next topic. Thank you and see you there.