

## **Methodology Description for Public Opinion Survey on Oregon House Bill 3470** PolicyInteractive Research & Information Alliance Survey (N=402 May 12-17, 2015)

**Background:** PolicyInteractive (PI), an Oregon-based nonprofit policy research organization, directed the survey at hand, “Public Opinion Survey on Oregon House Bill 3470.” 402 randomly-selected Oregon registered voters completed this opinion survey, which included questions on general political affairs and, more specifically, questions about pending legislation Oregon 2015 House Bill 3470 (HB 3470). Results of this public opinion survey were shared with legislative policymakers, members of the public, and posted on the PolicyInteractive website. Hyperlinks in the electronic version of this document (in blue font; footnotes on the bottom of page 2 contain full link addresses) take the interested reader to background material. Methodology details are as follows (bracketed numbers are for internal quality control purposes):

**Methodology description:** The Oregon HB 3470 public opinion survey was written, sponsored, and supervised by [PolicyInteractive\\*](#), who hired [Information Alliance†](#) to conduct the surveys. [1,2] Funding for the survey came from the Institute for Sustainability Education and Ecology with a grant from the Oregon Community Foundation. [3] The unabridged survey and response frequencies are available at: [HB 3470 Survey \(unabridged\)\\*\\*](#). [4] The survey population was Oregon-registered voters. [5]

The sample population was pulled from a [public source††](#) sampling frame, which contains a listing of registered voters in Oregon, maintained by and obtained by the Oregon Secretary of State. PI obtained this sampling frame through a third party, the Oregon League of Conservation Voters. [6,7,8]

The survey drew respondents from the above-mentioned sampling frame using random sampling. This was conducted in two steps. First, 30,000 prospective respondents were randomly drawn from the entire universe of 2,264,126 registered voters in Oregon; this sub-frame was delivered to the field house (Information Alliance). The field house, using a CfMC (Computers for Marketing Corporation) Survox computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) program, randomly drew from the 30,000 population sub-sampling frame to obtain the target sample of 400 respondents. The CATI program was programmed to draw the sample for pre-survey quotas of age and gender (matched to US Census), political party registration (matched to Oregon voting record as of May 2015), and geographic distribution (matched to congressional district distribution using the voter file records). Thus quotas are met through the CATI algorithm-based random selection and no post-survey weighting was applied. Key demographics were double-checked in the data output frequencies to the benchmark standards of age, gender, geographic region and political party registration. [9]

The sample was a random-selection telephone CATI-administered sampling design and conforms to standard probability sampling norms. Cell phones were not distinguished from landlines when accounting for sample distribution because each sampling source telephone number was provided by the respondent, and so was accessed through public records. [10]

Sample size was 402 respondents within a population universe of 2,264,126 registered voters for a statistical margin of error of  $\pm 4.9\%$  of population being sampled, at the 95% confidence interval. No weighting was applied in final output results. [11] The randomization of the selection process should not yield any design effect or special deviations from conventional probability sampling standards. [12]

When the analysis of results show sub-groups within the sample, the margin of error of the smaller sample populations is represented in survey results frequency tables. For this survey, Supplemental Table 1 for question 8 in the unabridged survey results document\*\* displays results by congressional district (determined by respondent address); these five subsets contained sub-populations of 80 or 81 respondents and the output tables show a margin of error of  $\pm 10\%$  (95% CI). [13]

This survey was designed by PolicyInteractive, and the telephone sampling and survey interviews were conducted by the field house Information Alliance of Logan, Utah, using a computer assisted telephone-interviewing system. Anonymous monitoring of at least one full interview by each telephone operator on the

project was conducted by PolicyInteractive staff at the outset of the survey; periodic random check-in on survey call administration is standard procedure for quality control purposes. The survey was conducted May 12 - 17, 2015, in English, with specification for a minimum of five attempted callbacks on valid numbers, break-offs or temporary refusals, and were scheduled for different times of the day and week to improve contact with busy or hard-to-reach potential respondents. [14]

Survey diagnostics at completion ( $N=402$ ):

Net Effective Incidence		74.79%
Response Rate	AAPOR type 3	20.36%
Refusal Rate		48.03%
Cooperation Rate		39.61%

Questions or information about this survey may be obtained through [info@policyinteractive.org](mailto:info@policyinteractive.org) or Tom Bowerman, Director, PolicyInteractive: [tom@policyinteractive.org](mailto:tom@policyinteractive.org) or telephone 541-726-7116. [15]

\* [www.policyinteractive.org](http://www.policyinteractive.org)

† <http://www.infoalli.com>

\*\* [http://www.policyinteractive.org/HB3470\\_N402Toplines9.1.15Unabridged.pdf](http://www.policyinteractive.org/HB3470_N402Toplines9.1.15Unabridged.pdf)

†† <http://sos.oregon.gov/elections/Documents/SEL510.pdf>

## Endnotes of Checklist Items

1. Who sponsored the research study.
2. Who conducted it.
3. Who funded it, including, to the extent known, all original sources of funding.
4. The exact wording and presentation of questions and response options whose results are reported.
5. A definition of the population under study, including its geographic location.
6. A description of the sampling frame used to identify the population.
7. If the sampling frame was provided by a third party, the supplier shall be named.
8. If no frame or list was utilized, this shall be indicated.
9. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected (or self-selected) and recruited, along with any quotas or additional sample selection criteria applied within the survey instrument or post-fielding.
10. The description of the sampling frame and sample design should include sufficient detail to determine whether the respondents were selected using probability or non-probability methods.
11. Sample sizes and a discussion of the precision of the findings, including estimates of sampling error for probability samples and a description of the weighting or estimation procedures and the specific variables used.
12. The discussion of the precision of the findings should state whether or not the reported margins of sampling error or statistical analyses have been adjusted for the design effect due to clustering and weighting, if any.
13. Which results are based on parts of the sample, rather than on the total sample, and the size of such parts?
14. Method and dates of data collection including languages administered in.
15. Contact for obtaining more information about the study.