

Vital and Health Statistics

Series 1
Program and Collection Procedures

Design and Operation of the National Survey of Adoptive Parents, 2007

Matthew D. Bramlett, Ph.D., National Center for Health Statistics, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Erin B. Foster, M.S.T., Alicia M. Frasier, M.P.H., Jennifer Satorius, M.S.W., Benjamin J. Skalland, M.S., Kari L. Nysse-Carris, Ph.D., Heather M. Morrison, M.A., and Sadeq R. Chowdhury, Ph.D., NORC at the University of Chicago

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
National Center for Health Statistics
Hyattsville, Maryland**

Acknowledgements

The National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP) was sponsored and funded by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation and the Administration for Children and Families, both of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The project director is Laura Radel.

The survey was conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) as a module of the State and Local Area Integrated Telephone Survey (SLAITS). The SLAITS director is Marcie Cynamon and the NSAP survey director is Matthew Bramlett. Design, production, and analytic assistance for this project were provided by Rosa Avila, Stephen Blumberg, Julian Luke, and Kathleen O'Connor. CDC's National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases graciously permitted the use of the National Immunization Survey sampling frame for this survey.

NORC at the University of Chicago conducted all interviews for this project. Technical assistance was contributed by Nada Ganesh, Tracie Carroll, Shannon Ten Broeck, Enyinnaya Adighibe, and Erin Raasch. Gretchen Caspary, Kirk Wolter, Kennon Copeland and Tiffani Balok provided management support.

This report was edited by <NAME> and typeset by <NAME> of CDC's Division of Creative Services. The report's outline and some text were borrowed with permission from an earlier Vital and Health Statistics series report ("Design and Operation of the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, 2005-2006").

Finally, we extend our appreciation to the thousands of parents and other family members who were willing to share their stories. Their efforts made this project a reality.

Suggested Citation

Bramlett MD, Foster EB, Frasier AM, et al. Design and Operation of the National Survey of Adoptive Parents, 2007. National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Stat 1. Forthcoming.

Contents

- Abstract..... 1
- Introduction..... 2
 - The State and Local Area Integrated Telephone Survey program..... 3
 - History of the State and Local Area Integrated Telephone Survey program..... 3
- Background..... 4
 - Development of the Survey Instrument..... 6
- Sample design..... 7
 - The National Immunization Survey sampling plan..... 7
 - NSCH sample design and allocation..... 8
 - Drawing the sample..... 8
 - Conducting the NSAP interviews..... 9
- Questionnaire..... 9
 - Content..... 9
 - Significant changes during data collection..... 10
 - CATI programming..... 11
- Interviewer training..... 12
 - Training sessions..... 12
 - Mock interviews..... 12
- Data collection..... 13
 - Pretesting..... 13
 - Advance letters..... 13
 - Toll-free telephone number..... 13
 - Selection of sampled child..... 13
 - Selection of respondent..... 14
 - Informed consent..... 14
 - Assurance of confidentiality..... 15
 - Interview length..... 16
 - Interview breakoffs..... 16
 - Cases pending at close of data collection..... 16
 - Incentive effort..... 16
 - Response rates..... 17
 - Resolution rate..... 17
 - Age-screener completion rate..... 17
 - NSCH interview completion rate..... 18
 - NSAP screener completion rate..... 18
 - NSAP interview completion rate..... 18
 - Overall response rate..... 19
 - Alternative response rates..... 19
 - Efforts to maximize response rates..... 19
- Quality control..... 20
 - Quality control of interviewing..... 20
 - Data quality control..... 21

Weighting procedures	21
Base weight	21
Adjustment for incomplete NSAP screener	21
Adjustment for incomplete NSAP Interview	22
Raking adjustment	22
Quality control	23
Imputation of relevant variables	23
Public use data file	23
Editing	23
Missing data	24
Coding of verbatim answers into question responses	24
Edits to protect confidentiality	25
Derived variables	28
Dummy variables	29
Additional data notes	30
Quality control	31
Estimation and hypothesis testing	32
Variables used for variance estimation	32
Variance estimation using SUDAAN or Stata	33
Variance estimation for subsets of the data	34
Weighted frequencies, prevalence estimates, and standard errors	34
Guidelines for data use	34
Further Information	35
References	37
Appendix I: Sampling and weighting technical summary	39
Sample Design	39
Weighting procedures	43
Appendix II: Banked sample	46
Appendix III: Questionnaire	48
Appendix IV: Summary of questionnaire changes during data collection	49
Appendix V: Pretest	50
Modifications to instrument after pretest	50
Appendix VI: Letters sent to sampled households	58
Appendix VII: Disposition code frequencies and response rate calculation	59
Appendix VIII: Incentive effort	60
Appendix IX: Nonresponse bias analysis	62
Appendix X: Coding of verbatim answers into question responses	64
Appendix XI: Prevalence estimates and weighted frequencies	68
Table A: Augmentation sample by state	69
Table B: Number and percent of respondents, by relationship to sampled child	70
Table C: Mean and median length of the National Survey of Adoptive Parents interview (in minutes and seconds)	71
Table D: Final disposition of the 2007 NSAP sample	72
Table E: NSAP weighted response rates	73
Table F: NSAP alternative ¹ weighted response rates	74
Table I: Summary statistics for NSAP final weight	75

Table II: NSAP final case dispositions	76
Table III: Unweighted ¹ response rate calculations for National Survey of Adoptive Parents ²	79
Table IV: Case status after initial \$25 incentive	81
Table V: Completion rates, by NSAP incentive type	82
Table VI: Percent of children by demographic and health characteristics for respondents and nonrespondents in the National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP)	83
Table VII: Percent of children by household socioeconomic and demographic characteristics for respondents and nonrespondents in the National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP).....	84
Table VIII: Percent of children by NSCH characteristics similar to NSAP data elements for respondents and nonrespondents in the National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP).....	85
Table IX: Percent of children by demographic and health characteristics in the final National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP) and for all NSAP-eligible cases.....	86
Table X: Percent of children by household socioeconomic and demographic characteristics in the final National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP) and for all NSAP-eligible cases.....	87
Table XI: Percent of children by NSCH characteristics similar to NSAP data elements in the final National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP) and for all NSAP-eligible cases.....	88
Table XII: Unweighted and weighted estimates of the frequency and prevalence of type of adoption.....	89

Abstract

Objective

This report presents the development, plan, and operation of the National Survey of Adoptive Parents, a module of the State and Local Area Integrated Telephone Survey, conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for Health Statistics. This survey was designed to produce national estimates of the characteristics, health, and well-being of adopted children and their families, the pre-adoption experiences of the adoptive parents, and their access to and utilization of post-adoption supports and services. Funding for this survey was provided by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation and the Administration for Children and Families, both of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Methods

The National Survey of Children's Health, 2007 (NSCH) was a random-digit-dial telephone survey of households with children under age 18. In households with more than one child, one child was randomly selected to be the target of the interview. The survey included questions that identified whether the sampled child lived with at least one adoptive parent and if so, whether the adoption had been finalized. Children who were thus identified as adopted, who did not live with a biological parent, and who lived in households where English was spoken, were eligible for the National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP) follow-up interview. The NSAP interview was a call-back scheduled at the end of the NSCH telephone interview, although respondents had the option of continuing on to the NSAP interview immediately. Sampled children included children adopted from other countries, children adopted from the U.S. foster care system, and children adopted from private domestic sources. Respondents were either the adoptive mother or the adoptive father.

Results

A total of 2,089 NSAP interviews were completed from April 2007 to July 2008. The weighted interview completion rate (i.e., cooperation rate) for eligible NSAP respondents was 74.4%. The weighted overall response rate, taking account of nonresponse to the NSCH, was 34.6%.

Keywords

Adoption; adopted children; adoptive parents; adoptive families; international adoption; adoption from foster care; preadoption experiences; postadoption supports and services; SLAITS

Introduction

Several agencies within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), including the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), have collaborated to develop the National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP). Administered for the first time in 2007, the NSAP focuses on the characteristics and needs of adopted children and their adoptive families. The survey is tailored to collect data from three types of adoptive families:

- those who adopted through the U.S. foster care system;
- those who adopted internationally; and
- those who adopted through domestic private sources.

Due to the relatively low prevalence rate of adoptive families in the United States, surveys of this population have typically been conducted using targeted list samples. NSAP cases, however, are screened via administration of a parent survey, the 2007 National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH). The NSCH identifies households with children under age 18 and selects one child from that household as the subject of a broader interview. Once the NSCH has identified the selected child as adopted, respondents are invited to also participate in the NSAP interview. As a result the NSAP sample has much better coverage than prior efforts to survey adoptive families and is able to provide much needed data on:

- adopted child and family characteristics;
- parent and child well-being;
- adoption agreement and post-adoption financial services; and
- post-adoption non-financial supports.

These data, combined with those collected in the NSCH interview, will provide researchers with previously unavailable insights into adopted families and their health and well-being. The content of the NSCH is broad, addressing a variety of physical, emotional, and behavioral health indicators and measures of children's health experiences with the health care system. The survey includes an extensive battery of questions about the family, including parental health, stress and coping behaviors, family activities, and parental concerns about their children. The NSCH also asks respondents for their perceptions of the child's neighborhood (1).

Both the NSCH and NSAP were administered as modules of the State and Local Area Integrated Telephone Survey (SLAITS), a telephone survey mechanism designed to benefit from the extensive Random Digit Dial (RDD) sampling investment made by the National Immunization Survey (NIS). The synchronicity between the NIS, NSCH, and NSAP surveys enabled the NSAP to take advantage of a singularly robust RDD sample design and yet field a new survey in a highly cost-effective manner. Furthermore, the association with the NSCH enriches each NSAP case with a wealth of additional information on the health and well-being of NSAP children and their families.

The State and Local Area Integrated Telephone Survey program

The SLAITS program, conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), is a broad-based, ongoing survey system available at the national, state, and local levels for tracking and monitoring the health and well-being of children and adults. Surveys conducted as part of the SLAITS system use the same sampling frame as the CDC's National Immunization Survey (NIS), and immediately follow the NIS in selected households, using its sample for efficiency and economy. The NIS is a large-scale random-digit-dialed (RDD) telephone survey that screens households for the presence of young children and collects immunization history information for children 19 to 35 months of age. To achieve an adequate sample of households with children in this age range, the NIS contacts over one million households per year to determine if they contain age-eligible children. The process of identifying this large number of households – most of which are ineligible for the NIS – provides an economical opportunity to administer other surveys on a range of health- and welfare-related topics in an operationally seamless, cost-effective, and statistically sound manner.

Surveys conducted as part of the SLAITS system vary in content, duration, and sample size based on the research needs of their sponsors. Sponsors work with NCHS to establish parameters – including sample size, questionnaire design, and other survey requirements. Since 2005, NORC at the University of Chicago has implemented all aspects of the survey operations under contract with NCHS, including development and testing of the computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) instrument, recruiting and training interviewers, completing the targeted number of interviews, and preparing data files and documentation. NCHS is responsible for all aspects of SLAITS administration.

History of the State and Local Area Integrated Telephone Survey program

SLAITS began in 1997 with a pilot test in two states (Iowa and Washington) of a series of questions on health, including issues of access to care, health status, and insurance. In 1998, a SLAITS module concerning child well-being and welfare issues was implemented using three samples: a Texas RDD sample, known Medicaid program participants seeded into the Texas RDD sample, and known Medicaid or MinnesotaCare participants in Minnesota. The first national SLAITS survey was fielded in 2000: the National Survey of Early Childhood Health collected data from a national sample regarding parents' perceptions of their children's pediatric care and examined relationships between the promotion of health in the pediatric office and promotion of health in the home (2).

In 2000-2002, SLAITS fielded the first National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs (NS-CSHCN), designed to collect data on children with special health care needs (CSHCN), children's health insurance coverage, and uninsured children from low-income households (3). This was the first SLAITS module to take full advantage of the NIS sampling frame to produce state-level estimates. In 2003, SLAITS fielded the first iteration of the National Survey of Children's Health, which examined the physical and emotional health of children 0-17 years of age (4). In 2003, SLAITS also fielded the National Asthma Survey, which examined the health, socioeconomic, behavioral, and environmental

factors that relate to better control of asthma for children and adults (5). In 2005-2006, SLAITS fielded the second iteration of the NS-CSHCN (6), and in 2007, SLAITS fielded the second iteration of the NSCH, concurrently with the NSAP.

Background

The National Survey of Adoptive Parents was jointly funded by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) and the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), both of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

The Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation advises the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services across the many topical areas within the Department's areas of responsibility. ASPE leads special initiatives, coordinates the Department's evaluation, research, and demonstration activities, and manages cross-Department planning activities such as strategic planning, legislative planning, and review of regulations. Integral to this role, ASPE conducts research and evaluation studies, develops policy analyses, and estimates the cost and benefits of policy alternatives under consideration by the Department and the Congress. Within ASPE, the Office of Human Services Policy focuses on economic self sufficiency and human services delivery issues, as well as policies affecting children, youth, and families. The office works closely with the Administration for Children and Families and a variety of other agencies and Departments. ASPE has a long history of research in foster care and adoption issues, publishing over 40 research reports on the topic over the past two decades. All of ASPE's related publications may be found on ASPE's web site, <http://aspe.hhs.gov>, under the topical heading "child welfare."

The Administration for Children and Families is responsible for federal programs that promote the economic and social well-being of families, children, individuals, and communities. Within ACF, support for the NSAP came from the Children's Bureau, which works with State and local agencies to develop programs that focus on the prevention and protection of children from maltreatment, the provision of services to children and families to assist with reunification efforts, and finding permanent placements for those children who cannot safely be returned to their birth families. The Children's Bureau seeks to provide for the safety, permanency, and well-being of children through leadership, support for necessary services, and productive partnerships with States, Tribes, and communities. The Bureau administers over \$2 billion in funding for adoption programs under several legislative authorities. These programs are intended to support state and local efforts to recruit adoptive families for children in foster care and to support these families over time and include: the title IV-E Adoption Assistance Program, which provides adoption subsidies to many families that adopt children with special needs from the foster care system; the Adoption Opportunities Program, which funds demonstration grants to fuel innovation in foster care adoption practice; the Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program, which includes funding for adoption promotion and support services; and the Adoption Incentives Program, which provides incentive funds to states that increase the number of foster care adoptions they perform in several categories. The Children's Bureau also administers the Infant Adoption Awareness Training Program, authorized by the Children's Health Act, which trains staff of eligible health centers in providing adoption

information and referrals to pregnant women. The Children's Bureau funds the national adoption recruitment campaign, in partnership with the Ad Council, as well as the AdoptUsKids project, which provides fulfillment activities to the campaign, operates the national photo-listing site of waiting children, and provides training and technical assistance to States on the recruitment and retention of foster and adoptive parents. In addition, the Bureau also funds the National Resource Center for Adoption, which provides training and technical assistance on a variety of other adoption issues to States.

The National Survey of Adoptive Parents was intended to gather information on the characteristics of adopted children and their families and to gain insights into their adoption-related experiences and post-adoption service utilization and needs. Much of the social services literature uses adoption as an end point to the search for an adoptive family for the child and gives relatively little attention to children's needs and well-being after the adoption has been finalized, or to families' potential ongoing challenges. As the number of children adopted both from foster care and international sources has grown in recent years, there has been increased interest in understanding children's long-term well-being following adoption. However, for government agencies involved in adoption, contact with families is usually extremely limited following finalization. In addition, because children's names, social security numbers, and other potentially identifying information may change at the time of adoption, it is not usually possible to use administrative data to track children's use of government assistance or services from the pre-adoption to the post-adoption periods.

Most federal activity and funding related to adoption relates to adoptions from foster care. However, in recent years the negotiation and ratification of the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption has increased the role of the State Department with respect to children adopted internationally. This international treaty, which entered force in the U.S. in 2008, is intended to protect the rights of all parties involved in intercountry adoptions – the child, the birth parents, and the adoptive parents. The enhancement of a population-based survey made it possible to look across adoption types for a view of the full range of adoptive families as well as to provide the opportunity for comparisons among families adopting from different sources. While not a formal partner in the NSAP, staff at the State Department with expertise in intercountry adoption issues were consulted at several points during the survey's development to assure that issues specific to international adoptions were addressed as much as possible.

The number of children adopted from foster care increased dramatically in the late 1990s, in part as a result of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, which emphasized the need to find permanent alternatives for children in foster care who could not be reunified with their birth families. As a result, in many states the number of adopted children receiving adoption subsidies currently exceeds the number of children in foster care. Information on the experiences of families who have adopted can provide insights into the factors that facilitate or hinder the success of adoptions and the post-adoption supports that may be helpful to assure the continued well-being of adopted children and their families. In addition, with respect to children adopted from foster care, a better understanding of how families utilize adoption subsidy funds for their children's well-being may help demonstrate their utility in recruiting families for children in foster care.

The information obtained through the NSAP will be used to develop ways to better identify and communicate with potential adoptive parents for children in the U.S. foster care system by describing the reasons why families adopt and the characteristics of adoptive families and the children they adopt. The information will also improve our understanding of the supports adoptive families find most helpful. In addition, the NSAP will provide data on openness in adoptions, transracial and transcultural aspects of adoption, and adoption satisfaction across adoption types.

Development of the Survey Instrument

In August 2005, ASPE issued a task order to The Urban Institute and the National Opinion Research Center to develop the instrument for the National Survey of Adoptive Families. Instrument development began with an effort to locate as many previous adoption surveys as possible. Urban Institute staff conducted an extensive literature review of adoption research to identify past surveys and other related research regarding adoption. Survey instruments used in these research efforts were obtained and categorized according to the part of the adoption process they addressed and by the topics covered. Results were compiled into a comprehensive planning document identifying existing survey questions on each topic of importance. The planning document was used to construct the survey instrument, choosing the most relevant questions on desired topics from existing surveys and constructing new questions on several topics that were not adequately addressed in any of the pre-existing instruments. The ordering of questions was adjusted to flow in a way that made sense as a telephone interview, and transitional scripts were added to guide the respondent from one section of the survey to another.

ASPE and ACF staff reviewed draft questions, suggested new topics for inclusion and sources of questions, and provided overall supervision throughout the questionnaire and survey design process. Staff at the State Department's Office of Children's Issues concerned with intercountry adoptions were also consulted to ensure that the survey adequately addressed issues regarding intercountry adoption and that questions were worded in ways that made sense for families adopting from international as well as domestic sources.

Before finalizing the instrument, both cognitive interviews and a small instrument pretest were conducted. The cognitive interviews were conducted with a convenience sample of participants. They consisted of five parents who adopted through foster care, one who adopted privately, and one who adopted internationally. The goal of the cognitive interviews was to learn how the survey questions sounded in the ear of an adoptive parent. Did the terminology make sense? Did the order of the questions flow well? Were parents able to answer the questions as they were asked? After each subsection of the questionnaire participants were asked about certain items that might have been confusing. Feedback from the cognitive interviews was used to inform a new draft of the instrument, which was used in the instrument pretest. The instrument pretest was also a convenience sample and consisted of three international adoptive parents, three parents who adopted through foster care, and two who adopted privately. The main goal of the instrument pretest was to learn about the timing and the flow of the instrument. However, participants

also provided feedback on the items themselves, and so the pretest also served to inform the wording and content of the instrument.

Following the instrument pretest, decisions were made about the final inclusion of questions, with a number of items being dropped to ensure that the survey fit within time constraints of an approximately 30 minute interview.

Sample design

As noted above, eligibility screening for NSAP was conducted as part of the 2007 NSCH interview (7). Therefore, the initial sample of telephone numbers for NSAP was the same as the sample of telephone numbers for NSCH. The remainder of this section describes the NSCH sampling design.

Like all SLAITS modules, NSCH took advantage of the large number of screening calls required for the NIS. To accomplish the goal of 1,700 completed NSCH interviews in each state, telephone numbers were initially selected from the telephone numbers randomly selected for the NIS screening effort. Therefore, the procedures for drawing the NIS sample were the first steps in the procedures for drawing the NSCH sample. There were, however, some states for which the NIS sample was not large enough to achieve the desired number of completed NSCH interviews. In these cases, additional sample (called “augmentation sample”) was drawn for the purpose of administering the NSCH interview, but without going through the NIS first.

The next two sections describe the basic NIS sample design and serve as a non-technical description of NSCH sample design and allocation procedures. Appendix I of this report includes a more technical description of NSCH and NSAP sample design and weighting procedures. For more detail on the NIS sample design, readers are encouraged to refer to chapter 2 of the 2007 Methodology Report for the National Immunization Survey (8), which is available from NCHS. Further information regarding the NIS itself can be found in National Immunization Survey: The Methodology of a Vaccination Surveillance System (9) and online (<http://www.cdc.gov/nis>).

The National Immunization Survey sampling plan

The NIS was established to monitor vaccination levels of very young children within states and local areas. These “estimation areas” are non-overlapping and cover the U.S., and each estimation area is enclosed within the borders of a single state. In effect, each quarter-year the NIS conducts a separate survey in each estimation area, using a common sample design. The target number of completed interviews in each sampling area reflects the goal of obtaining equally precise estimates in each estimation area. If necessary, the target for a sampling area in each quarter is adjusted to compensate for its total shortfall or excess in the previous quarters.

The target population for the NIS is children aged 19 to 35 months, the primary targets of immunization programs. Because less than 5 percent of households in the United States contain children in this age

range, the NIS screens over 1 million households per year to identify a sufficient number of households with eligible children. SLAITS modules use this NIS screening sample.

The NIS uses the list-assisted method of RDD (10,11). This method selects a random sample of telephone numbers from “banks” of 100 consecutive telephone numbers (e.g., 773-256-0000 to 773-256-0099) that contain at least one directory-listed residential telephone number. The sampling frame of telephone numbers is updated each quarter to reflect new telephone exchanges and area codes. Although the number of cellular telephone users in the U.S. has increased rapidly, most households with children continue to maintain land-line telephone service (12). Also, most cellular telephone users pay for incoming calls. Therefore, the NIS sampling frame excluded cellular telephone exchanges in 2007.

NSCH sample design and allocation

The number of children to be selected for NSCH in each NIS sampling area was determined by allocating the total sample size of children in the state to each sampling area within the state in proportion to the total estimated number of households with children in the sampling area. Given this allocation, the number of households that needed to be screened in each sampling area was calculated using the expected proportion of households with children under 18 years of age in the area. Then, the number of telephone lines that needed to be called was computed using the expected working residential number rate, accounting for expected nonresponse.

Drawing the sample

After the number of telephone lines necessary to achieve the target number of interviews in each area had been estimated, the samples were drawn. The sample draw proceeded in three steps. First, telephone lines were sampled in each area as described above. A portion of these telephone lines in each area was flagged to be part of the NIS Teen sample, a sample designed to assess the vaccination coverage of teenagers. Next, a portion of the telephone lines in each area was flagged to be part of the NSCH sample. Thus, after these steps, every telephone line to be called for NIS screening fell into one of four categories: (1) NIS-only, (2) NIS and Teen, (3) NIS and NSCH, or (4) NIS, Teen, and NSCH. An effort was made to flag both Teen and NSCH for as few telephone lines as possible, but it was necessary have some overlap between the two sample segments in quarter 1 of 2008.

In nine states (Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, Montana, North Dakota, Oklahoma and Utah), there was insufficient NIS sample available to obtain the desired number of NSCH completed interviews. Therefore, samples of additional telephone lines were drawn in these states and categorized as NSCH-only sample. Table A shows the proportion of the total NSCH sample that was augmented for each state. That is, for each state in Table A, the proportion listed is the proportion of the total sample called only for NSCH and not for NIS.

<Table A here>

Conducting the NSAP interviews

Each telephone number selected for NSCH was called and screened for residential status and the presence of NIS age-eligible children. (The augmentation sample was an exception to this rule, since it was selected and called solely for the NSCH and not the NIS. These households were not screened for NIS age-eligible children.) NIS interviews were conducted if NIS age-eligible children lived in the household. If NIS age-eligible children did not live in the household, interviewers asked if there were any children under age 18 living in the household. Regardless of whether a NIS interview was conducted, if there were children in the household, one child was randomly selected to be the subject of the NSCH interview. If there was only one child in the household, that child was selected as the subject of the interview.

Households were called and interviews were administered from April 5, 2007 through July 27, 2008. In quarter 4 of 2007, the NIS began a separate survey of vaccination rates among teenagers, the “NIS Teen” survey. A national NIS Teen sample was fielded in quarter 4 of 2007, and state-based sampling began in quarter 1 of 2008. During this one quarter, some households were flagged to receive both the NIS Teen and the NSCH interviews (if eligible). Once the NSCH interview had been completed, if the selected NSCH child was found to be eligible for NSAP (i.e., the child was adopted, the adoption had been finalized, no biological parents of the child lived in the household, and the NSCH respondent spoke English), an attempt was made to conduct an NSAP interview about that child.

With the exception of the possible NIS Teen/NSCH overlap in quarter 1 of 2008, the sampling and interviewing process described above applied to the entire data collection period except for the first quarter of 2007. For quarter 1 of 2007, after the telephone numbers were called and finalized for the NIS, a subsample of this initially-selected sample was drawn, and it was this subsample that was dialed for NSCH interviewing. Because the numbers in Quarter 1 of 2007 were first allowed to finalize for the NIS before being subsampled and called back at a later date to attempt NSCH interviews, this sample is referred to as the “banked” sample. More detail regarding the reason the sample was banked and the subsampling scheme can be found in Appendix II.

Questionnaire

Content

The NSAP interview contained sections covering the six topics described below. A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix III.

1. Adoption-eligibility screening and demographic characteristics—This section asked about the country of origin (for international adoptions only), relationship of the respondent to the child, current marital status of the adoptive parent(s), adoption agencies involved in the adoption, whether the adoption was an interstate adoption, and questions regarding the foster parent(s) and length of stay if the adoptive parent was a foster parent to the child prior to adoption. Demographic data collected on the NSCH were not repeated on the NSAP interview.

2. Characteristics—The Characteristics section gathered information about the adopted child and his/her situation before adoption, including age at adoption finalization, age at first placement in home, whether the child ever lived with birth family or had birth siblings, whether the child had any of several behavioral disorders or developmental problems, whether the child had needed treatment from mental health professionals, had used alcohol or drugs (asked only for teens), had been arrested (asked only for teens), or had been pregnant (asked only for teens), and the child’s native language and education experiences. In addition, this section gathered information about the adoptive parent(s), including whether the adoptive parent(s) had their own biological children, their reasons for adopting, what types of adoption they considered, their reasons for choosing a specific type of adoption, and whether they chose activities or moved because of the child’s race or culture. This section also collected data on information provided to the adoptive parent(s) before adoption, including whether it was an open adoption; whether there was any relationship with the birth family; the level of involvement of adoption attorneys or caseworkers; and whether any psychological report, medical history, or educational records were provided.

3. Parent and child well-being—The next section gathered data on the relationship of the respondent with the adopted child in terms of affection, understanding, distance, and trust; the child’s relations with other members of the family; the child’s feelings about being adopted; whether the respondent would recommend adoption to others based on their experience; whether the child had spent time away from home due to behavioral issues; and whether the respondent had thought about or taken action on ending the adoption and, if applicable, what their reasons were for wanting to end the adoption.

4. Adoption agreement and post-adoption financial services—This section inquired about the existence of an adoption agreement and a monthly subsidy; the total costs associated with adoption; the respondent’s Medicaid experience; the mental health care needs of the child; mental health medications; dental care needs; medical care needs including vision and hearing; who paid for all of these services for the adopted child; and the federal tax credit for adoption.

5. Post-adoption non-financial supports—This section contained questions on post-adoption services, adoption support groups for the adopted child, adoption support groups for the respondent or his/her spouse/partner, mental health care or counseling for the adopted child, family counseling, crisis counseling, alcohol or drug evaluation/treatment for the adopted child, education and childcare services, respite care, residential treatment or psychiatric care, and information or education received about adoption.

6. Final demographics—This section collected other demographics not previously collected in the NSCH, including the year of the respondent’s birth, the year of the respondent’s spouse’s/partner’s birth, ethnicity and race of the respondent and of the spouse/partner, and the respondent’s employment status.

Significant changes during data collection

During the course of data collection, a number of changes were made to the questionnaire in order to improve the quality of data collected and to address concerns voiced by respondents and/or interviewers.

The first significant changes occurred in quarter 3 of 2007 and involved the following items or scripts:

- Skip logic concerning Question S3_N was modified to accept answer fills from NSCH if the parent had reported having a partner during administration of the NSCH.
- Introductory text for questions C12_INTRO, C22A, C23A_N, and C24A was modified to highlight the focus of these questions as separate and distinct from question C12.
- Question W13 was repositioned so that it would be asked immediately after W8. This improved the questionnaire flow as questions with the same response options were grouped together.
- Skip logic was incorporated at F3. If the parent had previously indicated that he/she did not receive a monthly subsidy payment, question F3 was skipped.
- Skip logic was added to questions N14aa1 through N14aa4. If a parent indicated that a particular health insurance carrier paid for all expenses related to residential treatment, then the CATI instrument did not ask whether other types of insurance covered the costs.
- At the beginning of Quarter 3, the estimated interview length provided to parents in the informed consent script was modified downward from 40 minutes to 35 minutes. On July 18, 2008, this estimate was further modified from 35 minutes to “about half an hour.”

An additional change occurred in quarter 1 of 2008:

- The skip logic for CPC12C and CPC12E was rewritten to indicate which respondents should answer C12C and C12E, respectively, rather than which respondents should be directed away from these questions. The modification allowed these questions to be asked only when appropriate.

Other minor questionnaire changes made during the course of data collection are described in Appendix IV.

CATI programming

The NSAP was conducted using a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system. The CATI data collection software presents the questionnaire on a computer screen to each interviewer. The program guides the interviewer through the questionnaire, automatically routing to the appropriate questions based on answers to previous questions. Interviewers enter survey responses directly into the computer; the CATI program determines whether the selected response is within an allowable range and saves the responses in a survey data file. Online help screens and text are available to aid interviewers. This data collection technology reduces the time required for transferring, processing, and releasing data, and ensures accurate questionnaire flow.

The NSAP questionnaire was programmed as a module of the NIS and NSCH, integrating the surveys into a single interview. As noted above, the instrument made full use of the CATI system’s ability to check whether a response was within a legitimate range and to follow skip patterns. It also filled state-specific information in questions as applicable (for example, names of state health insurance programs), and employed “pick lists” for response categories. Certain household and demographic questions were

identical in the NIS, NSCH, and NSAP portions of the interview. If a respondent answered these questions during NIS or NSCH administration, the system was programmed so that the questions were not repeated in NSAP. Instead, the answers to these questions in the NIS or NSCH were copied to the data file for NSAP, as appropriate. Once initial programming was completed, the instrument underwent rigorous testing to ensure correct functioning of the CATI system.

Interviewer training

NORC conducted all interviews for the NSAP. Interviewer training was conducted by NORC staff at the production center located in Chicago, IL. All interviewers selected to attend the training were previously-certified staff. In all, 32 NSAP interviewers were trained at the Chicago production center in April 2007, and all 32 passed the training.

Training sessions

The interviewer training sessions (for both pretest and main survey) began with an introduction and project overview. Interviewers were informed about project goals, the purpose and importance of the study, study sponsors, and the study design. A review of the screener and each section of the questionnaire were conducted, with emphasis on quality data collection. The relationship between NSCH and NSAP was also covered.

Several cooperation-gaining exercises were conducted throughout the training to ensure that interviewers were equipped to answer frequently asked questions (FAQs) and handle refusals. Part of the exercises included a review of the FAQs and other Job Aids provided for interviewers.

Mock interviews

Two types of mock interviews were used during training: demo and round robin. The demo mock interviews were led by the trainer and focused on the screener and on gaining cooperation. The first round robin mock interview was integrated into a section-by-section lecture that progressed through the questionnaire. The interviewers would first listen to a lecture regarding each section, and then practice moving through that section in CATI before moving on to a discussion about the next section. This method ensured that interviewers became acclimated to the questionnaire, navigating CATI, and gaining cooperation as new topics were introduced.

Two additional round robin mock interviews were then conducted that simulated real interviewing situations in real time. In one case a privately-adopted child was the subject of the interview, and the second case focused on a foster care adoption. Each mock interview was designed to highlight various sections of the screener and the main questionnaire, and to provide different cooperation-gaining scenarios.

Data collection

Pretesting

A pretest of the CATI instrument was fielded in December, 2006. A total of 61 completed interviews were obtained over the course of three days from a sample of volunteers. This volunteer pool of adoptive parents was compiled through a snowball sample. Emails were sent to NORC staff and NCHS staff, and then on to any friends or relatives who had adopted children or knew someone who had adopted children.

The NSCH instrument was administered first. The administration time for the NSCH interview averaged 32 minutes for all NSCH pretest respondents, and the administration time for the NSAP interview averaged 40 minutes. Based on results from the CATI pretest, changes were made to the instrument and the production version was finalized. See Appendix V for further details.

Advance letters

An advance letter was mailed prior to any telephone calls when a mailing address could be identified for a sampled telephone number. Letters were mailed for 58.8% of the telephone numbers dialed by the interviewers, which was 31.0 percent of the telephone numbers randomly generated. (Some known business and nonworking telephone numbers are removed from the sample of randomly generated telephone numbers prior to dialing.) In the letter, recipients were asked to participate in a voluntary study on the immunization status of their children and the types of health and related services that their children need and use. The letter advised recipients that their telephone number had been chosen randomly and indicated that they might be called in the next few weeks. A toll-free telephone number was provided for those who wished to participate immediately or to learn more about the study. NSAP letters sent to households are shown in Appendix VI.

Toll-free telephone number

A toll-free telephone line established for both the NSCH and NSAP surveys offered respondents the flexibility to call at their convenience if they had questions about the survey, wanted to complete the interview, or wished to submit feedback on any aspect of the survey. The telephone line was an especially useful resource for NSAP-eligible households that had already devoted time to NSCH and wanted to complete NSAP at another time. Advance letters, incentive letters, answering machine scripts, and closing scripts referenced the toll-free number, and interviewers provided the number to respondents who requested such a resource during the interview.

The telephone line was answered by interviewers trained on NSCH and who subsequently connected the respondent to an NSAP-trained interviewer. During the course of the survey, 80 NSAP cases made calls to the toll-free line, with 52 of those cases ultimately completing the survey.

Selection of sampled child

The child selected for NSCH, if identified as an adopted child during the NSCH interview, was then selected for the NSAP interview. During the NSCH interview, households were screened for the presence

of children less than 18 years of age. The ages of all children living or staying in the household were then rostered. If a household only had one child, that child was selected as the focus of the interview by default. In households with multiple children, one child was randomly selected to be the focus of the interview. To be eligible for NSAP, the NSCH selected child's adoption had to have been finalized and no biological parents of the child could be living in the household (to exclude step-parent adoptions). In addition, the NSCH interview had to have been completed in English. Of the 2,778 NSCH interviews regarding an adopted child with a fully completed NSAP screener, 2,737 conducted the NSCH interview in English (98.5 percent). Of the 41 cases who completed NSCH about an adopted child in another language, 40 were done in Spanish and one in Cantonese. These households were ineligible for NSAP.

Selection of respondent

Participation was limited to the adoptive mother or adoptive father of the selected child. Most often, the mother of the adopted child completed NSAP. The parent who completed NSCH was most likely to complete NSAP, although this was not a requirement of NSAP participation. Table B shows the frequency distribution of the relationship of study respondents to the sampled child.

<Table B here>

Informed consent

Upon conclusion of NSCH, the interviewer informed the respondent that the household was eligible to complete NSAP because the respondent or another household member was the sampled child's adoptive parent. If the interviewer was trained to conduct NSAP interviews and the adoptive parent was available and willing to complete NSAP at that time, then the interviewer confirmed that he/she was speaking to the child's adoptive mother or father and read the NSAP informed consent script. If the interviewer was an NSCH interviewer not trained in NSAP interviewing or the adoptive parent was unable to complete NSAP immediately after NSCH, the interviewer arranged to call the respondent at a later time. During the subsequent call, the NSAP interviewer confirmed that he/she was speaking to the child's adoptive parent and then read the informed consent script. Verbal consent for study participation was documented in the CATI system.

The informed consent script explained to respondents the voluntary nature of the survey, assured them that their responses would be kept confidential, and indicated that there was no penalty for not answering questions and that participation had no effect on any benefits the family might receive. In addition, the informed consent statement provided information about the expected interview duration. Respondents were also told that they would receive \$25 (or \$30 if the household had met certain refusal pattern benchmarks, described below) in appreciation of their time. Finally, the respondents were also told that the interview might be recorded and monitored by a supervisor for quality purposes.

During the course of data collection the expected interview duration was revised to reflect actual average administration times. The consent script originally informed adoptive parents that the NSAP interview

would require approximately 40 minutes to complete. At the beginning of Q3/2007, the interview duration time was revised to 35 minutes and then further revised to “about half an hour” on July 18, 2007.

Beginning with Q4/2007, the monetary incentive was offered immediately before informing respondents of the interview duration. In all previous quarters, the monetary incentive was offered after respondents were informed of the interview duration.

In accordance with HHS regulations (45 CFR 46), these procedures were reviewed by the NCHS Research Ethics Review Board (ERB) and the NORC Institutional Review Board (IRB). Approval for data collection was received in December 2006 from the NCHS ERB and in November 2006 from the NORC IRB. The federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number for this collection of information was 0920-0406.

Assurance of confidentiality

Participation in surveys conducted by NCHS is voluntary, and information collected on individuals is confidential. For NSAP, assurance of confidentiality was provided to potential respondents as part of the informed consent procedures. In the CATI system, interviewers acknowledged that they had read the following statement to respondents:

Before we continue, I'd like you to know that taking part in this research is voluntary. You may choose not to answer any questions you don't wish to answer or end the interview at any time. Whether or not you take part in this survey has no effect on benefits and no known risks. We are required by Federal law to develop and follow strict procedures to protect your information and use your answers only for statistical research. I can describe these laws if you wish. The survey will take about half an hour. In appreciation for your time, we will send you \$25/\$30. In order to review my work, my supervisor may record and listen as I ask the questions. I'd like to continue now unless you have any questions.

If respondents requested to hear more about the Federal laws, they were read the following statements:

The Public Health Service Act is Volume 42 of the US Code, Section 242k. The collection of information in this survey is authorized by Section 306 of this Act. The confidentiality of your responses is assured by Section 308d of this Act and by the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act.

If respondents had any additional questions or concerns, they were directed to the project web site for more information: www.cdc.gov/nchs/slaits.

When NCHS (including its contractors and agents) collect personally identifiable information under a pledge of confidentiality for exclusively statistical purposes, Section 308d of the Public Health Service Act and Section 512b of the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act (CIPSEA)

require that confidentiality be maintained without exception. Violations of CIPSEA are a class E felony, punishable by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, a fine not more than \$250,000, or both. Strict procedures are used by NCHS, its data collection contractors, and other agents to prevent disclosure of confidential data in survey operations and data dissemination.

Interview length

The average NSAP interview length was 30 minutes, 46 seconds, and the median time was 29 minutes, 24 seconds. Mean and median interview lengths appear in Table C.

<Table C here>

Interview breakoffs

For households that terminated the interview before completion, interviewers attempted to convert incomplete interviews into completed interviews. Not all of these interviews were refusals, but refusal conversion techniques were applied because adoption is relatively rare, and therefore every case was very valuable. By the end of data collection, 152 interviews were completed with households that had initially refused to participate (7.3 percent of completed interviews).

There were 648 NSAP-eligible households in which an interview was not completed (23.7 percent of NSAP-eligible households). At the end of the NSCH interview, the NSAP interview was explained to eligible respondents and the interviewer attempted to schedule an appointment for the NSAP interview. Of these 648 households, 263 scheduled a time for the NSAP interview. However, only 21 were reached on call back and provided informed consent for the NSAP interview. Of the 385 households that did not schedule a time for the NSAP interview, only 13 were reached on call back and provided informed consent for the NSAP interview. For the 34 cases that gave consent to do the interview, there was little commonality in the location of the questionnaire where the interview was terminated.

Cases pending at close of data collection

Most of the cases pending at the end of data collection were those in which the telephone number had not yet been resolved as residential or nonresidential (79.0% of pending cases and 15.9% of the initial sample of telephone lines). A smaller number of cases had been resolved as households without age eligibility being determined (13.1 percent of pending cases and 2.6% of the initial sample). Of all age-eligible households, 32.6% had not completed the NSAP screener (7.8% of pending cases and 1.6% of the initial sample). Finally, 23.7% of all NSAP-eligible cases had not completed the interview (0.11% of pending cases and 0.02% of the initial sample). Table D shows the final dispositions of cases. See Appendix VII for more detailed information about the final disposition of cases.

<Table D here>

Incentive effort

All cases eligible for NSAP were offered a \$25 incentive to complete the interview. In addition, NSAP executed its refusal-based incentive model beginning in September 2007. The NSAP incentive model was

akin to the NSCH incentive model in that eligibility for both models was based on similar household call history patterns, the process by which incentives were offered was comparable, and an expanded incentive effort was ultimately implemented in both surveys. Two types of incentives, active refusal and passive refusal, were offered to eligible households. Completion rates for the active and passive refusal incentive cases were 33.2% and 37.5%, respectively. A more detailed description of the NSAP incentive model, the process by which cases were offered incentives, and relevant response rates is included in Appendix VIII.

Response rates

Response rates provide one measure of the potential for nonresponse bias – that is, the possibility that the sample interviewed differs from the actual population in some meaningful way. The NSAP weighted response rate, calculated nationally, reflects the potential for bias in the sample of children for whom the NSAP interview was completed. The response rate, based on the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) guidelines, was calculated in accordance with the American Association for Public Opinion Research’s Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys (13) and using the assumptions for Response Rate #3 detailed by Ezzati-Rice et al. (14). Table E gives the weighted national NSAP response rate. The response rate was calculated as the product of component completion rates, which are discussed below.

<Table E here>

Resolution rate

Response rates for telephone surveys are typically lower than response rates for household in-person surveys because some telephone numbers ring with no indication of whether the number belongs to a household or a business. The national resolution rate, which measures the proportion of sampled telephone numbers that could be identified as residential or non-residential, was 81.9%. When called, the majority of the unresolved telephone numbers rang with no answer. Most of the other unresolved numbers either reached persons or machines who “hung up” before identifying themselves or reached answering machines that provided no indication of whether the caller reached a residence or a business.

Age-screener completion rate

After a telephone number was determined to belong to a household, an attempt was made to screen that household for the presence of children under 18 years of age. Each household was first screened for NIS eligibility; that is, each household was screened for the presence of children of age 19 to 35 months (augmentation sample households were not screened for the NIS and so were age-screened only during the rostering portion of NSCH). If a household was age-eligible for the NIS, then the household was also considered to be age-eligible for NSCH and NSAP. If a household was age-ineligible for the NIS, then that household’s eligibility for NSCH and NSAP was unknown and the CATI system proceeded to the rostering portion of NSCH. If the respondent then indicated that the household contained children under age 18, the household was considered to be age-eligible for NSCH and NSAP. If during the NIS screener

or during the NSCH rostering the household indicated that they had no children whatsoever, the household was considered to be age-ineligible for NSCH and NSAP.

For some households, it was never determined whether or not the household contained children under age 18; that is, some households did not complete the age-screener. The age-screener completion rate is defined as the proportion of identified households for which it was determined whether children under age 18 were living or staying there. The national age-screener completion rate was 86.4%.

NSCH interview completion rate

After it had been determined that a household contained children under 18 years of age, a child was randomly chosen from the household, and an attempt was made to conduct the NSCH interview about the selected child. The interview was considered to have been completed if Section 6: Early Childhood (for selected children aged 0-5 years) or Section 7: Middle Childhood and Adolescence (for selected children aged 6-17 years) of the NSCH interview was completed.

Not all households containing a child completed the NSCH interview. The NSCH interview completion rate is defined as the proportion of age-eligible households that completed Section 6 or Section 7 of the NSCH interview. The national NSCH interview completion rate was 66.0%.

NSAP screener completion rate

For each child with a completed NSCH interview, an attempt was made to screen the child for NSAP eligibility. That is, an attempt was made to determine whether the child was legally adopted, and if so, whether the adoption had been finalized, whether a biological parent lived in the household, and whether the NSCH interview was conducted in English.

NSAP eligibility status was not determined for all children with a completed NSCH interview, because some partially-completed NSCH interviews ended before reaching the questions that determined NSAP eligibility and some respondents did not answer the NSAP-eligibility questions. The NSAP screener completion rate is defined as the proportion of children with a completed NSCH interview that were successfully screened for NSAP eligibility. The national NSAP screener completion rate (given a completed NSCH interview) was 99.5%.

NSAP interview completion rate

After it had been determined that the child with a completed NSCH interview was NSAP eligible, an attempt was made to conduct the NSAP interview about the child. The interview was considered to be complete if the respondent finished “Section F: Adoption Agreement and Post Adoption Services – Financial” of the NSAP interview.

The NSAP interview was not completed for all children determined to be NSAP eligible. The NSAP interview completion rate is defined as the proportion of identified NSAP-eligible children for whom

Section F of the NSAP interview was completed. The national NSAP interview completion rate was 74.4%.

Because the NSAP response rate is largely dependent on the underlying rates for the NSCH, some researchers may wish to report a cooperation rate that focuses solely on the NSAP, to more closely indicate the response propensity of identified eligible adoptive parents. In this case, one could consider the NSAP as a list sample of children previously identified as adopted and report the NSAP interview completion rate of 74.4% as the “cooperation rate.”

Overall response rate

The overall response rate is the product of the resolution rate, the age-screener completion rate, the NSCH interview completion rate, the NSAP screener completion rate, and the NSAP interview completion rate. At the national level, the overall response rate was 34.6%. Because of this low overall CASRO response rate, an examination of the potential for non-response bias is presented in Appendix IX.

Alternative response rates

Table F shows an alternative response rate that was calculated by assuming that all non-contact cases – telephone numbers for which all call outcomes were “ring, no answer” or busy signals – are not households. The national alternative resolution rate was 89.9%, increased from the 81.9% resolution rate in Table F because non-contact cases were assumed to be non-residential. The component age-screener completion rate, NSCH interview completion rate, NSAP screener completion rate, and NSAP interview completion rate remain the same, at 86.4%, 66.0%, 99.5%, and 74.4% respectively, because non-contact cases do not enter into the calculation of these rates. Given the alternative resolution rate, the overall alternative response rate, at the national level, was 38.0%.

<Table F here>

Efforts to maximize response rates

Respondent participation was encouraged by sending advance letters, informing respondents of the importance of the survey, offering incentives, and allowing respondents to call a toll-free number at their convenience. Ongoing assessments and modifications of the data collection instrument, data collection procedures, and calling rules were conducted. Integrated sample management teams focused on the NSCH and the NSAP met frequently to manage the sample in an effective and efficient manner.

A pretest was conducted before data collection began in order to understand how respondents would react to personal questions, a lengthy interview, and suspicions of legitimacy and confidentiality, among other issues. After the pretest was conducted and analyzed, NORC worked with NCHS to make specific improvements based on the findings of the pretest. Also, after every quarter of data collection, a list of potential changes to the instrument were reviewed and implemented if necessary. These changes were based on analyses of questionnaire breakoffs and reports from interviewers of problem areas within the questionnaire.

Response rates were monitored throughout the data collection period. In response to findings of certain non-response patterns, the NSCH incentive model was adjusted to target these non-responsive subpopulations. Specially trained refusal converters attempted to convert non-respondents by targeting the case-specific source of the refusal based on the case history. More detailed descriptions of the incentive models, the process by which cases were offered an incentive, and important response rates are included in Appendix VIII.

A toll-free number was maintained and listed in all letters to respondents. This number allowed respondents to participate immediately, ask questions regarding the survey or obtain additional NSCH or NSAP survey-related information.

Quality control

Quality control of interviewing

Telephone center supervisors were available to interviewing staff at all times to resolve any questions or concerns about a case. Supervisors regularly observed the data collection process to monitor interviewers informally. In addition, supervisory staff used remote telephone- and computer-monitoring technology to evaluate whether interviewers performed according to project specifications. This formal monitoring was conducted to ensure that introductory materials were properly read, that item wording and sequence of the questionnaire were followed correctly, that respondent questions were answered properly, and that any vague responses were properly probed. Computer monitoring also allowed supervisors to ascertain whether answers were entered accurately into the CATI system.

All supervisors attended an 8-hour training session that introduced them to the Monitoring Evaluation Form, the Monitoring Database where forms are filled out electronically, and the Monitoring Selection Database where telephone interviewers are prioritized and selected for monitoring. In addition to learning these basics of how to monitor, supervisors participated in an exercise to learn the basics on giving effective feedback and coaching interviewers. After this training session, each new supervisor was scheduled to conduct dual-monitoring sessions for one week with experienced staff. In these sessions, new monitors observed live monitoring side-by-side with an experienced monitor, and each completed a Monitoring Evaluation Form. At the end of each session they compared notes, discussed proper scoring guidelines, and created a strategy for giving feedback. These strategies served to ensure that all supervisors were monitoring interviewers using the same criteria for evaluation.

To avoid bias in selecting whom to monitor, the CATI monitoring system automatically selected which interviewers to monitor. Newly trained interviewers, those with the fewest monitoring sessions, or those with the weakest performance reviews were given the highest priority for selection. Experienced interviewers were prioritized for monitoring based upon the length of time since their last monitoring

session and recent monitoring scores. Each interviewer was typically monitored at least once a week; however, some interviewers were monitored more often.

Throughout data collection interviews were recorded (after gaining agreement from respondents). These recordings were valuable tools for trainings, as well as for providing feedback to interviewers on specific case-related performance. The recordings were kept for four quarters of data collection and then deleted.

Data quality control

The CATI system was programmed to help ensure complete and accurate data collection using automated data checking techniques such as response-value range checks and consistency checks during the interview process. These features enabled interviewers to obtain needed clarifications while still on the telephone with the respondent. Throughout data collection, interview data were reviewed for consistency between fields, appropriate response-value ranges, skip logic patterns, and missing information.

Weighting procedures

This section provides a non-technical overview of the weighting procedures for the NSAP sample. A more detailed and technical description can be found in Appendix I.

Base weight

Since the NSAP sample is obtained from NSCH completed cases, NSAP weighting started with the final NSCH weights. That is, the base weight for the NSAP sample is the final NSCH weight. The final NSCH weights were derived by applying adjustments to account for nonresponse, for households with multiple telephone numbers, and for noncoverage of children in households without landline telephones, as well as adjustments to known population control estimates. For a detailed description of the derivation of the NSCH final weights, readers are referred to the 2007 NSCH Design and Operations Report (7).

Adjustment for incomplete NSAP screener

The goal was for all children with complete NSCH interviews to be screened for NSAP. However, because some NSCH completed cases did not complete the NSAP screener, an adjustment for this nonresponse was applied to cases for which the NSAP screener was completed.

Adjustment cells were formed using the following variables, listed in order of priority:

- age group;
- health insurance; and
- number of children in the household.

Within each adjustment cell, the adjustment factor was computed as the ratio of the sum of base weights for all cases in the adjustment cell to the sum of base weights for all screener completed cases in the adjustment cell. For screener completed cases, the screener weight is obtained by multiplying the base weight and the adjustment factor.

Since the NSAP cases were NSCH interview completes, any missing values of the above variables used in cell formation were already imputed as part of NSCH weighting, and hence, no new imputation was required.

Adjustment for incomplete NSAP Interview

Not all NSAP interview eligible cases completed the NSAP interview. To compensate for nonresponse to the NSAP interview, the weights of the children with complete NSAP interviews were adjusted.

Adjustment cells were formed using the following variables, listed in order of priority:

- type of adoption;
- age group; and
- race/ethnicity.

Within each adjustment cell, the adjustment factor was computed as the ratio of the sum of screener weights for all interview eligible cases in the adjustment cell to the sum of screener weights for all interview completed cases in the adjustment cell. For interview completed cases, the interview adjusted weight is obtained by multiplying the screener weight and the adjustment factor.

Raking adjustment

Finally, a raking adjustment was applied to the NSAP interview complete cases. Since there are no external control totals on adopted children, this raking adjustment only ensured that the sums of weights before and after the NSAP interview nonresponse adjustment were equal in terms of the raking variables. That is, the control totals were obtained by summing NSAP screener weights within selected categories for all NSAP eligible cases.

Raking adjustment was done using the following margins within each census region:

- number of male and female adopted children within each of three age groups;
- number of adopted children by type of adoption (international, foster, private) within each of three age groups;
- race/ethnicity;
- number of adopted children in households by highest reported education in the household;
- number of children in households by household income; and
- number of adopted children in MSA and non-MSA areas.

After raking, any extreme weights were trimmed, and then, the weights were re-raked. This process was iterated until there were no extreme weights after raking. The raking and trimming process produced a final weight for each child with a complete NSAP interview.

Quality control

Staff compared the formulas for the weights and adjustments developed by the sampling statistician with the actual weights and adjustments constructed by the statistical programmer. An independent check was performed on the programmer's implementation of the statistician's weighting specifications.

Imputation of relevant variables

Since NSAP cases were NSCH interview completes, any variables that needed imputation for the NSAP weighting process were already imputed as part of NSCH weighting, and hence, no new imputation was required.

Public use data file

One public use data file was created using SAS version 9.1. The file included data from complete interviews (complete through Section F: Adoption Agreement and Post Adoption Services - Financial) that were conducted in 2007 and 2008. In order to maintain confidentiality, certain variables that could be used to identify respondents were excluded from the file.

The file contains one record for each child who was randomly selected to be the subject of the interview. This file (n = 2,089) contains data on adopted child and family characteristics, parent and child well-being, adoption agreement and post-adoption financial services, and post-adoption non-financial supports. Of the 2,089 records, 2,083 cases completed the full interview, and 6 are partially completed interviews (partially completed interviews were treated as complete and included in the data file as long as Section F of the interview was completed).

Editing

As discussed in the Data quality control section, the CATI system was designed to perform edits as an interviewer entered data into the computer system. To prevent interviewer error, the CATI system was developed to include range and consistency checks. If an interviewer entered something 'out of range,' a warning screen would appear, instructing the interviewer that the data would not be accepted and that they would have to re-enter the response to the question. For example, the acceptable range for C1A, "How old was [S.C.] when [his/her] adoption was finalized?," is from 0 to 17 years, 0 to 12 months, and 0 to 52 weeks. If an interviewer entered a value outside these ranges, such as 13 months or greater, a warning screen would appear saying "Please, enter value between 0 and 12." Another consistency check also had to do with the child's age at adoption finalization. For example, a respondent might mistakenly report or the interviewer might mistakenly enter the child's age at adoption as older than the child's current age. In that event, a consistency check would appear indicating the discrepancy: "[S.C.]'s age when [his/her] adoption was finalized must be less than or equal to child's age." Even with many built-in CATI checks, data cleaning was still necessary. Invalid values were deleted and missing values were investigated. On rare occasions, certain data were not collected correctly, but based on related questions, the missing data were easy to determine. The most important part of data cleaning was making sure that each selected child's type of adoption was assigned based on the NSAP screener questions. Finally,

missing data had to be determined to be the result of a legitimate skip, a partially completed interview, or data that actually were missing in error. Questionnaire variables in the public use file that have been altered in any way after data collection, either due to cleaning or other editing steps described below, have had the letter “R” appended to the variable name to denote “recode.”

Missing data

Missing data are not desirable when doing analyses and are often ignored completely by data analysts. However, it is very helpful to know why data are missing. The following codes have been used in the interview file to give analysts as much information as possible on why certain data are missing.

(.A) Added question

Variable is missing because this question was added after the start of data collection and the interview was conducted before the question was added.

(.D) Deleted question

Variable is missing because this question was removed after the start of data collection and the interview was conducted after the question was deleted.

(.L) Legitimate skip

Variable is missing due to valid questionnaire paths based on a previous answer to a root question.

(.M) Missing in error

Variable is missing due to interviewer or system errors. In cases of interviewer error, the interviewer may have deleted the data by accident or simply may have not answered the question. In cases of system error, the data may not have been collected or saved properly after they were entered by the interviewer in the CATI system.

(.P) Partially completed interview

Variable is missing because the respondent hung up after completing Section F but before completing the full interview.

Derived variables do not include the detailed coding of missing data. Missing values for derived variables received an “.M” code regardless of the reason for the missing data.

Coding of verbatim answers into question responses

For many questions in the NSAP interview, respondents provided a response that did not match any pre-existing category. If this occurred, the interviewer chose “other” and typed in the response provided by the respondent. At the end of the data collection period verbatim responses were recoded into existing response categories where appropriate.

There were three ways in which verbatim responses were used to recode or back-code data:

- Some verbatim responses were back-coded to existing response categories on the preceding question;
- Some verbatim responses were used to create new response categories for the preceding question, which are indicated by new dummy variables;
- Some verbatim responses were used to create new variables to capture the data because no root question existed for which to create new categories or back-code verbatim responses into preexisting categories.

More detail about coding of verbatim responses is provided in Appendix X.

Edits to protect confidentiality

NCHS takes extraordinary measures to assure that the identities of survey subjects cannot be disclosed. The risk of inadvertent disclosure of confidential information regarding individual respondents is higher with a publicly released data set having detailed geography variables, a detailed and extensive set of survey observations, and a sizable proportion of the total population of interest. Coarsening a data set by suppressing survey variables, collapsing multiple variables into one, collapsing response categories for other variables, and/or introduction of noise in the data are common techniques to reduce the risk of inadvertent disclosure.

The NSAP data face a special challenge in assuring the confidentiality of respondents. The base survey data, from the NSCH, includes state identifiers on the public use file. The NSAP's national sample size of 2,089 is too small to release state identifiers, as the risk of disclosure would be increased. This also means that the public use NSAP data cannot be linkable to the public use NSCH data, as such linkage would allow the state identifiers to be attached to the NSAP data file.

To prevent the linkage of the public use files for the NSAP and NSCH, the following steps were taken: for all NSCH variables that were included on the NSAP public use file (n), and all common data elements that exist on both public use files (m), $(n+m)$ -way cross-tabulations were examined to identify any NSAP case with a particular combination of characteristics that could be uniquely matched to an NSCH case with the same combination of characteristics. Whenever five or fewer NSCH cases existed as potential matches to a single NSAP case, the NSCH and NSAP sampling weights were examined to determine if differences in the order of magnitude in sampling weights could be used to conclusively identify which of the 5 or fewer cases was the exact match to the NSAP case (although the NSAP sampling weight does not equal the NSCH sampling weight, a hypothetical single NSAP case with an NSAP weight of 65 that had two potential matching NSCH cases, with NSCH sampling weights of 60 and 2,500, respectively, could be deduced to match to the first of those two NSCH cases).

To reduce the number of $(n+m)$ common data elements between the two public use files, NSAP variables C46 and C47 (which could be combined to derive a match to NSCH variable K2Q34A, whether the respondent was ever told the child had behavioral or conduct problems such as Oppositional Defiant Disorder or Conduct Disorder) were dropped from the NSAP public use file. The age of the child at

interview was also collapsed to six categories (0-2 years; 3-4 years; 5-9 years; 10-12 years; 13-14 years; 15-17 years), and household income relative to the federal poverty level (FPL) was collapsed to five categories (0-100% of FPL; >100-200%; >200-300%; >300-400%; >400%) in the NSAP file to reduce the number of data points that could be used to match to the NSCH. In addition, NSCH variable K11Q33 (which indicates whether the child was born out of the United States or not) was perturbed in the NSCH public use file such that children adopted internationally were recoded from “born out of the U.S.” to “born in the U.S.” to prevent this data point from being used to help identify NSAP cases in the NSCH (the NSCH public use file does not identify the adoptive status of children).

NSAP variables C8A, C8C, C9A, C9C, and C9E (which indicate the exact number of children of various types in the household) and variables indicating the specific race and ethnicity of both the respondent and the respondent’s spouse/partner (N24, N24A, N25, and N25A) were dropped from the NSAP public use file to prevent them being used to specifically identify a household based on detailed family structure. Variables indicating whether the sample child had had any biological children (C52) and the age of the child when action to end the adoption was taken (W20B) were dropped from the NSAP public use file because they were extremely rare and potentially observable. Additionally, a few records were perturbed as described below. These edits ensure that no NSAP case in the public use file can be matched to its respective NSCH record in the NSCH public use file with certainty.

Geography

The NSAP public use data contains no geographic identifiers of any kind. Although State is identified on the NSCH public use file, it is not possible to match NSAP respondents to their respective NSCH records using only the NSAP and NSCH public use files.

Race

NSCH Question K11Q02 asked about the sample child’s race. Respondents were permitted to identify all possible categories that described the child’s race. If a race other than one of the seven existing categories was indicated, then a verbatim response was captured. Verbatim responses were reviewed and matched against a database of alternative race terminology maintained by the U.S. Census Bureau. Where possible, “other” race responses were backcoded into one of the seven existing categories. Once all possible verbatim responses were backcoded, a new race variable was created by collapsing the seven categories into six categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Multiple Race. “Multiple Race” was reserved for those cases where more than one of the other five categories applied. If the respondent did not know or refused to provide the race, then race was coded as missing. Cases where a verbatim response could not be conclusively backcoded (e.g., American, Indian, Jewish) and no other race was reported were also coded as missing.

To reduce the number of common data elements and prevent the matching of NSAP records to their respective NSCH records, race was combined with Hispanic ethnicity for the NSAP public use file, as described below for derived variable HISPRACE.

Top-coded and collapsed variables

Several other variables have been top-coded to conceal the values of outliers at the high end of the distribution of responses or collapsed to coarsen the detail of the measurement. Due to their unusual characteristics, records including this detail might have been more readily identifiable.

- The country of origin (S1_NR) has been collapsed such that countries other than China, Russia, Guatemala and South Korea are grouped by continent: Other: Africa; Other: Asia; Other: Europe; Other: Central America; Other: South America; and Other.
- The time between when the child was placed in the home and when adoption became the case goal (S11_MONTHS) is measured in months, and 60 months or more is the maximum reported.
- The child's age when the adoption was finalized (C1AR) is collapsed into the following categories: 0 years; 1 year; 2 years; 3 years; 4-5 years; 6-7 years; 8-10 years; 11 years and older.
- The child's age when first placed in the home (C1BR) is collapsed into the following categories: 0 years; 1 year; 2-3 years; 4-5 years; 6-8 years; 9 years and older.
- Responses of "another adoptive family" and "a residential treatment facility" for the place where the child lived prior to placement (C2_NR) have been collapsed with "other."
- For respondents who were themselves adopted as children, the respondent's age at adoption (C15A_MONTHS) is measured in months, and 120 months or more is the maximum reported.
- For respondents' spouses/partners who were themselves adopted as children, the respondent's spouse's/partner's age at adoption (C15C_MONTHS) is measured in months, and 60 months or more is the maximum reported.
- For the number of post-adoption reports filed (C25AAR), 17 or more is the maximum reported.
- For the first language the child spoke (C53R), Korean and Ukrainian have been collapsed into "other."
- For the number of times the child has lived outside the home for two weeks or more (W17AR), 8 or more is the maximum reported.
- The adoption subsidy monthly dollar amount (F4R) has been collapsed into the following categories: \$0-300; \$301-400; \$401-500; \$501-600; \$601-750; \$751-1,000; and >\$1000.
- Respondent's (N23R) and respondent's spouse's/partner's (N23AAR) years of birth have been collapsed into the following categories: <1950; 1950-54; 1955-59; 1960-64; 1965-69; and >1969.
- The calculated year of adoption (YR_ADOPT) has been collapsed into 8 categories: 1990-1992; 1993-1995; 1996-1997; 1998-2000; 2001-2002; 2003-2004; 2005-2006; and 2007-2008.

Data perturbations

As part of the effort to prevent the matching of NSAP records to their respective NSCH records, the following perturbations were made to mask unique combinations of characteristics:

- One case had missing data for household income relative to poverty level (POVLEVEL5) replaced with imputed data.
- Two cases had age at interview (AGEGRP6) changed to an adjacent category.

Analysts interested in working with data that were suppressed to protect confidentiality may apply to access unmodified data files through the NCHS Research Data Centers (RDC). These facilities are located at NCHS headquarters in Hyattsville, Maryland, a Washington, DC suburb, and in Atlanta, Georgia, CDC's home base. Data files housed in an RDC may also be accessed remotely via e-mail or through affiliated Census RDCs. In all cases, the initial proposal to access NSAP data must be submitted to the NCHS RDC in Hyattsville. Analysts should visit the web site at <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/r&d/rdc.htm> for more information.

Derived variables

A number of derived variables appear on the public use data file. The definitions of these variables are provided below. Derived variables from the NSCH interview that were appended to the NSAP public use file are also included.

ADOPT_TYPE – This variable, based on NSCH variables K11Q38 and K11Q40, indicates the selected child's type of adoption (international, foster care, or private domestic).

AGEGRP6 – This variable is a collapsed version of NSCH variable AGEYR_CHILD, and categorizes the child's age at interview into 6 categories of whole years of age: 0-2; 3-4; 5-9; 10-12; 13-14; 15-17.

ANYSIBS – This variable is based on NSCH variable S_UNDR18, which gives the total number of children under 18 years old in the household. ANYSIBS indicates if there are any other children in the household (1) or not (0).

C15A_MONTHS – This variable is based on NSAP variables C15A_YEAR and C15A_MONTH, which give the respondent's age at adoption, for cases in which the adult respondent was also adopted as a child. C15A_MONTHS is measured in months, and top-coded at 120 months or more.

C15C_MONTHS – This variable is based on NSAP variables C15C_YEAR and C15C_MONTH, which give the respondent's spouse's/partner's age at adoption, for cases in which the respondent's spouse/partner was also adopted as a child. C15C_MONTHS is measured in months, and top-coded at 60 months or more.

CSHCN – This variable is based on NSCH variables K2Q10 through K2Q23 and indicates whether or not the child had any of five health care consequences resulting from a medical, behavioral or other health condition that had lasted or was expected to last at least 12 months.

HISPRACE – This variable (based on K11Q01 and K11Q02X01 through K11Q02X08 from the NSCH, including responses back coded from the verbatim variable K11Q02_OS) indicates whether or not the child is of Hispanic or Latino origin, and if not, indicates the race of the child. If the child is of Hispanic or Latino origin, then HISPRACE = 1. If the child is not of Hispanic or Latino origin, then HISPRACE specifies the race of the selected child as of one of 4 categories: non-Hispanic white only (2), non-

Hispanic black only (3), non-Hispanic Asian only (4), and non-Hispanic other (5), including American Indian only, Alaska Native only, Native Hawaiian only, Pacific Islander only, other unknown or multiple races. Twenty-one cases of “don’t know” or “refused” responses have been replaced with imputed values for the NSAP public use file.

POVLEVEL5 – This variable is a collapsed version of NSCH variable **POVERTY_LEVEL**, which is based on total household members (K9Q00) and the household income value. If data for either of these two components are missing, refused, or had a “don’t know” response, this variable is assigned a missing value. Once an income-to-household-size measure is computed, it is compared with DHHS Federal Poverty Guidelines. Appendix VII of the NSCH Design and Operations Report details the derivation of **POVERTY_LEVEL** (7). **POVLEVEL5**, released on the NSAP public file, collapses **POVERTY_LEVEL** into the following five categories: 0-100% of the federal poverty level (FPL); >100-200% FPL; >200-300% FPL; >300-400% FPL; and >400% FPL.

S11_MONTHS – This variable is based on NSAP variables **S11_Y** and **S11_M**, which give the span between the time the child was placed in the home and when adoption became the case goal. **S11_MONTHS** is measured in months, and top-coded at 60 months or more.

SEX – This variable is based on NSCH variable **K1Q01** and specifies the gender of the child. Five cases of “don’t know” or “refused” responses have been replaced with imputed values for the NSAP public use file.

TRANSRACE – This variable is based on NSAP variables **C17_N** and **C17_A** and indicates whether or not the child’s race/ethnicity differs from the race/ethnicity of both parents, or differs from the race/ethnicity of the single parent.

YR_ADOPT– This variable is derived from the date of NSAP interview and the child’s reported age at adoption and age in months at interview. The number of months between the date of adoption and the date of interview were obtained by comparison of the child’s age in months at adoption and age in months at interview, and was subtracted from the century-month code (CMC) of the date of interview to derive the CMC of the date of adoption. This variable has been collapsed as 8 categories: 1990-1992; 1993-1995; 1996-1997; 1998-2000; 2001-2002; 2003-2004; 2005-2006; and 2007-2008.

Dummy variables

When respondents were permitted to provide multiple answers for the same question, a variable was created for each possible answer. The values for these new dummy variables are “yes, this answer was given” and “no, this answer was not given.” When respondents could not or did not provide an answer to the question, a value of “don’t know” or “refused” was reported for each of the dummy variables.

- C10_N is represented by C10_NX01 to C10_NX03;
- W20A is represented by W20AX01 to W20AX03;

- N1D is represented by N1DX01 to N1DX06;
- N2BA is represented by N2BAX01 to N2BAX08;
- N2D is represented by N2DX01 to N2DX05;
- N3B is represented by N3BX01 to N3BX07;
- N3D is represented by N3DX01 to N3DX05;
- N5D is represented by N5DX01 to N5DX09;
- N5F is represented by N5FX01 to N5FX05;
- N6B is represented by N6BX01 to N6BX09;
- N6D is represented by N6DX01 to N6DX07;
- N7B is represented by N7BX01 to N7BX07;
- N7D is represented by N7DX01 to N7DX07;
- N8B is represented by N8BX01 to N8BX08;
- N8D is represented by N8DX01 to N8DX07;
- N9B is represented by N9BX01 to N9BX08;
- N9D is represented by N9DX01 to N9DX06;
- N10BB is represented by N10BBX01 to N10BBX08;
- N10D is represented by N10DX01 to N10DX07;
- N11B is represented by N11BX01 to N11BX07;
- N11D is represented by N11DX01 to N11DX07;
- N12B is represented by N12BX01 to N12BX07;
- N12D is represented by N12DX01 to N12DX07;
- N14BB is represented by N14BBX01 to N14BBX08;
- N14D is represented by N14DX01 to N14DX07;
- N18B is represented by N18BX01 to N18BX07;
- N18D is represented by N18DX01 to N18DX05;
- N24A is represented by N24AX01 to N24AX08; and
- N25A is represented by N25AX01 to N25AX08.

Additional data notes

For 73 cases, a change was made to the original ADOPT_TYPE assignment because information regarding the type of adoption provided by the respondent during the NSAP interview conflicted with similar information provided during the NSCH interview. Derived variable ADOPT_TYPE reflects the later value for these cases.

Beginning in Q3/2007, S3_N was filled based on NSCH variable K9Q17A, if K9Q17A=1 (married) or 2 (living together as partners). Cases that were not asked this question in previous quarters, but would be filled based on the new logic, are set to S3_N=.A (added question). There are 19 such cases.

In Q1/2008, S3_N and S4_N skip logic was modified slightly to have these questions asked if both adoptive parents were reported in the NSCH K9Q12 parent roster (i.e., a non-parent respondent completed the NSCH interview). Five cases in previous quarters have S3_N and/or S4_N set to .A (added question).

As the result of a system error, 14 cases have C9E set to “missing in error.”

In Q1/2008, skip logic was modified at C12C and C12E. Nine cases in previous quarters would have been asked C12C based on the new logic and C12C=.A (added question) for these cases.

After data collection, one case with C15A_YEAR = 31 was recoded such that C15A_YEAR was set to 2 and C15A_MONTH was set to 7.

Three cases with values of 5 or 7 for C15A_WEEK were recoded such that C15A_MONTH was changed from 0 to 1.

During Q2/2007 the skip logic for C42 was revised based on an error found at checkpoint C46. Cases that already finished this section before the skip logic revision, but would have been asked C42 based on the new logic, have C42=.A (added question). There are 41 such cases.

A problem in the skip logic allowed 8 cases (private domestic adoptions) to receive F11A instead of F11B. All 8 cases were set to .L on F11AR; 5 of the 8 cases were in response categories 1 or 2 (that matched to F11B categories) and were coded accordingly on F11BR. The remaining three cases had values of 3 on F11A and are set to .M on F11BR.

A problem in the skip logic for the mental health medication questions (F14A_A, F14A_AA, F16A_A - F16A_EA) was identified late in data collection. Under the following circumstances, the mental health medication questions are set to missing in error:

- 283 cases where NSCH variable K2Q31D=1 (yes), and
- 35 cases where NSCH variable K4Q23=1 (yes) and F16E=0, 6 or 7 (no, don't know, or refused).

Quality control

A team of programmers and project staff were responsible for cleaning data at the end of data collection. The cleaned data were also thoroughly checked by other project staff. Below is a brief description of the steps involved in producing the final data file.

Using the questionnaire specifications, project staff produced several computer programs to review the data and identify data items that required cleaning. These programs were also used during data collection to monitor production. The programming team developed cleaning programs so that the resulting cleaned data file could be replicated and reviewed by others. These programs applied any final data corrections

based on data recovery, checked that skip patterns were followed, created derived variables from questionnaire variables, and assigned special codes to reflect various missing data.

Project staff then ran several quality control checks on the cleaned data file. The project staff cross-checked the cleaned file against an independently prepared data file. Variable frequencies were reviewed to confirm skip patterns, missing code assignments, and expected distributions. Derived variable specifications and computations were carefully reviewed. Variable labels were compared against the questionnaire to confirm accurate label assignments.

The cleaning programs were run on each new version of the data file until no problems were identified in the quality control checks. The reviewer then signed off on the data file. Finally, senior project management reviewed the data file and supporting documents.

Estimation and hypothesis testing

The National Survey of Adoptive Parents data were obtained through a complex sample design involving the selection of a single child per household and stratification of households within states. To produce estimates that are nationally representative of adopted children, sampling weights must be used. These sampling weights account for the unequal probabilities of selection for households and children, and they include adjustments for multiple-telephone households, unit nonresponse, and noncoverage of nontelephone households and households without landline telephones, as well as adjustments to known population control estimates. As described earlier, the sampling weights for NSAP respondents have further been adjusted for nonresponse to the NSAP and re-adjusted to population control estimates for adopted children derived from the 2007 NSCH. Estimates based on the sampling weights generalize to the U.S. population of adopted children 0-17 years of age living in households where English is spoken. These estimates do not generalize to the population of adoptive parents, or the population of adoptive mothers, or the population of adopted children's health care providers.

Variables used for variance estimation

The sample design of the NSAP is complex, and the interview records have unequal weights, so statistical software that assumes simple random sampling will most often compute standard errors that are too low. Tests of statistical hypotheses may then suggest statistically significant differences or associations that are misleading. Computer programs are available that provide the capability of variance estimation for complex sample designs (e.g., SUDAAN, Stata, WesVar). To provide the user with the capability to estimate the complex sample variances for the NSAP data, stratum and primary sampling unit (PSU) identifiers have been provided on the data file. These variables and the sample weights are necessary to properly calculate variances.

The stratum identifiers reported on the data set are not identical to the strata used to draw the main sample. In states with multiple estimation areas, independent samples were drawn from each estimation area in proportion to the total number of households with children in each estimation area. Therefore, these estimation areas should be considered strata for variance estimation. However, disclosure of the

specific estimation area for each child could increase the risk of disclosure of a respondent's or child's identity. In the absence of estimation-area specific identifiers, the NSCH collapsed stratum identifier is the state identifier. By using the state identifier rather than the suppressed estimation area identifier, the standard errors for national and state estimates with key variables are affected only slightly and not in a consistent direction.

The NSAP sample size of 2,089 is considerably smaller than the NSCH sample size of 91,642, and the former is too small to allow for the release of state identifier, as the risk of disclosure of a respondent's or child's identity would be increased. Therefore, the NSAP collapsed stratum identifier (called PSUID) collapses the 51 strata for the 50 states plus Washington, DC into ten categories. The categories were determined by rank-ordering the 51 strata by average sampling weight, and dividing the 51 strata into 10 strata by whole state. Nine categories contain 5 strata, and one category contains 6 strata. By using this collapsed stratum identifier PSUID rather than the suppressed state identifier, the standard errors for national estimates and for estimates by adoption type with key variables are affected only slightly and not in a consistent direction. Households were sampled within strata, and the unique household identifier is called NSAPID.

The overall number of persons in this survey is sufficient for many statistical inference purposes. However, analyses of some rare responses and analyses of subclasses can lead to estimates that are unreliable. Small sample sizes used in the variance calculations may also produce unstable estimates of the variances. Consequently, these analyses require that the user pay particular attention to the variability of estimates of means, proportions, and totals.

Variance estimation using SUDAAN or Stata

Standard errors of estimates from the NSAP can be obtained using the Taylor Series approximation method, available in software such as SUDAAN, SAS, and Stata. The stratum should be identified by the variable PSUID, and the household should be identified by the variable NSAPID.

The simplifying assumption that households have been sampled with replacement allows most complex survey sample design computer programs to calculate standard errors in a straightforward way. This method requires no recoding of design variables, but it is statistically less efficient (and therefore more conservative) than some other methods. For SUDAAN, the data file needs to be sorted by stratum (PSUID) and household (NSAPID). The following SUDAAN design statements are then used for analyses:

- PROC ... DESIGN = WR;
- NEST PSUID NSAPID;
- WEIGHT NSAPWT;

For Stata, the following design statements are used:

- svyset strata PSUID

- svyset psu NSAPID
- svyset pweight NSAPWT
- svyset

Other variance estimation procedures are also applicable to the NSAP. Specifically, the jackknife method with replicate weights and the bootstrap resampling method with replicate weights can also be used (via software such as WesVar) to obtain standard errors that fully reflect the impact of the weighting adjustments on standard errors.

Variance estimation for subsets of the data

Many analyses of the NSAP data will focus on specific population subgroups, such as children adopted internationally or adopted children living with a single parent. Some analysts will therefore be tempted to delete all records outside of the domain of interest in order to work with smaller data files and run computer jobs more quickly. This procedure of keeping only selected records and list-wise deleting other records is called subsetting the data. Subsetted data that are appropriately weighted can be used to generate correct point estimates (e.g., estimates of population subgroup frequencies or means), but most software packages that analyze complex survey data will incorrectly compute standard errors for subsetted data. When complex survey data are subsetted, the sample design structure is often compromised because the complete design information is not available. Subsetting the data can delete important design information needed for variance estimation (e.g., deleting all records for certain subgroups may result in entire PSUs being removed from the design structure). Typically, the standard errors for subsetted data will be inflated, resulting in a higher probability of type-II error (i.e., failing to detect significant differences that do in fact exist). SUDAAN has a SUBPOPN option that allows the user to target specific subpopulations for analysis while retaining the full unsubsetted data set that includes the full sample design information. Analysts interested in specific subpopulations must use SUBPOPN with the full sample data rather than subsetting the data set.

Weighted frequencies, prevalence estimates, and standard errors

Weighted frequencies of adopted children by adoption type, with standard errors calculated using the Taylor Series approximation method in SUDAAN, appear in Appendix XI. Analysts may wish to replicate this table to determine if they are using the weights and sample design variables correctly.

Guidelines for data use

With the goal of mutual benefit, NCHS requests that users of data files cooperate in certain actions related to their use.

Any published material derived from the data should acknowledge NCHS as the original source. The suggested citation, “Data Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, National Survey of Adoptive Parents, 2007” should appear at the bottom of all tables.

Published material derived from the data should also include a disclaimer that credits any analyses, interpretations, or conclusions reached to the author and not to NCHS, which is responsible only for the initial data. Consumers who wish to publish a technical description of the data should make a reasonable effort to ensure that the description is not inconsistent with that published by NCHS.

CIPSEA and the Public Health Service Act (section 308d) provide that these data collected by NCHS may be used only for the purpose of statistical reporting and analysis. Any effort to determine the identity of any reported case is prohibited by these laws. NCHS takes extraordinary measures to assure that the identity of survey subjects cannot be disclosed. All direct identifiers, as well as any characteristics that might lead to identification, have been omitted from the data set. Any intentional identification or disclosure of a person or establishment violates the assurances of confidentiality given to providers of the information. Therefore, users must:

- Use the data in this data set for statistical reporting and analysis only.
- Make no use of the identity of any person discovered, inadvertently or otherwise, and advise the Director, NCHS, of any such discovery (301-458-4500).
- Not link this data set with individually identifiable data from any NCHS or non-NCHS data sources.

Use of the data set signifies users' agreement to comply with the above-stated statutory-based requirements.

Further Information

Data users can obtain the latest information about SLAITS by periodically checking the SLAITS web site at <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/slaits.htm>. This site features downloadable data files and documentation for SLAITS modules, as well as important information about any modifications and updates to data and/or documentation. Data users will also find current contact information if there are any additional questions. Data users with questions may also send e-mail to slaits@cdc.gov.

Researchers may also wish to join the SLAITS electronic mail listserv. To subscribe or unsubscribe, visit <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/about/major/slaits/slaitlistserv.htm> and follow the directions listed. The listserv has approximately 1,000 subscribers around the world who use SLAITS data or are interested in SLAITS. Subscribers periodically receive e-mail containing news about SLAITS surveys (e.g., new releases or modifications to existing data), publications, or related conferences. The listserv is moderated and listserv membership is private.

For more information on CDC, you may contact CDC's Information Contact Center (CDC-INFO) in English or Spanish by calling (800) CDC-INFO [800-232-4636] or e-mailing cdcinfo@cdc.gov. Persons with hearing impairment may contact CDC-INFO with a TTY machine at (888) 232-6348. The CDC-INFO fax machine line is (770) 488-4760. Please note, however, that CDC-INFO cannot respond to

questions about individual medical cases, provide second opinions, or make specific recommendations regarding therapy. These issues should be addressed directly with personal health care providers.

References

1. van Dyck P, Kogan MD, Heppel D, et al. The National Survey of Children's Health: A new data resource. *Matern Child Health J* 8:183–8. 2004.
2. Blumberg SJ, Olson L, Osborn L, et al. Design and operation of the National Survey of Early Childhood Health, 2000. National Center for Health Statistics. *Vital Health Stat* 1(40). 2002.
3. Blumberg SJ, Olson L, Frankel M, et al. Design and operation of the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, 2001. National Center for Health Statistics. *Vital Health Stat* 1(41). 2003.
4. Blumberg SJ, Olson L, Frankel MR, Osborn L, Srinath KP, Giambo P. Design and operation of the National Survey of Children's Health, 2003. National Center for Health Statistics. *Vital Health Stat* 1(43). 2005.
5. O'Connor KS, Osborn L, Olson L, Blumberg SJ, Frankel MR, Srinath KP, et al. Design and operation of the National Asthma Survey. National Center for Health Statistics. *Vital Health Stat* 1(46). 2008
6. Blumberg SJ, Welch EM, Chowdhury SR, Upchurch HL, Parker EK, Skalland BJ. Design and operation of the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, 2005-06. National Center for Health Statistics. *Vital Health Stat* 1(45). 2008.
7. Blumberg SJ, Foster EB, Frasier AM, et al. Design and Operation of the National Survey of Children's Health, 2007. National Center for Health Statistics. *Vital Health Stat* 1. Forthcoming.
8. NORC at the University of Chicago. 2007 Methodology Report: National Immunization Survey. Chicago, IL: NORC. 2008.
9. Zell ER, Ezzati-Rice RM, Battaglia MP, Wright RA. National immunization survey: The methodology of a vaccination surveillance system. *Public Health Reports* 115:65-77. 2000.
10. Lepkowski, JM. Telephone Sampling Methods in the United States. In R. M. Groves et al. (eds.), *Telephone Survey Methodology*. New York: Wiley. pp. 73-98. 1988.
11. Tucker C, Casady RJ, and Lepkowski, JM. A Hierarchy of List-Assisted Stratified Telephone Sample Design Options. *Proceedings of the Survey Research Methods Section*. Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association, pp. 982–987. 1993.

12. Blumberg SJ, Luke JV, Cynamon ML, Frankel MR. Recent trends in household telephone coverage in the United States. In J. M. Lepkowski et al. (Eds.), *Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology* (chapter 3). New York: J.W. Wiley and Sons, Inc. Forthcoming.
13. The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2006. *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. 4th edition. Lenexa, Kansas: AAPOR.
14. Ezzati-Rice TM, Cynamon M, Blumberg SJ, Madans JH. Use of an existing sampling frame to collect broad-based health and health-related data at the state and local level. *Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Statistical Policy*. Working Paper Series 30:283–92. 2000.

Appendix I: Sampling and weighting technical summary

Sample Design

NSCH sample design

The basic design objective of NSCH sample was to select a sample of 1,700 children under 18 years of age in each state and the District of Columbia. The sample was selected by identifying households with children under the age of 18. In all sample households where children were present, one child was selected.

NSAP sample

Once the NSCH interview had been completed, if the selected NSCH child was found to be eligible for NSAP (i.e., the child was adopted, the adoption had been finalized, no biological parents of the child lived in the household, and the NSCH respondent spoke English), an attempt was made to conduct an NSAP interview about that child.

Drawing NIS sample

The sample of households selected for screening for NSCH was a subsample of the households screened for the National Immunization Survey (NIS), a continuous list-assisted random-digit-dial (RDD) survey. Starting in 2007, the base NIS sample area included 56 regions (50 state or “rest of state” areas plus 6 grantee urban areas). The six (6) grantee urban areas are: Chicago, IL; Philadelphia, PA; New York City, NY; Bexar County, TX; Houston County, TX; and Washington, DC. Also starting in 2007, state immunization programs could identify cities or counties of interest to be oversampled. Eight (8) of those regions, which may change annually, were selected and added to the base NIS sample area to equal a total of 64 sample areas. For more detail on the NIS sample design, readers are encouraged to obtain the 2007 NIS Methodology Report (8).

Associating telephone numbers with sampling areas

To draw a sample of telephone numbers in a sampling area, one must compile a list of all telephone numbers that belong to that area. For some sampling areas, this step is straightforward. For example, when the sampling area is a state, the list would consist of all telephone numbers within the central-office codes that are in service in the area codes assigned to that state. (Combined, an area code and a central-office code form a “prefix area.” For example, 312-555-xxxx is the prefix area corresponding to the 555 central office in the 312 area code.)

For other sampling areas, however, this step encounters a number of complications. When the sampling area is a city, county, or combination of counties, some prefix areas may cover part of the sampling area and part of an adjacent sampling area. In such situations, the NIS applies a proportional rule: The prefix area is assigned to the specific sampling area that corresponds to the maximum share.

Drawing initial NIS sample

The sampling frame for a sampling area consists of banks of 100 consecutive telephone numbers within the prefix areas assigned to the sampling area. To exclude banks that contain zero directory-listed residential telephone numbers, the GENESYS Sampling System (a proprietary product of Marketing Systems Group (MSG)) uses a file of directory-listed residential numbers from InfoUSA. The result is a file that lists the remaining banks (the “1+ working banks”). From the 1+ working banks, a random sample of complete ten-digit telephone numbers is drawn for each quarter in such a way that each number has a known and equal probability of selection. Within each sampling area, the sample is then segmented into replicates, or representative subsamples, with each replicate containing sample telephone numbers from each of the 64 sampling areas. Segmenting the sample into replicates allows the release of telephone numbers over time in a controlled manner.

Updating NIS sampling frame

The set of telephone banks with at least one directory-listed residential telephone number changes over time. As a result, the sampling frame needs to be updated on a quarterly basis. Area-code splits produce additional changes to the sampling frame. MSG maintains a separate sampling frame for each sampling area. Each quarter, NORC and MSG examine the database to determine whether any currently included banks should be assigned to different sampling areas and to assign newly included banks to sampling areas. The rules for assignment are the same as in the initial definitions of the sampling areas.

Once all modifications have been made to the GENESYS database, a number of checks ensure that all changes have been applied correctly and that the new database produces samples consistent with those produced prior to the changes. These checks compare the numbers of active banks and RDD-selectable lines in each sampling area before and after the update. In parallel, the numbers of exchanges assigned to each sampling area before and after the update are compared. Small changes are expected, because new banks are put into service as new numbers are assigned. In the event of a major discrepancy in any of these checks, MSG is notified of the difference and asked to provide documentation of the reasons for the change.

Preparation of the sample

Coordinated management of the sample follows a sequence of steps. The initial quarterly sample for each sampling area is divided into replicates. Before a replicate is loaded into the CATI system, several stages of processing remove as many businesses and nonworking numbers as possible. A separate step matches the telephone numbers in the sample against a large database, to obtain addresses so that advance letters can be sent. Telephone numbers on the NIS’s “Do Not Call List” are removed from the sample. Also, at each quarter, any duplicate telephone numbers (i.e., numbers that have appeared in the sample in the three prior quarters) are identified and omitted from the sample files.

Forming NIS sample replicates

Instead of using a single size for all replicates in all sampling areas, the NIS divides the sample in each area into the same number, 26, of replicates. This procedure permits smoother release of the sample (at

the rate of one or two replicates per week) for each sampling area separately, as needed. Toward the end of the quarter, half-size replicates allow tighter control over the total amount of sample released. The aim is to produce an even distribution of work in the telephone center over the course of a quarter.

Removing business and nonworking numbers

Over two-thirds of all selected telephone numbers are typically businesses or unassigned. It would be incredibly inefficient to require the interviewers to dial and classify all of these numbers. To prevent that potential expense, the NIS uses another MSG product (a companion to the GENESYS Sampling System) to quickly and accurately reduce the size of this task.

First, the selected sample is matched against a GENESYS file containing telephone numbers that are directory-listed in a business Yellow Pages and are not directory-listed in a residential White Pages. Any business numbers so identified are removed from the sample.

Second, numbers listed in residential White Pages are identified and temporarily set aside.

Third, a hardware system screens the remaining sample to remove a portion of the non-working numbers. Using personal computers with special hardware and software, this system (the “auto-dialer”) automatically dials the telephone numbers to detect non-working numbers, which are indicated by the familiar tri-tone signal for out-of-service numbers, by an extended period of silence, or by continuous noise on the line. During 2000, the NIS made a transition from one hardware system, GENESYS-ID, which had been used since the beginning of the NIS in 1994, to a new system, GENESYS-ID*plus*. GENESYS-ID minimizes intrusiveness by hanging up as soon as it detects a number starting to ring. However, sometimes non-working numbers ring one or more times before the tri-tone occurs. GENESYS-ID did not identify such non-working numbers, which may be a significant proportion of the total in some sampling areas. GENESYS-ID*plus* was developed to identify more non-working-number tri-tones by letting numbers ring two times before hanging up. On a national basis, 15 percent to 20 percent of the dialed numbers ring and are answered. To minimize the number of answered calls, the system is used only during the day; and the answered calls are routed to an attendant, who says, “Sorry, I must have dialed the wrong number.”

Finally, the directory-listed residential numbers are combined with the numbers that were not removed by the auto-dialer to produce the sample for the telephone center. The numbers removed within released replicates are themselves considered released; they are also considered pre-screened and assigned disposition codes indicating that they are resolved, non-residential numbers.

Ported cell telephones

A significant recent development in the telecommunications industry is the new FCC regulation on portability. Local number portability allows wireless telephone customers to switch from one company to another while retaining the same telephone number. There are three ways in which consumers can take advantage of the new wireless number portability provisions: 1) wireless-to-wireless, 2) wireless-to-

wireline, and 3) wireline-to-wireless. The first two ways do not impact the RDD sampling strategy, since cellular telephone numbers are not in the RDD sampling frame. However, the third way – the porting of wireline numbers to wireless service providers – creates the possibility of inadvertently including wireless telephone numbers in the RDD samples. FCC rules (implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991) bar automated calls to wireless telephone numbers. To pre-identify landlines that have been ported to wireless, the selected NIS sample is matched to the NeuStar database, which contains the national list of ported telephone numbers. Details on the database can be found in <http://www.tcpacompliance.com>. Each quarterly sample is compared to the database and the ported numbers flagged accordingly. The flagged numbers are assigned an out-of-scope disposition code and are not called. The numbers in released replicates are also matched to the NeuStar database on a daily basis to identify any new ports that have not already been finalized within the telephone center. If a number is dialed in the NIS and it is found to be a wireless telephone, the call is immediately terminated and classified as out of scope without seeking an interview.

Obtaining addresses for advance letters

To obtain addresses that correspond to telephone numbers in the sample, the numbers for each replicate are sent to a vendor, TARGUSinfo. TARGUSinfo maintains a large database, updated daily, for its telephone Data Express program: over 160 million residential and business telephone numbers, including unpublished telephone numbers. Sources for the data include call centers and companies in telecommunications, consumer goods, and the insurance and credit industries.

After the pre-resolution operations described in the foregoing three sections, the use of TARGUSinfo yielded addresses for about 58.8 percent of the telephone numbers loaded into the CATI system. Advance letters were sent to this set of telephone numbers. The mailing was approximately 10 days, or two weekends, prior to the time when the telephone numbers in the corresponding replicates were scheduled to be called.

“Do Not Call” Requests

A file is maintained containing telephone numbers of people who have requested that they not be called. The file was inherited from the previous NIS contractor and was updated throughout 2007 and Q1 2008 to reflect new requests. Each quarter’s sample is compared with this file, and numbers contained in the “Do Not Call List” are not included in the quarterly sample of numbers loaded into the CATI system.

Duplicate telephone numbers

Because of the repeated quarterly sampling operations in each sampling area, some telephone numbers were selected more than once. To increase the annual effective sample size and also avoid any respondent problems created by re-contacts for the same survey, a further step of sampling identified duplicate numbers. Each quarterly sample file was compared with all sample files for the three prior quarters. The duplicate numbers were excluded from the quarterly sample file. Thus, the quarterly samples were essentially selected by a method of without replacement sampling.

Weighting procedures

NSAP weighting procedures

Since the NSAP sample is obtained from NSCH completed cases, the NSAP weighting process starts with the final NSCH weights. NSCH weights were adjusted to account for nonresponse, for households with multiple telephone numbers, and for noncoverage of children in households without landline telephones. For a detailed description of the derivation of the NSCH final weights, readers are referred to the 2007 NSCH Design and Operations Report (7). To derive the NSAP weights, the NSCH final weights were adjusted first for incomplete NSAP screeners and then for nonresponse to the NSAP interview. Finally, a raking adjustment was applied to nonresponse-adjusted NSAP weights. Therefore, the NSAP weighting process involved the following steps:

- obtaining the NSAP base weight from NSCH ,
- adjustment for incomplete NSAP screener,
- adjustment for incomplete NSAP interview,
- raking adjustment.

a. NSAP base weight

Since the NSAP sample is obtained from NSCH completed cases, the NSAP base weight for each case was defined as the final NSCH weight for that child. The final NSCH weights were derived by applying adjustments to account for nonresponse, for households with multiple telephone numbers, and for noncoverage of children in households without landline telephones, as well as adjustments to known population control estimates.

b. Adjustment for incomplete NSAP screener

The children with completed NSCH interviews were screened for NSAP. Since not all NSCH completed cases complete the NSAP screener, an adjustment for this nonresponse was applied to the cases for which NSAP screener was completed. The screener nonresponse adjusted weight was derived by dividing the NSAP base weight for each child by the weighted NSAP screener completion rate for the adjustment cell containing the child. The adjustment cells were formed using the following variables listed in order of priority:

- Age group,
- Health insurance,
- Number of children in the household.

The cells where the number of responding cases was less than 20 were collapsed. Since NSAP cases come from NSCH completes, any missing values of the above variables were already imputed as part of NSCH weighting, and hence, no new imputation was required.

c. Adjustment for incomplete NSAP interview

To compensate for nonresponse to the NSAP interview, the weights of the children with complete NSAP interviews were adjusted. The nonresponse adjusted weight was derived by dividing the screener

nonresponse adjusted weight for each child by the weighted NSAP interview completion rate for the adjustment cell containing the child. The adjustment cells were formed using the following variables listed in order of priority:

- Type of adoption,
- Age group,
- Race/Ethnicity.

The cells where the number of responding cases was less than 20 were collapsed.

d. Raking adjustment

Finally, a raking adjustment was applied to the completed cases. Since there are no external control totals on adopted children, this raking adjustment only ensured that the sums of weights before and after interview nonresponse adjustment were equal in terms of the raking variables. That is, the control totals were obtained by summing the NSAP screener weights of the NSAP eligible cases.

The raking adjustment was applied using the following margins within each Census Region:

- Number of male and female adopted children within each of three age groups,
- Number of adopted children by type of adoption within each of three age groups,
- Race/ethnicity,
- Number of adopted children in households by highest reported education in the household,
- Number of children in households by household income,
- Number of adopted children in MSA and non-MSA areas.

The categories of these raking dimensions were collapsed if the number of cases was less than 20 or if there was any difficulty in convergence.

The raked weights can be expressed as the nonresponse-adjusted weight for the child multiplied by the raking adjustment factor for the child derived through the iteration process.

At this point, the weights were checked for extreme values. Similar to the process for the NIS, the weights that exceeded the median weight plus six times the inter-quartile range of the weights (at the Census Region level) were truncated to this cutoff. The raking procedure was applied again after the truncation of the weights, and the weights were rechecked for extreme weights and truncated as before. The process was iterated until there was no extreme weight after raking.

The repeated raking and truncation process produced a final NSAP weight for each child with a complete NSAP interview.

National estimates & summary statistics of weights

Descriptive statistics for the final NSAP weight are provided in Table I. The final NSAP weight is used to obtain estimates at the national level.

<Table I here>

Appendix II: Banked sample

In the usual SLAITS operation, households that either screen as a) ineligible for the NIS, or b) NIS-eligible and complete the NIS interview move directly – on the same call, where feasible – on to the SLAITS portion of the CATI instrument for SLAITS screening and interviewing. However, in Q1/2007 the CATI instrument was not finalized at the time the NIS was being fielded; therefore, households could not move on to NSCH screening and interviewing directly upon finishing the NIS.

As in other quarters, in Q1/2007 a portion of the NIS sample was flagged for NSCH. Although NSCH screening and interviewing could not be done in Q1/2007, in order to take advantage of the NIS screening that was done in Q1/2007, a subsample of the initially-flagged NSCH sample was drawn, using the outcomes of the NIS dialing operation as stratifiers to increase efficiency.

First, every NSCH-flagged case that completed the NIS, either as NIS-ineligible or as NIS-eligible with a completed NIS interview, was included in the subsample with certainty. These cases were dialed for NSCH screening and interviewing between May and October, 2007.

Next, the NSCH-flagged cases that did not complete the NIS (either as NIS-ineligible or as NIS-eligible with a completed NIS interview), were sent through GENESYS-ID*plus* in November of 2007, which screened out a portion of the cases as businesses and non-working telephone numbers. Any case that was screened out by GENESYS-ID*plus* was included in the subsample with certainty. However, it was never dialed for NSCH interviewing.

Finally, 10,000 cases were selected from among the NSCH-flagged cases that did not complete the NIS, (either as NIS-ineligible or as NIS-eligible with a completed NIS interview), and were not screened out by GENESYS-ID*plus*. The cases were selected using state and NIS outcome as strata. The 10,000 cases were allocated to each state in proportion to the number of cases initially flagged for NSCH in the state. (For example, if 1/40th of Q1/2007 initially-flagged NSCH cases fell within a particular state, then that state was allocated 1/40th of the 10,000 cases, or 250 cases.) Within each state, the cases were grouped into four strata according to the outcome of the NIS dialing effort in Q1/2007:

- Group 1: Screened for NIS age-eligibility
- Group 2: Identified as a known household by the NIS, but not screened for NIS age eligibility
- Group 3: Final NIS disposition of “likely household” or “answering machine”
- Group 4: Final NIS disposition of “non-contact,” “non-residential,” or “non-working telephone number”

Within each state, cases from Group 1 were selected with certainty, and cases in Groups 2, 3, and 4 were selected at an equal rate, where this rate varied by state so as to yield the appropriate total number of cases selected in each state based on the state level allocation of the 10,000 cases. Once the 10,000 cases

were chosen in this way, the cases were dialed for NSCH screening and interviewing from December 2007 to April 2008.

In this way, the final Q1/2007 NSCH sample consisted of a subsample of the initially-flagged Q1/2007 NSCH sample, in three pieces:

- Cases that finished the NIS either as NIS-ineligible or NIS-eligible with a completed NIS interview. These cases were included in the subsample with probability 1.
- Cases not in 1) that were screened as businesses or non-working telephone numbers by GENESYS-ID*plus*. These cases were included in the subsample with probability 1.
- 10,000 cases not in 1) or 2) that were selected using the NIS outcomes as strata. These cases were included in the subsample with probability ≤ 1 .

Appendix III: Questionnaire

This appendix contains the NSAP questionnaire. The NSCH questionnaire can be found in the 2007 NSCH Design and Operations Report (7) and online at the SLAITS web site (<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/slait.htm>).

When this report is edited, typeset, and printed, the NSAP questionnaire will be added. Until such time, this questionnaire may be found online at the SLAITS web site (<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/slait.htm>)

Appendix IV: Summary of questionnaire changes during data collection

On May 2, 2007, changes were made to the following questions:

- An error in skip logic at the checkpoint CPC46 was corrected from “IF K2Q34A = NO THEN SKIP TO CPC49” to “IF K2Q34A = NO THEN SKIP TO CPC42.”
- The interviewer help text at C28 was revised to include telephone calls as part of the definition of contact.

On July 5, 2007, the following changes were made:

- In S1_N, the list of countries was alphabetized, but the numbering was kept the same.
- At W1, the following help text was added: “Please describe the relationship as it exists now.”
- At C12_INTRO, C22A, C23A_N, and C24A, the introduction texts were improved to further differentiate these sections.
- W13 was moved to just after W8 to further enhance the flow of the questionnaire.
- The system was changed to skip F3 if no adoption agreement was in place.
- The interview time estimate was changed from 40 to 35 minutes.

On July 18, 2007, the following changes were made:

- The interview time estimate was changed from 35 minutes to “about half an hour.”

On October 5, 2007, the following changes were made:

- Incentives for refusal cases in NSAP were introduced in Quarter 3, 2007. As such, text at the following variables was changed to incorporate the incentive offer for eligible cases: INTRO_1, CONSENT_INTRO, MSCH_NSAP, MSG_Y_APPT_NSAP, and END.
- In addition, language at CONSENT_INTRO was modified from “You may choose not to answer any question you don’t wish to answer or stop at any time,” to “You may choose not to answer any questions you don’t wish to answer or end the interview at any time.”

On January 3, 2008, the following changes were made:

- The system was updated to account for cases in which K9Q12 = 04 and 08 at CPS3 and CPS4.
- CPC12C was changed from “IF (C8_N=2 OR C8B=2) AND (C7_N=2 OR C4_N=2) AND (C9_N=2 OR C9B=2) GO TO CPC12E, ELSE GO TO C12C” to “IF C7_N = 1 OR C8B=1 OR C9B=1 OR C9D=1, THEN ASK C12C, OTHERWISE GO TO CPC12E.”
- CPC12E was changed from “IF C4_N=2 OR C7_N=2 GO TO C12F, ELSE GO TO C12E” to “IF C7_N=1 ASK C12E, ELSE GO TO C12F.”
- Text at F16E was changed from “Is there any other source helping pay for medical care?” to “Is there any other source helping pay for mental health services?”

Appendix V: Pretest

The NSAP pretest was conducted along with the NSCH pretest in December 2006. A total of 61 NSAP interviews were completed.

Sample

The sample for the NSAP pretest was a convenience sample. Volunteers were sought through email notifications to NORC staff and NCHS staff, listserv postings by volunteers, and snowball sampling of friends and family who had adopted children. Volunteers were offered \$25 as a token of appreciation for their participation, and a total of 61 completed surveys were obtained. NCHS and NORC staff who were interviewed as part of the pretest were ineligible for the token of appreciation.

Training

Training was conducted during the early weeks of December in conjunction with NSCH pretest training. Sixty interviewers were trained for the NSCH and NSAP pretest. Three six-hour trainings were held in Chicago with experienced telephone interviewers. These training sessions used the techniques described earlier in this methodology report.

Modifications to instrument after pretest

Deletions

- S1C, which asked whether the sampled child's adoption was completed in his/her country of origin, was deleted from the production version of the questionnaire.
- S2 and S2A, which asked in what country the sampled child was born, were deleted.
- S5_N, which asked the respondent's marital status, was deleted.
- S14C and S14CA, which asked about other agencies involved in the adoption, were deleted.
- C12D was deleted. This question asked whether the fact that the sampled child needed a home and the respondent wanted to provide him/her with one was a reason for adopting the child.
- C21 and C22_N, which asked whether the respondent considered other types of adoptions, were deleted.
- C23J and C23JA, which ask the respondent about wanting to adopt a child in need of a permanent family, were deleted.
- C24 was also deleted. This question read: "At the time of the adoption, did the adoption agency or attorney offer any options for an open adoption? By open adoption, we mean sharing written information such as letters or email, or in-person visits between you [TEXTFILL: or your spouse/partner] and the birth family or between your child and the birth family?" (This variable name was reassigned to a new question. See "Additions" for details.)
- Questions C25-C25C, which asked about post-adoption reports, were deleted. (These variable names were reassigned to new questions. See "Additions" for details.)

- Questions C28-C28A, which asked about the sampled child’s relationship with his/her birth family members, were deleted. (These variable names were reassigned to new questions. See “Additions” for details.)
- Questions C36G-C36GA, which ask about information the respondent was able to obtain about the sampled child prior to the adoption, were deleted.
- C37, which asked how well the adoption agency or attorney prepared the respondent for the adoption, was deleted.
- C39, which asked whether the respondent believed there was important information the agency did not know about the sampled child, was deleted.
- C40, which asked if there was anything else that would have helped to prepare the respondent for the adoption, was deleted.
- C48 and C48A, which asked about other mental health or behavioral conditions with which the sampled child was diagnosed, were deleted.
- C54, which asked whether the sampled child had ever taken classes to improve his/her English, was deleted.
- The introductory text in W4_INTRO was deleted. It read: “I am going to read a series of statements to you that may or may not be like (SC). For each statement, tell me how often it would be true for you to make the statement about (SC).”
- W10 and W11, which asked about the effects of having other children present in the sampled child’s household, were deleted.
- W12_INTRO was deleted. It read: “The next series of questions are about the process of adopting (S.C.) and how you feel about the experience.”
- N13-N13DA, which asked about special services the sampled child might have received since the time of his/her adoption, were deleted.
- N14, which asked whether the sampled child had spent time in a residential treatment or psychiatric facility since the time of his/her adoption, was deleted.
- N15A-N17DA, which asked about support systems such as physical or occupational therapy, specialized camps for adopted children, and in-home nurses, were deleted.
- N19-N20BA, which asked about adoption resources like books, articles, web sites, and internet chat rooms, were deleted.

Additions

- Questions C21A-C21C, which asked which types of adoption the respondent considered, were added to the production version of the instrument.
- Questions C22-C221AA, which listed potential reasons the respondent had for choosing a private domestic adoption, were added.
- Regarding reasons for choosing to adopt internationally, follow-up questions C23AA-C23LA were added to each potential reason to ask whether the reason was very important, somewhat important, or not important in their decision to adopt internationally.

- Questions C24A-C24FAA were added to inquire about the reasons the respondent had for choosing to adopt a child in the U.S. foster care system and to determine how important each reason was in the respondent's decision.
- Questions C25-C25AB, which asked about post-adoption reports in open adoptions, were added. A help screen was added to C25 that read: "By open adoption, we mean sharing written information such as letters or email, or in-person visits between you [TEXTFILL: or your spouse/partner] and the birth family or between your child and the birth family?" Another help screen was added to C25AA, which read: "These could be reports to either the government or to any other organization in the country of origin."
- Questions C28, C28A, C28B, which asked about the amount and quality of contact the respondent, other adoptive parent and the child have with the adopted child's birth family, were added to the production version of the questionnaire.
- Transition text was added to the section starting with C31. This text, labeled C31_INTRO, read: "These next questions are about any contact that you [or your spouse/partner] have had with (S.C.)'s birth family."
- Transition text was added to the section starting with C36. This text, labeled C36_INTRO, read: "These next questions are about information you may have received about (S.C.) before adopting [him/her]."
- The question stem "Prior to (S.C.)'s adoption, did you [TEXTFILL: or your spouse/partner]" was added to the C36 series.
- Transition text labeled "F1_INTRO" was added to precede F1. It read: "These next few questions are about financial services you may have received related to the adoption of (S.C.)."
- Transition text was added to precede F11. Labeled F11_INTRO, it read: "These next few questions are about costs you may have incurred related to the adoption of (S.C.)."
- Transition text was added to precede F13. Labeled F13_INTRO, it read: "These next questions are about your experiences with Medicaid. Some of these questions may seem similar to other questions you have already answered, but they ask about different things."
- Transition text was added to precede F15. Labeled F15, it read: "These next few questions are about mental health care (S.C.) may have received during the last 12 months."
- Transition text was added to precede F16. Labeled F16_INTRO, it read: "Earlier you mentioned that (S.C.) has received treatment or counseling from a mental health professional in the past 12 months." A help screen was also added that read: "'Earlier' was during the health survey you completed recently."
- Questions F14A_A and F14AA_A, which ask about using Medicaid to obtain mental health services for the sampled child, were added.
- A series of new questions (F16_A-F16EA_A) were added to determine what portion of the sampled child's mental health medication needs was paid for by various sources.
- Transition text was added to precede F17. Labeled F17_INTRO, it read: "These next few questions are about dental care (S.C.) may have received in the last 12 months."

- Transition text was added to precede F19. Labeled F19_INTRO, it read: “The next few questions are about other sources of financial support you may have received at the time of the adoption.”
- Transition text was added to precede N14. Labeled N14_INTRO, it read: “Earlier you told me that (S.C.) has spent time in a residential treatment or psychiatric facility since the time of [his/her] adoption.”
- END2 was added immediately following address verification. It read: “I’d like to thank you on behalf of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for the time and effort you’ve spent answering these questions. If you have any questions about this survey, you may call my supervisor toll-free at 1-866-999-3340. If you have questions about your rights as a survey participant, you may call the chairman of the Research Ethics Review Board at 1-800-223-8118. Thank you again.”

Modifications

- The question text and response options for S1B were modified. The original question read: “Was (S.C.)’s adoption finalized in the U.S.?” The revised question read: “In what country was (S.C.)’s adoption completed? Was it in the U.S., the child’s country of origin, or both?” There was also a fourth response option (not read aloud): “ADOPTION IS NOT YET FINALIZED.”
- The question text in S14B was modified. The original text read: “Private agency under contract with public child welfare agency (for example, Catholic Charities, Lutheran Social Services)?” The revised text began “READ IF NECESSARY: Were any of the following agencies involved in the adoption of (S.C.) ...)” followed by “Private agency under contract with public child welfare agency (for example, Catholic Charities, Lutheran Social Services)?”
- S15 was modified. The original version read: “Was S.C.’s adoption an interstate adoption? That is, prior to S.C. coming to live with you, did you and S.C. live in different states?” However, in the revised version, the question was shortened to “Was S.C.’s adoption an interstate adoption?” In the event that a respondent required clarification, a help screen was added that read: “Prior to (S.C.) coming to live with you, did you and (S.C.) live in different states?”
- C1A was shortened. The introduction text [“Now I would like to ask you a few questions about (S.C.) and the experience of adopting (him/her)”] was deleted.
- The response options for C2_N were altered. The option “BIRTH PARENTS” was added and the word “treatment” was added to the response choice “A RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT FACILITY IN THE U.S.”
- Questions C3INTRO-C3E were moved. In the production version of the instrument, these immediately followed the question originally labeled C41. For C3A-C3C and C3E, the response option “CHILD ADOPTED AT BIRTH” was added along with the instruction that it should not be read to respondents. A help screen was added to C3A-C3E that read: “These questions may not apply to your child, but it is important that we ask these questions of everyone.”
- The question text of C4_N was changed from “To your knowledge, does (S.C.) have birth siblings including half siblings?” to “To your knowledge, does (S.C.) have birth siblings, that is, brothers or sisters of (S.C.), including half siblings?”

- The question text of C5_N was changed from “At the time of S.C.’s adoption or any time since then, have any of (S.C.)’s birth siblings including half siblings been available for adoption?” to “Have any of (S.C.)’s birth siblings including half siblings ever been available for adoption?”
- C6_N was slightly modified. The question formerly read: “Were you [TEXTFILL: or your spouse/parent] interested in adopting any or all of (S.C.)’s birth siblings?” In the production version of the instrument, the words “or all” were deleted from this question.
- C7_N was also slightly altered. The original question read: “Have you adopted any birth siblings, that is, brothers or sisters of (S.C.)?” In the revised version, the clarifying phrase “that is, brothers or sisters of (S.C.)” was deleted.
- In C12A-C12C, the following “READ IF NECESSARY” section was added: “Please tell me whether or not this was one of the reasons that you [TEXTFILL: or your spouse/partner] had for adopting (S.C.).”
- For C12E and C12F, the following “READ IF NECESSARY” section was added: “Please tell me whether or not this was one of the reasons that you [TEXTFILL: or your spouse/partner] had for adopting (S.C.).”
- The question text in C17_N was changed from “Is (S.C.) a different race or ethnicity or from a different culture than you?” to “Compared to yourself, is (S.C.) a different race or ethnicity or from a different culture?”
- A “READ IF NECESSARY” section was added to C18C-C18I. It read: “Since the time of the adoption, has your family done any of the following...”
- The question originally labeled C24 was renamed C24A, and the original C24A was renamed C24AA.
- The question text in C26 was slightly modified. The phrase “or other birth kin” was replaced with “or other birth family members.”
- C41 underwent several modifications. First, the question stem was changed from “Overall, was your [TEXTFILL: and your spouse’s/partner’s] experience with your adoption agency or attorney...” to “Now I would like to ask you a few questions about (SC) and the experience of adopting (him/her). Overall, was your [TEXTFILL: and your spouse’s/partner’s] experience with your adoption agency or attorney...” Second, the third response option was changed from “MIXED, POSITIVES AND NEGATIVES ABOUT EQUAL” to “MIXED.” Lastly, a sixth response option was added that read: “THERE WAS NO ATTORNEY OR AGENCY.”
- The question text in C42 was changed. Originally, it read: “Since the time the adoption was finalized, has (S.C.) ever seen a counselor or doctor for emotional or behavioral problems?” The revised version read: Mental health professionals include psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric nurses, and clinical social workers. Since the time the adoption was finalized, has (S.C.) received any treatment or counseling from a mental health professional?”
- C44 was rephrased. The original version read: “Has a doctor or health professional ever told you [TEXTFILL: or your spouse/partner] that (S.C.) has the following conditions...” The revised version read: “Now I am going to read you a list of conditions. For each condition, please tell me

- The language in C51 was changed from “gotten pregnant” to “been pregnant.”
- More specific language was added to C55. The original text read: “Has (S.C.) ever received special education services?” The revised version read: “Does (S.C.) receive services from a program called Special Educational Services? Children receiving these services often have an Individualized Education Program.” The help screen associated with this question was also revised. The new text read: “Special Education is any kind of special school, classes or tutoring.”
- In C56, the question text was changed from “reading/language arts” to “reading and language arts.” Also, for C56 and C56A, the response option “VERY GOOD” was inserted between “EXCELLENT” and “GOOD.”
- In W1 and W1A, the response option “NEITHER WARM AND CLOSE NOR DISTANT” was deleted.
- The response categories were altered in W2. Originally, the choices were “VERY OFTEN, SOMETIMES, NOT VERY OFTEN, or ALMOST NEVER.” The revised categories are: “NEVER, RARELY, SOMETIMES, or ALWAYS.”
- The third response option in W3 was changed from “DISSATISFIED” to “SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED.”
- The response categories in W4-W6 were altered. Originally, they were: “ALWAYS, OFTEN, SOMETIMES, SELDOM, or NEVER.” The revised categories are as follows: “NEVER, RARELY, SOMETIMES, USUALLY, or ALWAYS.”
- The first and third response options in W7 and W8 were changed from “BETTER THAN YOU EXPECTED” and “WORSE THAN YOU EXPECTED” to “BETTER THAN YOU EVER EXPECTED” and “MORE DIFFICULT THAN YOU EVER EXPECTED,” respectively.
- The response categories in W9 were changed from “NEVER, HARDLY EVER, SOMETIMES, ALMOST ALWAYS” to “NEVER, RARELY, SOMETIMES, USUALLY, or ALWAYS.”
- The second, third, and fourth response options in W12 changed. The question text was also revised to reflect these changes. The original text listed the options as follows: “Would you say it has affected your family very positively, positively, mixed (positives and negatives about equal), negatively, or very negatively?” The revised text read: “Would you say it has affected your family very positively, somewhat positively, somewhat negatively, very negatively, or mixed?”
- The response categories in W13 were revised. The original text listed the response options in this way: “Would you say it is much better than expected, better than expected, just about what you expected, worse than expected, or much worse than expected?” The revised text read: “Would you say it is better than you expected, about what you expected, or more difficult than expected?”
- Another response option was added to W14. “FEELS NEITHER POSITIVE NOR NEGATIVE ABOUT IT” was inserted as the middle category, and the remaining answer choices were renumbered accordingly.
- W17B was changed from an open-ended question to a closed-coded question. The original question read: “Why did (S.C.) live outside your home?” The revised version read: “Was (S.C.)’s

- The introductory text in W21A_INTRO was revised. Originally, it read: “How important were the following reasons for taking this action...?” The new text read: “I am going to read a list of reasons some parents may take this action. Please tell me if each was a very important, somewhat important, or not important reason for you.”
- In W21A-W21E, the response categories “NOT TOO IMPORTANT” and “NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT” were deleted and replaced with “NOT IMPORTANT.”
- The formatting in W23-W23G was changed. The original stem read: “What prevented you [TEXTFILL: or your spouse/partner] from ending it or trying to end it? Did you...” The subsequent items in this series each listed a potential reason (e.g. W23A, “Resolve the problem(s) within family). The revised stem read: “I am going to read a list of reasons why you [TEXTFILL: or your spouse/partner] may have changed your mind about ending it. Please tell me if each was a reason you are no longer trying to end the adoption.” The subsequent items read as complete sentences (e.g. W23A, “You resolved the problem(s) within family.”)
- In F1, the latter half of the question text was moved to a help screen. It read: “By adoption agreement we mean an agreement made before the finalization of the adoption that may include monthly maintenance payments from the agency, medical coverage, and other services such as therapy.”
- In F2A, a portion of the question text was moved to a help screen. It read: “An adoption subsidy is a monthly payment.”
- The second response category in F10 was changed from “DID NOT QUALIFY FOR SUBSIDY OR WERE TURNED DOWN” to “WERE TURNED DOWN.”
- The question text in F11 was changed from “Were out-of-pocket expenses incurred at the time of the adoption, for example, did you pay for a home study or pay an attorney?” to “Did you pay anything at the time of the adoption, for example, did you pay for a home study or pay an attorney?”
- The response options, and thus question text, in F12 were modified. The original read: “Did the adoption agency reimburse all of these expenses, reimburse some, but not all expenses, or were none of these expenses reimbursed?” The revised version read: “Did the adoption agency reimburse all, some, or none of these expenses?”
- The question text in F15 was modified to define mental health care. The original text read: “In the last 12 months has (SC) had any mental health care?” The revised version read: “Mental health professionals include psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric nurses, and clinical social workers. During the past 12 months, has (S.C.) received any treatment or counseling from a mental health professional?”
- The question text in F16 was changed from “What portion of (S.C.)’s mental health needs in the last 12 months was paid for by each of the following sources:” to “What portion of (S.C.)’s mental health services in the last 12 months was paid for by each of the following sources: would you say none, some, almost all or all of (S.C.)’s mental health services were paid for by...”

- Slight modifications were made to the question format and language of questions F17-F17D, which ask about payment for dental or orthodontia care, and questions F18A-F18D, which ask about payment for medical care. Specifically, in F17A, “in the past year” was changed to “in the past 12 months.”
- The question text in N1C was modified. The end of the question was changed from “social worker at an adoption agency” to “someone at an adoption agency to discuss post-adoption services and supports after the adoption was finalized.”
- In N2C-N3C, the term “a support group” was changed to “an adoption support group.”
- In N5-N5F, the term “counseling” was changed to “mental health care or counseling.”
- A help screen was added to N6. It read: “By “family counseling” we mean any counseling for family problems, not just counseling related to being adopted.”
- In N6C, “since (S.C.)’s adoption” was deleted from the end of the question.
- In N7 and N7C, “in-home crisis counseling” was shortened to “crisis counseling.”
- In N8, the following clarification was added at the end of the question text: “Please do not include routine screening for purposes of employment or participation in school activities.”
- In N12C, “since adopting (S.C.)” was deleted from the end of the question.
- Logic was added to N14C that prompted the interviewer to read introductory text depending on the respondent’s answers to C42 and C43. This addition was as follows: “IF C42=NO, ASK: Earlier you told me that (S.C.) has not received any treatment or counseling from a mental health professional since the time of the adoption. Did you ever want (S.C.) to spend time in a residential treatment or psychiatric facility? ELSE IF C43 = NO, DK OR RF, ASK: Earlier you told me that (S.C.) has not spent time in a residential treatment or psychiatric facility since the time of the adoption.”
- In N18C, “since adopting (S.C.)” was added to the end of the question.
- The response options in N26 and N27 were modified to include “TEMPORARILY NOT WORKING,” “UNEMPLOYED,” and “RETIRED.”
- The “READ IF NECESSARY” text that repeats the question stem on follow-up questions was added for the following variables: S14B; C12A-C12F; C21B and C21C; C18B-C18I; C22A-C22H; C23A-C23K; C24A-C24E; C33 and C34; C36C-C36F; C3A-C3E; C44-C47; W21A-W21E; W23A-W23G; F6B and F6C; F16A-F16D; F16A_A-F16D_A; F17C-F17D; F18C-F18D; and N14AA-N14AA4.

Appendix VI: Letters sent to sampled households

This appendix contains the NSAP-specific complement of letters sent to households. The full complement of advance letters, follow-up letters, and thank you letters used over the course of data collection for the National Immunization Survey and NSCH can be found in the 2007 NSCH Design and Operations Report (7).

The following 4 NSAP letters are included in this appendix:

- 1) Follow-up letter when incentives were offered to households that had refused twice or passively refused.
- 2) Follow-up letter when incentives were offered to households that had refused twice or passively refused, for banked sample.
- 3) Thank you letter when incentive was mailed (\$25). Cases receiving this letter were either (a) eligible for \$25, or (b) eligible for \$30 and already received a \$5 prepaid incentive
- 4) Thank you letter when incentive was mailed (\$30). Cases receiving this letter were eligible for \$30 and did not receive a \$5 prepaid incentive.

When this report is edited, typeset, and printed, the letters will be added.

Appendix VII: Disposition code frequencies and response rate calculation

This appendix consists of tables II and III.

<Table II here>

<Table III here>

Appendix VIII: Incentive effort

NSAP faced a response-rate challenge because, as part of the SLAITS framework, it was possible for NSAP-eligible respondents to have been screened and interviewed for up to three surveys before beginning the NSAP interview. This prior demand for respondents' time and effort may have increased the chance of non-response. In order to counteract this possibility, an incentive model was developed for NSAP-eligible households. The implementation of this model augmented the other efforts to collect data from all NSAP-eligible households.

Eligible cases

To acknowledge the additional time asked of NSAP-eligible households, and with fewer households eligible for NSAP, all NSAP-eligible households were offered \$25 for completion of the survey. Households qualified for an additional \$5 incentive (total \$30 incentive payment) based on their interview status and their calling history characteristics.

Eligibility for the incentive effort was initially limited to households that had refused participation (i.e., active refusal). This incentive effort began in September 2007. After two refusals in an NSAP-eligible case's call history, with at least the second of those refusals occurring during the NSAP interview, the case became eligible for the additional \$5 incentive (\$30 total incentive payment).

In addition, an expanded incentive effort was implemented during NSAP, beginning in November of 2007, to attempt to contact a small group of non-responders. This effort was similar to the expanded incentive effort for NSCH. Multiple attempts to contact these NSAP-eligible respondents had yielded either a prolonged period of no contact, or one refusal followed by an abbreviated period of no contact. These patterns of continued non-response despite repeated attempts at contact with the household were classified as passive refusals. To ensure that such cases were not underrepresented in the NSAP data, these cases also qualified for the additional \$5 incentive (\$30 total incentive payment).

Two groups of passive refusal cases were added to the existing NSAP incentive model: (1) NSAP-eligible households that had never refused in their call history, but had multiple calls placed to their household over a period of time without successful contact, and (2) NSAP-eligible households that had refused once during their call history, but since this refusal had had multiple calls placed to their household over a period of time without successful contact.

While the additional \$5 incentive for active and passive refusal cases was implemented in the middle of the data collection, eligible cases from previous quarters were also worked as part of the incentive effort.

Procedures

Once NSAP-eligible cases qualified for the additional \$5 incentive (\$30 total incentive)—either active or passive—they were offered the incentive either by mail or on call back in the following manner. After a second refusal or qualifying for a passive refusal incentive, cases were temporarily finalized, or removed

from calling, within the CATI system. For households with an available address, a letter (Appendix VI) was mailed with \$5 enclosed. The letter explained that attempts had been made to contact the household via telephone to complete the NSAP interview. It also briefly described NSAP, included an FAQ section about the survey, and mentioned that \$25 would be mailed upon continued participation in NSAP. In this way, the letter served as a supplementary mode of refusal conversion. After approximately one to two weeks from the time the case temporarily finalized, the active refusal and passive refusal incentive cases were reactivated and offered \$25 by telephone. The incentive offer was introduced in various interview scripts (i.e., consent script, callback script, answering machine script) based on case progress within the interview. For active refusal or passive refusal incentive-eligible households without an address, \$30 was introduced at similar points in the survey.

Based on refusal counts following the incentive offer, cases would be permanently finalized and not called again. Active refusal cases (with two previous refusals) and passive refusal cases were finalized after one subsequent refusal. Passive refusals with no previous refusals finalized after the second refusal post-incentive offer. In addition, if any case refused in a hostile manner or requested to be removed from the calling list, the case was finalized and not called again.

If any passive refusal or active refusal incentive-eligible household completed NSAP, or if a respondent requested the incentive without completing the interview, address information for the household was either confirmed or collected. The appropriate \$25 or \$30 payment was mailed to the household, along with a letter expressing appreciation for the respondent's time and effort spent participating in the interview. If a household completed NSAP without becoming eligible for the \$5 incentive, \$25 was mailed to the household enclosed in a letter expressing appreciation for their participation. Households that completed the NSAP interview, but declined to confirm or provide address information (26 cases), were not mailed the incentive payment.

Results

Of the 2,737 NSAP-eligible cases, 1,978 completed the survey without additional incentives (72.3% completion rate) as can be seen in Table IV.

<Table IV here>

The \$5 additional incentive effort, both for active and passive refusals, helped achieve 111 additional NSAP interviews, as can be seen in Table V. Of the active refusal incentive cases, 33.2% completed the interview. Of the passive incentive cases, 37.5% completed the interview.

<Table V here>

The \$5 additional incentive effort increased the unweighted interview completion rate from 72.3% to 76.3% with the additional 111 interviews achieved.

Appendix IX: Nonresponse bias analysis

As previously described, the overall response rate for the National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP) was 34.6%. Nonresponse to the NSAP occurred in two stages: nonresponse to the 2007 National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH), and nonresponse to the follow-up interview for the NSAP. What is unusual in this case is that all of the nonrespondents in the second stage had already completed the NSCH, and as a result, a great deal of information was known about these nonrespondents, information that is usually not available for nonrespondents. This had two main implications: first, it was possible to conduct a more extensive and accurate analysis of the potential for nonresponse bias resulting from the second stage of nonresponse than would normally be possible; and second, it was possible to adjust the weights very precisely to correct for nonresponse bias (as described in Appendix I). As a result of the weighting adjustments, the overall response rate for the NSCH itself, i.e., the overall response rate for the first stage of nonresponse, could be considered the more accurate indicator of potential nonresponse bias in the NSAP.

Tables VI, VII and VIII present a comparison of NSAP respondents and nonrespondents on selected NSCH data elements. All cases completed the NSCH; they are differentiated by whether they responded or not in the second stage (i.e., whether they responded to the NSAP or not). Table VI shows child-level demographic and health characteristics, table VII shows household-level socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, and table VIII shows NSCH data elements that are topically similar to the sorts of data collected in NSAP. These tables demonstrate that there are significant differences between respondents and nonrespondents on many dimensions. Nonrespondents were significantly more likely to represent private domestic adoptions, older children, and non-Hispanic black children (table VI); significantly less likely to represent households in the highest income or education categories or households with 2 children (table VII); and significantly less likely to represent households with 2 adoptive parents or parents who usually felt angry with the child (table VIII). In addition to these statistically significant differences, many other characteristics showed differences between respondents and nonrespondents that are not statistically significant, but are large enough to prompt the question as to the magnitude of the effect of second-stage nonresponse on survey estimates.

<Table VI here>

<Table VII here>

<Table VIII here>

Tables IX, X and XI present estimates for the final NSAP sample, weighted by the nonresponse-adjusted sampling weights, compared with estimates for the full pool of NSCH cases that were eligible for the NSAP (i.e., the NSAP respondents and nonrespondents combined, the final NSAP sample that would have been attained if there were no second-stage nonresponse at all). After the weighting adjustments described in Appendix I, estimates for the NSAP respondents are much closer to the estimates for the full pool of NSAP eligible cases, and in many comparisons are so close that the remaining difference is

negligible. Although this is to be expected for the characteristics that were used to adjust the weights, such as adoption type, it is also the case for characteristics that were not directly controlled in the adjustment of the sampling weights, presumably because they are related to the variables that were controlled for in the weighting adjustment.

<Table IX here>

<Table X here>

<Table XI here>

The only characteristic that shows a significant difference in tables IX – XI is the percent of households where the primary language is not English (the final NSAP sample underestimates the proportion of adoptive households where the primary language is not English by 1.5 percentage points). However, NSAP eligibility required that the household at least include an English speaker, and very few adoptive households (only 2.5% of NSAP-eligible households as shown in table X) are English-speaking and have a language other than English as the primary language.

Other than the significant difference found for primary language in the household, only 6 other characteristics in tables IX – XI showed a difference between the final NSAP sample and full pool of NSAP eligible cases that was as high as two percentage points: one child in the household (2.5 percentage points, overestimated in the final NSAP file) and 3 or more children in the household (3.7 percentage points, underestimated in the final NSAP file, table X); one adoptive parent in the household (2.7 percentage points, underestimated in the final NSAP file), two adoptive parents in the household (2.7 percentage points, overestimated in the final NSAP file), the parent copes very well with parenting (2.6 percentage points, underestimated in the final NSAP file), and the child sometimes does things that bother the parent (2.3 percentage points, overestimated in the final NSAP file, table XI).

Of all the characteristics examined, there is a second-stage nonresponse bias of between 2 and 3 percentage points for categories of only four variables: the number of children in the household, the number of adoptive parents in the household, how well the parent copes with parenting, and how often the child does things that bother the parent. Although this analysis does not necessarily demonstrate that no nonresponse bias derives from second-stage nonresponse at all, it strongly suggests that the overall first-stage response rate (46.7%) is very likely a better indicator of the potential nonresponse bias in NSAP than the final overall response rate of 34.6%.

Appendix X: Coding of verbatim answers into question responses

For many questions in the NSAP interview, respondents provided a response that did not match any pre-existing category. If this occurred, the interviewer chose “other” and typed in the response provided by the respondent. After the end of the data collection period verbatim responses were recoded into existing response categories where appropriate.

There were three ways in which verbatim responses were used to recode or backcode data:

- Some verbatim responses were back-coded to existing response categories on preceding questions;
- Some verbatim responses were used to create new response categories for preceding questions, which are indicated by new dummy variables;
- Some verbatim responses were used to create new variables to capture the data because no root question existed for which to create new categories or back-code verbatim responses into preexisting categories.

Any existing variable that was recoded or back-coded based on verbatim responses had the letter ‘R’ appended to the variable name to denote “recoded version” of the variable.

Verbatim responses were used to back-code “other” into pre-existing categories for the following variables:

- C2_N asked where the child lived prior to placement with the family, and “other” responses were recorded verbatim in C2A. Verbatim responses were used to change a few cases of “other” to one of the pre-existing codes on C2_NR.
- C12A through C12F asked if a list of items were reasons why the respondent chose to adopt; C12G asked if there were any other reasons and C12GA recorded the verbatim reason. Verbatim responses were used to change “no” to “yes” for a few cases each on C12AR, C12CR, C12ER, and C12FR.
- C22A through C22H asked if a list of items were reasons why the respondent chose to adopt via a private domestic adoption; C22I asked if there were any other reasons and C22IA recorded the verbatim reason. C22A through C22H and C22IA were each followed by a question that asked if the reason was very important, somewhat important, or not important. Verbatim responses were used to change “no” to “yes” for a few cases each on C22AR, C22ER, and C22GR, and in each case, the value for the importance follow-up C22IA was assigned as appropriate to C22AAR, C22EAR, and C22GAR.
- C23A_N through C23K asked if a list of items were reasons why the respondent chose to adopt via an international adoption; C23L asked if there were any other reasons and C23LA recorded the verbatim reason. C23A_N through C23K and C23LA were each followed by a question that asked if the reason was very important, somewhat important, or not important. Verbatim

- C24A through C24E asked if a list of items were reasons why the respondent chose to adopt via the U.S. foster care system; C24F asked if there were any other reasons and C24FA recorded the verbatim reason. C24A through C24E and C24FA were each followed by a question that asked if the reason was very important, somewhat important, or not important. Verbatim responses were used to change “no” to “yes” for a few cases each on C24BR, C24DR, and C24ER, and in each case, the value for the importance follow-up C24FAA was assigned as appropriate to C24BAR, C24DAR, and C24EAR.
- F6A through F6C asked if a list of items were reasons why the respondent requested a subsidy; F6D asked if there were any other reasons and F6DA recorded the verbatim reason. Verbatim responses were used to change “no” to “yes” for a few cases on F6AR.
- N1D, N2D, N3D, N5F, N6D, N7D, N9D, N10D, N11D, N12D, N14D, and N18D are items that asked why the respondent or respondent’s child did not receive a particular post-adoption support or service; multiple answers were possible and the answers were recorded in dummy variables. Verbatim responses were used to change “other” to one of the pre-existing codes for a few cases on each the following dummy variables: N1DX01R, N1DX02R, N1DX05R, N2DX01R, N2DX02R, N3DX03R, N3DX04R, N5FX01R, N5FX02R, N5FX03R, N6DX01R, N6DX02R, N6DX03R, N6DX04R, N6DX06R, N7DX01R, N7DX02R, N7DX05R, N7DX06R, N9DX01R, N9DX02R, N9DX04R, N9DX05R, N10DX01R, N10DX02R, N10DX03R, N10DX04R, N10DX05R, N11DX01R, N11DX02R, N11DX04R, N12DX01R, N12DX02R, N12DX04R, N12DX05R, N14DX02R, N18DX01R, N18DX02R, and N18DX03R.
- N3B, N5D, N6B, N7B, N9B, N10BB, N11B, and N12B are items that asked how the respondent heard about particular post-adoption supports and services; multiple answers were possible and the answers were recorded in dummy variables. Verbatim responses were used to change “other” to one of the pre-existing codes for a few cases on each the following dummy variables: N3BX02R, N5DX01R, N5DX02R, N6BX03R, N6BX04R, N7BX01R, N9BX01R, N10BBX01R, N11BX01R, and N12BX01R.
- N21A and N22A asked the respondent who helped them assist or recruit other adoptive families. Verbatim responses were used to change “other” to one of the pre-existing codes for a few cases on N21AR and N22AR.
- N26 and N27 are items that asked the respondent’s and respondent’s spouse’s/partner’s employment status the previous week. Verbatim responses were used to change “other” to one of the pre-existing codes for a few cases on N26R and N27R.

Verbatim responses were used to create new response categories for the following variables:

- F10A asked for other reasons why the family didn’t receive an adoption subsidy. Some “other” responses are put into a new category on F10R indicating the subsidy was not available.

- N1DA, N2DA, N3DA, N5FA, N6DA, N7DA, N8DA, N9DA, N10DA, N11DA, N12DA, N14DA, and N18DA are items that asked for other reasons why the respondent or respondent's child did not receive a particular post-adoption support or service. For each, some "other: verbatim" responses have been back-coded into new categories: one that combines responses such as "distance" and "transportation issues," another that combines responses such as "time" and "scheduling difficulties," another that combines responses that indicate the child's condition or behavior prevented the family from receiving the service, and another that combined responses such as "it wasn't needed," "a family member refused," and "we didn't follow through with it." All these variables got the new code "no need/someone refused/no follow-through" and none of these variables got more than 2 new codes in total. The new response categories are captured by the dummy variables N1DA_1, N1DA_2, N2DA_1, N2DA_2, N3DA_1, N3DA_2, N5FA_1, N6DA_1, N7DA_1, N8DA_1, N9DA_1, N10DA_1, N11DA_1, N12DA_1, N14DA_1, N18DA_1, and N18DA_2.
- N2BAA, N3BA, N5DA, N6BA, N7BA, N8BA, N9BA, N10BA, N11BA, N12BA, N14BBA, and N18BA are items that asked for other sources from whom the respondent heard about particular post-adoption supports and services. For each, some "other: verbatim" responses have been back-coded into two new categories: one that combines responses such as "friends," "acquaintances," "church" and "word of mouth," and another that combines responses such as "clinic," "hospital," and others as "other service providers." The new response categories are captured by the dummy variables N2BAA_1, N2BAA_2, N3BA_1, N3BA_2, N5DA_1, N5DA_2, N6BA_1, N6BA_2, N7BA_1, N7BA_2, N8BA_1, N9BA_1, N9BA_2, N10BA_1, N10BA_2, N11BA_1, N11BA_2, N12BA_1, N12BA_2, N14BBA_1, N14BBA_2, N18BA_1, and N18BA_2.
- N21AA and N22AA asked the respondent for other sources that helped them assist or recruit other adoptive families. A new category has been created for these variables that groups together responses such as "social services," "other public agency," and "non-governmental organization." The new response categories are captured by the dummy variables N21AA_1 and N22AA_1.

Verbatim responses were used to create new variables for the following situations:

- C12GA asked for other reasons why the respondent chose to adopt. New variable C12GA_1 indicates that the respondent had formed a bond or already loved the child prior to adoption; C12GA_2 indicates that the child was a relative's or friend's child prior to the adoption; C12GA_3 indicates a general statement such as "I love children;" C12GA_4 indicates that the respondent wanted to help the child avoid going to foster care.
- C22IA, C23LA and C24FA asked for other reasons why the respondent chose the specific type of adoption they did (private domestic, international, or foster care). New variable C22IA_1 indicates responses such as convenience or a desire to help American children; C22IA_2 indicates responses such as lower cost or less risk; C22IA_3 indicates responses such as wanting an open adoption or knowing the child prior to adoption; and C22IA_4 indicates responses such as familiarity with that agency. C23LA_1 indicates responses such as wanting a Chinese girl;

- C23IAA asked why the respondent felt that a U.S. adoption would not be the best option. New variable C23IAAR has three categories created from the verbatim responses: “legal issues/fear of birth parents changing their minds,” “race or age considerations,” and “drug abuse/special needs considerations.”
- F6DA asked the respondent for other reasons why s/he requested an adoption subsidy. New variable F6DA_1 indicates one category created from the verbatim responses: because they could always use extra income, or because it was available.
- F16EA, F17EA and F18EA asked if there were any other source helping to pay for services. New variables F16EA_1 and F16EA_2 indicate answers of “insurance (other than Medicaid)” and “school,” F17EA_1 and F17EA_2 indicate answers of “insurance” and “Medicaid,” and F18EA_1 and F18EA_2 indicate answers of “insurance” and “Medicaid.”

Appendix XI: Prevalence estimates and weighted frequencies

This appendix consists of table XII.

<Table XII here>

Table A: Augmentation sample by state

State	Percent of sample called only for NSCH
Connecticut	17.8
Delaware	4.9
Idaho	18.8
Kansas	7.9
Mississippi	2.6
Montana	8.5
North Dakota	10.8
Oklahoma	17.0
Utah	8.0

When this report is typeset and edited, tables A-F will be embedded in the text as text tables, while tables I-XII will appear in appendices. Their current page numbering and placement in the table of contents is temporary.

Table B: Number and percent of respondents, by relationship to sampled child

Relationship of respondent to sampled child	Number	Percent
Total	2,089	100.0
Adoptive mother	1,651	79.0
Adoptive father	423	20.2
Unknown	1	0.0
Don't know/refused	14	0.7

Table C: Mean and median length of the National Survey of Adoptive Parents interview (in minutes and seconds)

Section of Interview	Interview Length	
	Mean	Median
Overall Length	30:46	29:24
Section S: Screener	02:23	02:02
Section C: Characteristics	12:16	11:45
Section W: Parent and child well-being	03:30	03:18
Section F: Adoption agreement and post-adoption services - financial	03:52	03:22
Section N: Post-adoption supports - non-financial	08:54	07:58

Table D: Final disposition of the 2007 NSAP sample

Final disposition	Number of selected telephone lines	Percent of total selected telephone lines
Total	2,806,416	100.0
Not resolved as residential/nonresidential	445,972	15.9
Out of scope (i.e., business, nonworking, fax/modem)	1,770,887	63.1
Known household, age eligibility undetermined	74,051	2.6
Age-screened household, no child age-eligible	380,130	13.5
Known age-eligible household, NSAP eligibility undetermined	44,166	1.6
NSAP-screened household, no child NSAP-eligible	88,473	3.2
NSAP-eligible household, interview not complete	648	0.0
NSAP-eligible household, partially completed interview	6	0.0
NSAP-eligible household, completed interview	2,083	0.1

Table E: NSAP weighted response rates

	Resolution rate	Age-screener completion rate	NSCH interview completion rate	NSAP screener completion rate¹	NSAP interview completion rate	CASRO² response rate
National	81.9%	86.4%	66.0%	99.5%	74.4%	34.6%

¹Given that the NSCH interview was completed.

²CASRO is Council of American Survey Research Organizations. The CASRO response rate is the product of the resolution rate, the age-screener completion rate, the NSCH interview completion rate, the NSAP screener completion rate, and the NSAP interview completion rate.

Table F: NSAP alternative¹ weighted response rates

	Resolution rate	Age-screener completion rate	NSCH interview completion rate	NSAP screener completion rate²	NSAP interview completion rate	CASRO³ response rate
National	89.9%	86.4%	66.0%	99.5%	74.4%	38.0%

¹The alternative response rates assume that all non-contact cases—i.e., telephone numbers for which all call outcomes were “ring, no answer” or busy signals—are not households.

²Given that the NSCH interview was completed.

³CASRO is Council of American Survey Research Organizations. The CASRO response rate is the product of the resolution rate, the age-screener completion rate, the NSCH interview completion rate, the NSAP screener completion rate, and the NSAP interview completion rate.

Table I: Summary statistics for NSAP final weight

Unweighted sample size	Minimum weight	Maximum weight	Mean weight	Median weight	Sum of weights
2,089	4.04	6,761.65	853.05	395.34	1,782,024.84

Table II: NSAP final case dispositions

Description of disposition code	Disposition category	Frequency	Percent of total
Total number of sampled telephone lines		2,806,416	100.00
Virgin—not released	UH	7	<0.005
No contact	UH	191,956	6.84
3 or more fax/modem prior to contact	Z	35,575	1.27
3 or more fast busy prior to contact	Z	14,810	0.53
3 or more other technological problem prior to contact	Z	630	0.02
2 or more not in service	Z	250,155	8.91
Other nonworking number	Z	22,451	0.80
Number changed	Z	806	0.03
Not residential	Z	119,746	4.27
Answering machine—residential status unknown	UH	82,561	2.94
Answering machine—known household	UO	2,317	0.08
Spanish case—residential status unknown	UH	210	0.01
Appointment at introduction—residential status unknown	UH	1,628	0.06
Callback at introduction—residential status unknown	UH	10,475	0.37
Hang-up during introduction—residential status unknown	UH	87,920	3.13
Refusal at introduction—residential status unknown	UH	71,133	2.53
Other Introduction—residential status unknown	UH	82	<0.005
Appointment—known household (NIS screening pending)	UO	8,468	0.30
Callback—known household (NIS screening pending)	UO	23,435	0.84
Refusal—known household (NIS screening pending)	UO	25,110	0.89
Other—known household (NIS screening pending)	UO	488	0.02
NIS-level appointment (NIS eligible)	R	114	<0.005
NIS-level callback (NIS eligible)	R	52	<0.005
NIS-level refusal (NIS eligible)	R	1,159	0.04

Table II: NSAP final case dispositions (continued)

Description of disposition code	Disposition category	Frequency	Percent of total
NIS-level other (NIS eligible)	R	9	<0.005
NIS-finalized eligible for SLAITS redialing, recontact unsuccessful	R	1,748	0.06
Teen-level appointment (Teen screening pending)	R	41	<0.005
Teen-level callback (Teen screening pending)	R	102	<0.005
Teen-level refusal (Teen screening pending)	R	317	0.01
Teen-level other (Teen screening pending)	R	10	<0.005
Teen-level appointment (Teen eligible)	R	6	<0.005
Teen-level callback (Teen eligible)	R	5	<0.005
Teen-level refusal (Teen eligible)	R	121	<0.005
Teen-level other (Teen eligible)	R	1	<0.005
Teen-finalized eligible for SLAITS redialing, recontact unsuccessful	R	237	0.01
Appointment prior to NSCH Item S_UNDR18 (NSCH screening pending)	UO	621	0.02
Callback prior to NSCH Item S_UNDR18 (NSCH screening pending)	UO	3,761	0.13
Refusal prior to NSCH Item S_UNDR18 (NSCH screening pending)	UO	9,530	0.34
Other prior to NSCH Item S_UNDR18 (NSCH screening pending)	UO	312	0.01
Appointment prior to NSCH Item K8Q12	R	7,602	0.27
Callback prior to NSCH Item K8Q12	R	9,673	0.34
Refusal prior to NSCH Item K8Q12	R	21,762	0.78
NIS-finalized eligible for SLAITS redialing, ended prior to NSCH Item K8Q12	R	274	0.01
Teen-finalized eligible for SLAITS redialing, ended prior to NSCH Item K8Q12	R	38	<0.005
Other prior to NSCH Item K8Q12	R	463	0.02
Appointment—Age eligible, NSAP screening incomplete	NS	146	0.01
Callback—Age eligible, NSAP screening incomplete	NS	131	<0.005

Table II: NSAP final case dispositions (continued)

Description of disposition code	Disposition category	Frequency	Percent of total
Refusal—Age eligible, NSAP screening incomplete	NS	152	0.01
NIS-finalized eligible for SLAITS redialing—Age eligible, NSAP screening incomplete	NS	2	<0.005
Other—Age eligible, NSAP screening incomplete	NS	1	<0.005
Appointment—NSAP eligible, interview incomplete	E	211	0.01
Callback—NSAP eligible, interview incomplete	E	150	0.01
Refusal—NSAP eligible, interview incomplete	E	255	0.01
NIS-finalized eligible for SLAITS redialing—NSAP eligible, interview incomplete	E	4	<0.005
Other—NSAP eligible, interview incomplete	E	28	<0.005
Appointment—partial NSAP interview	P	4	<0.005
Callback—partial NSAP interview	P	2	<0.005
Completed NSAP interview	I	1522	0.05
Converted NSAP interview from refusal	I	551	0.02
Converted NSAP interview, NIS-finalized eligible for SLAITS redialing	I	9	<0.005
Converted NSAP interview, Teen-finalized eligible for SLAITS redialing	I	1	<0.005
NSAP ineligible—Age eligible, Child Not Adopted	XN	88,432	3.15
NSAP ineligible—Age eligible, Language	XN	41	<0.005
Minor HH	X	2,843	0.10
Age Ineligible	X	377,287	13.44
Prefinalized Do Not Call List	UO	9	<0.005
GENESYS resolved telephone numbers (nonworking, business, and modem numbers)	Z	1,326,714	47.27

Table III: Unweighted¹ response rate calculations for National Survey of Adoptive Parents²

Disposition categories and response rates	Frequency or calculated rate	Disposition code or formula
Summary of disposition categories		
Non-contact	191,963	UH
Answering Machine	82,561	UH
Unknown residential status	171,448	UH
Known household, unknown age eligibility	74,051	UO
Disconnect	324,427	Z
Non-residential	119,746	Z
Genesys Prefinalized	1,326,714	Z
Age Eligible, NSCH incomplete	43,734	R
Age Eligible, NSCH complete, NSAP screening incomplete	432	NS
Age Eligible, NSAP ineligible	88,473	XN
Age Ineligible	380,130	X
Eligible for NSAP, incomplete interview	648	E
Full NSAP completed interviews at the household level	2,083	I
Partial NSAP interviews at the household level	6	P
Total	2,806,416	
Calculation of response rates		
Resolution Rate (RR)	84.11%	$(I+P+E+NS+R+XN+X+UO+Z) / (I+P+E+NS+R+XN+X+UO+Z+UH)$
Age-screener completion rate (SCR1)	87.44%	$(I+P+E+NS+R+XN+X) / (I+P+E+NS+R+XN+X+UO)$
NSCH interview completion rate (ICR1)	67.69%	$(I+P+E+NS+XN) / (I+P+E+NS+XN+R)$

**Table III: Unweighted¹ response rate calculations for National Survey of Adoptive Parents²
(continued)**

Disposition categories and response rates	Frequency or calculated rate	Disposition code or formula
NSAP screener completion rate ³ (SCR2)	99.53%	$(I+P+E+XN) / (I+P+E+NS+XN)$
NSAP interview completion rate (ICR2)	76.32%	$(I+P) / (I+P+E)$
Overall response rate	37.82%	$(RR)(SCR1)(ICR1)(SCR2)(ICR2)$

¹ Response rate calculations are unweighted for all quarters including Q1BANK.

² Includes cases called between 4/05/2007 and 7/27/2008.

³ Given that the NSCH interview was completed.

Table IV: Case status after initial \$25 incentive

	NSAP-eligible	Percent
Total	2,737	100.0
Completed Interview	1,978	72.3
Did not complete, qualified for additional \$5 active refusal incentive	244	8.9
Did not complete, qualified for additional \$5 passive refusal incentive	80	2.9
Did not complete, not eligible for further incentive	435	15.9

Table V: Completion rates, by NSAP incentive type

	NSAP-eligible	Completed interview	Interview completion rate (percent)
\$25 initial incentive, qualified for additional \$5 active refusal incentive	244	81	33.2
\$25 initial incentive, qualified for additional \$5 passive refusal incentive	80	30	37.5

Table VI: Percent of children by demographic and health characteristics for respondents and nonrespondents in the National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP)

<i>Child-level characteristic</i>	<i>Weighted Percent (SE)</i>	
	<i>NSAP-eligible, Nonrespondents</i>	<i>NSAP-eligible, Respondents</i>
Adoption type		
International	21.4 (3.84)	26.1 (2.07)
Foster care	32.1 (4.29)	38.8 (2.55)
Private domestic	46.5 (4.76)*	35.1 (2.49)*
Age		
0-2 years	5.8 (1.51)	5.2 (0.69)
3-5 years	8.7 (2.24)*	15.4 (2.07)*
6-11 years	34.5 (4.41)	40.8 (2.55)
12-17 years	51.0 (4.73)*	38.7 (2.45)*
Sex		
Male	54.3 (4.64)	46.8 (2.60)
Female	45.7 (4.64)	53.2 (2.60)
Race/ethnicity		
Hispanic	11.0 (2.92)	16.8 (2.27)
Non-Hispanic white	34.5 (3.87)	36.9 (2.37)
Non-Hispanic black	31.9 (4.96)*	20.2 (2.05)*
Non-Hispanic Asian	10.7 (2.23)*	17.0 (1.96)*
Non-Hispanic other	11.9 (3.95)	9.2 (1.37)
Overall health		
Excellent	54.9 (4.71)	58.2 (2.55)
Very Good	33.3 (4.63)	26.7 (2.19)
Good	9.4 (1.98)	10.4 (1.55)
Fair	2.1 (0.93)	3.2 (1.04)
Poor	0.3 (0.17)	1.5 (1.22)
Child has Special Health Care Needs		
Yes	35.3 (4.62)	40.9 (2.58)
No	64.7 (4.62)	59.1 (2.58)
Child received mental health treatment		
Yes	21.1 (3.62)	21.1 (2.06)
No	78.9 (3.62)	78.9 (2.06)
Child has health insurance		
Yes	91.0 (3.29)	96.1 (0.68)
No	9.0 (3.29)	3.9 (0.68)
Sample size		
Weight		
	648	2,089
	NSCH	NSCH

Source: National Survey of Children's Health, 2007 (NSCH)

*Estimates for respondents and nonrespondents differ at the 0.05 level

Table VII: Percent of children by household socioeconomic and demographic characteristics for respondents and nonrespondents in the National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP)

<i>Household-level characteristic</i>	<i>Weighted Percent (SE)</i>	
	<i>NSAP-eligible, Nonrespondents</i>	<i>NSAP-eligible, Respondents</i>
Total household income		
Less than \$10,000	5.2 (2.79)	4.2 (1.35)
\$10,000 - \$19,999	7.3 (1.36)	4.9 (0.82)
\$20,000 - \$39,999	20.3 (4.67)	13.8 (1.61)
\$40,000 - \$59,000	21.9 (4.56)	21.5 (2.42)
\$60,000 or more	45.3 (4.51)*	55.6 (2.59)*
Highest educational attainment		
Less than high school	10.7 (3.18)	6.8 (1.51)
High school/equivalent	25.6 (4.59)*	14.3 (1.47)*
More than high school	63.7 (4.85)*	78.8 (1.98)*
Number of adults		
1	23.1 (4.72)	18.0 (2.04)
2	63.4 (4.68)	63.8 (2.54)
3 or more	13.5 (2.17)	18.2 (2.12)
Number of children		
1	38.2 (4.58)	34.3 (2.18)
2	28.0 (4.02)*	38.8 (2.57)*
3 or more	33.8 (4.69)	26.9 (2.50)
Parent's marital status		
Married	72.8 (5.21)	76.4 (2.39)
Separated	3.4 (2.02)	1.8 (0.52)
Divorced	6.5 (2.28)	10.4 (1.97)
Widowed	7.7 (2.80)	2.9 (0.64)
Never Married	9.6 (4.42)	8.6 (1.50)
Cohabiting	4.5 (2.26)	3.0 (1.21)
Primary language in the household		
English	95.7 (2.69)	98.1 (1.23)
Not English	4.3 (2.69)	1.9 (1.23)
Census region		
Northeast	20.2 (3.31)	18.6 (1.98)
Midwest	24.3 (3.46)	24.9 (1.78)
South	37.5 (4.88)	36.6 (2.54)
West	18.0 (3.93)	19.9 (2.34)
Metropolitan Statistical Area status		
In Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	86.1 (2.07)	85.7 (1.16)
Not in MSA	13.9 (2.07)	14.3 (1.16)
Sample size		
	648	2,089
Weight		
	NSCH	NSCH

Source: National Survey of Children's Health, 2007 (NSCH)

*Estimates for respondents and nonrespondents differ at the 0.05 level

Table VIII: Percent of children by NSCH characteristics similar to NSAP data elements for respondents and nonrespondents in the National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP)

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Weighted Percent (SE)</i>	
	<i>NSAP-eligible, Nonrespondents</i>	<i>NSAP-eligible, Respondents</i>
Number of adoptive parents in household		
1	48.5 (5.47)*	31.0 (2.47)*
2	51.5 (5.47)*	69.1 (2.47)*
Child was born outside the U.S.		
Yes	22.0 (3.85)	26.6 (2.08)
No	78.0 (3.85)	73.4 (2.08)
How well parent & child share ideas, talk		
Very well	69.1 (4.54)	61.1 (2.87)
Somewhat well	27.8 (4.38)	30.9 (2.57)
Not very well	2.5 (1.37)	4.7 (1.60)
Not very well at all	0.6 (0.40)	3.3 (1.63)
How well parent copes with parenting		
Very well	58.3 (4.69)	54.9 (2.55)
Somewhat well	40.8 (4.69)	43.1 (2.53)
Not very well	0.4 (0.24)	1.5 (0.54)
Not very well at all	0.5 (0.35)	0.5 (0.28)
How often parent feels the child was harder to care for than other children		
Never	49.1 (4.74)	44.2 (2.55)
Rarely	19.6 (3.96)	22.3 (2.05)
Sometimes	18.3 (2.73)	20.7 (1.98)
Usually	6.0 (2.86)	8.6 (1.72)
Always	7.0 (3.07)	4.3 (1.30)
How often child does things that bother parent		
Never	24.7 (3.88)	17.0 (1.63)
Rarely	29.0 (4.20)	32.7 (2.42)
Sometimes	37.7 (4.71)	41.0 (2.53)
Usually	7.3 (2.82)	6.7 (1.51)
Always	1.3 (0.52)	2.6 (1.26)
How often parent feels angry with child		
Never	22.7 (4.29)	17.7 (2.09)
Rarely	33.6 (3.93)	36.4 (2.38)
Sometimes	41.5 (4.86)	40.3 (2.48)
Usually	0.5 (0.25)*	2.5 (0.61)*
Always	1.7 (0.94)	3.1 (1.72)
Sample size	648	2,089
Weight	NSCH	NSCH

Source: National Survey of Children's Health, 2007 (NSCH)

*Estimates for respondents and nonrespondents differ at the 0.05 level

Table IX: Percent of children by demographic and health characteristics in the final National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP) and for all NSAP-eligible cases

<i>Child-level characteristic</i>	<i>Weighted Percent (95% CI)</i>	
	<i>All NSAP-eligible Cases</i>	<i>Final NSAP Data File</i>
Adoption type		
International	24.9 (21.5-28.7)	24.9 (21.9-28.1)
Foster care	37.1 (32.9-41.5)	37.1 (33.5-40.8)
Private domestic	38.0 (33.7-42.5)	38.0 (34.5-41.6)
Age		
0-2 years	5.4 (4.2-6.8)	5.7 (4.5-7.2)
3-5 years	13.7 (10.7-17.3)	13.3 (11.1-15.9)
6-11 years	39.2 (34.9-43.6)	39.1 (35.5-42.9)
12-17 years	41.8 (37.5-46.3)	41.8 (38.2-45.6)
Sex		
Male	48.7 (44.3-53.2)	48.7 (45.0-52.5)
Female	51.3 (46.8-55.7)	51.3 (47.5-55.0)
Race/ethnicity		
Hispanic	15.3 (12.0-19.3)	15.3 (12.8-18.1)
Non-Hispanic white	36.3 (32.4-40.3)	37.3 (33.9-40.7)
Non-Hispanic black	23.2 (19.4-27.4)	23.2 (20.0-26.7)
Non-Hispanic Asian	15.4 (12.5-18.7)	15.4 (12.8-18.3)
Non-Hispanic other	9.9 (7.4-13.1)	8.9 (7.1-11.1)
Overall health		
Excellent	57.3 (52.9-61.7)	57.3 (53.5-61.0)
Very Good	28.4 (24.6-32.6)	28.0 (24.6-31.6)
Good	10.2 (7.9-12.9)	11.2 (9.0-13.8)
Fair	2.9 (1.7-5.0)	2.9 (1.8-4.6)
Poor	1.2 (0.3-5.2)	0.7 (0.2-2.2)
Child has Special Health Care Needs		
Yes	39.5 (35.2-44.0)	39.4 (35.9-43.0)
No	60.5 (56.0-64.8)	60.6 (57.0-64.1)
Child received mental health treatment		
Yes	21.1 (17.8-24.8)	22.0 (19.1-25.1)
No	78.9 (75.2-82.2)	78.1 (74.9-80.9)
Child has health insurance		
Yes	94.8 (92.5-96.5)	95.2 (93.2-96.6)
No	5.2 (3.6-7.6)	4.8 (3.4-6.8)
Sample size		
Weight		
	2,737 NSCH	2,089 NSAP

Source: National Survey of Children's Health, 2007 (NSCH) & National Survey of Adoptive Parents, 2007 (NSAP)

Table X: Percent of children by household socioeconomic and demographic characteristics in the final National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP) and for all NSAP-eligible cases

<i>Household-level characteristic</i>	<i>Weighted Percent (95% CI)</i>	
	<i>All NSAP-eligible Cases</i>	<i>Final NSAP Data File</i>
Total household income		
Less than \$10,000	4.5 (2.6-7.6)	4.0 (2.7-6.0)
\$10,000 - \$19,999	5.5 (4.3-7.1)	6.0 (4.4-8.3)
\$20,000 - \$39,999	15.5 (12.4-19.1)	15.4 (12.8-18.5)
\$40,000 - \$59,000	21.6 (17.7-26.1)	21.6 (18.5-25.1)
\$60,000 or more	53.0 (48.5-57.4)	53.0 (49.2-56.6)
Highest educational attainment		
Less than high school	7.8 (5.5-11.0)	7.7 (5.7-10.3)
High school/equivalent	17.2 (14.2-20.7)	17.4 (14.6-20.5)
More than high school	75.0 (70.9-78.7)	75.0 (71.4-78.2)
Number of adults		
1	19.3 (15.8-23.4)	17.6 (14.9-20.8)
2	63.7 (59.2-67.9)	64.5 (60.8-68.0)
3 or more	17.0 (14.0-20.6)	17.9 (15.2-20.9)
Number of children		
1	35.3 (31.5-39.3)	37.8 (34.5-41.3)
2	36.0 (31.8-40.5)	37.2 (33.6-40.9)
3 or more	28.7 (24.5-33.2)	25.0 (21.7-28.7)
Parent's marital status		
Married	75.5 (71.0-79.6)	76.8 (73.2-80.0)
Separated	2.2 (1.2-3.8)	2.2 (1.3-3.7)
Divorced	9.5 (6.7-13.1)	9.5 (7.2-12.4)
Widowed	4.0 (2.6-5.9)	3.2 (2.1-4.8)
Never Married	8.9 (6.3-12.4)	8.4 (6.5-10.7)
Cohabiting	3.4 (1.8-6.2)	2.2 (1.4-3.6)
Primary language in the household		
English	97.5 (93.9-99.0)*	99.0 (97.7-99.6)*
Not English	2.5 (1.0-6.1)*	1.0 (0.4-2.3)*
Census region		
Northeast	19.0 (15.9-22.6)	19.0 (17.1-21.1)
Midwest	24.7 (21.7-28.0)	24.7 (22.8-26.8)
South	36.9 (32.6-41.4)	36.9 (34.4-39.4)
West	19.4 (15.8-23.7)	19.4 (17.7-21.3)
Metropolitan Statistical Area status		
In Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	85.8 (83.7-87.7)	85.8 (83.7-87.6)
Not in MSA	14.2 (12.4-16.3)	14.2 (12.4-16.3)
Sample size		
	2,737	2,089
Weight		
	NSCH	NSAP

Source: National Survey of Children's Health, 2007 (NSCH) & National Survey of Adoptive Parents, 2007 (NSAP)

*Estimates for NSAP final data and NSAP-eligible cases differ at the 0.05 level

Table XI: Percent of children by NSCH characteristics similar to NSAP data elements in the final National Survey of Adoptive Parents (NSAP) and for all NSAP-eligible cases

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Weighted Percent (95% CI)</i>	
	<i>All NSAP-eligible Cases</i>	<i>Final NSAP Data File</i>
Number of adoptive parents in household		
1	35.1 (30.6-39.9)	32.4 (28.8-36.3)
2	64.9 (60.1-69.4)	67.6 (63.7-71.2)
Child was born outside the U.S.		
Yes	25.4 (22.0-29.2)	25.6 (22.6-28.9)
No	74.6 (70.8-78.0)	74.4 (71.1-77.4)
How well parent & child share ideas, talk		
Very well	63.3 (58.3-68.0)	62.4 (58.2-66.4)
Somewhat well	30.1 (25.9-34.6)	31.5 (27.8-35.5)
Not very well	4.1 (2.3-7.3)	3.8 (2.6-5.5)
Not very well at all	2.6 (1.0-6.3)	2.3 (1.2-4.6)
How well parent copes with parenting		
Very well	55.8 (51.3-60.1)	53.2 (49.5-56.9)
Somewhat well	42.5 (38.2-46.9)	44.4 (40.7-48.1)
Not very well	1.2 (0.6-2.4)	1.6 (0.9-2.9)
Not very well at all	0.5 (0.2-1.2)	0.8 (0.3-2.2)
How often parent feels the child was harder to care for than other children		
Never	45.4 (41.1-49.9)	44.3 (40.6-48.0)
Rarely	21.7 (18.3-25.5)	23.1 (20.0-26.5)
Sometimes	20.1 (17.0-23.5)	21.6 (18.7-24.8)
Usually	7.9 (5.5-11.3)	6.9 (5.2-9.2)
Always	5.0 (3.0-8.1)	4.1 (2.9-5.9)
How often child does things that really bother the parent		
Never	19.0 (16.1-22.2)	18.6 (16.1-21.5)
Rarely	31.8 (27.8-36.0)	31.1 (27.9-34.6)
Sometimes	40.2 (35.9-44.6)	42.5 (38.8-46.2)
Usually	6.8 (4.6-10.0)	6.0 (4.5-7.9)
Always	2.2 (1.0-5.1)	1.8 (1.0-3.3)
How often parent feels angry with child		
Never	19.0 (15.5-23.0)	17.3 (14.6-20.4)
Rarely	35.7 (31.8-39.8)	37.1 (33.8-40.6)
Sometimes	40.6 (36.3-45.1)	41.5 (37.9-45.2)
Usually	2.0 (1.2-3.1)	2.6 (1.7-3.8)
Always	2.8 (1.1-6.9)	1.5 (0.7-3.3)
Sample size	2,737	2,089
Weight	NSCH	NSAP

Source: National Survey of Children's Health, 2007 (NSCH) & National Survey of Adoptive Parents, 2007 (NSAP)

Table XII: Unweighted and weighted estimates of the frequency and prevalence of type of adoption

Type of Adoption	Total unweighted number of children	Total weighted estimate of number of children	Standard error of weighted estimate of number of children	Weighted percent of children	Standard error of weighted percent of children
Total	2,089	1,782,025	45,624.9	100.00	
International	545	444,014	29,985.7	24.92	1.61
Foster Care	763	660,846	38,627.9	37.08	1.87
Private Domestic	781	677,165	36,613.2	38.00	1.83