



DC | AAPOR



Washington  
Statistical  
Society

**DC-AAPOR/WSS 2022 Fall Super Review Conference**

**Program**

November 7, 2022

The Madison Hotel

1177 15th Avenue NW, Washington, DC

Premium sponsorship by NORC at the University of Chicago  
in recognition of the 50<sup>th</sup> celebration of the General Social Survey



GSS CELEBRATING **50** YEARS | 1972-2022

## PROGRAM

8:30 - 9:00	Coffee/registration	
9:00 - 9:30	Welcome & Opening Remarks About AAPOR membership with Heather Ridolfo	
9:30 - 10:45	Session 1A: Language and questionnaire design	Session 1B: Recruiting respondents, data quality, and biases in samples
	<p>Adapting the Advance Translation Method for use at Large U.S. Survey Organizations - Patricia Goerman</p> <p>Crosslinguistic Analysis of "Language Spoken at Home" Questions - Marcus Berger</p> <p>Toward Respondent Self-Coding - Erica Yu</p> <p>Comparison of probability vs. nonprobability designs for questionnaire evaluation - Reanne Townsend</p>	<p>Examination of Recruitment Mailing Design Decisions for a Probability-based Research Panel - Ipek Bilgen</p> <p>I Want My Two Dollars: Improving ROI of Enclosed Incentives - Kate Williams</p> <p>How do you know they did that? Exploring proxy response strategies in a survey of participation in the arts - Alfred Tuttle</p>
11:00 - 12:15	Session 2A: Sexual orientation, gender identity, and equity	Session 2B: Hard-to-reach populations
	<p>Who says that?: Demographic differences in open-ended responses to survey questions about sexual orientation - Shelley Feuer</p> <p>Results of a Mixed-Method Study to Evaluate 2-Step Gender Identity Measures - Valerie Ryan</p> <p>Evaluation of Compensation Data Collected Through the EEO-1 Form - Jennifer Park</p>	<p>Examining Mode Effects in a Sample of Jewish Households: Differences Beyond Standard Demographics - Jazmyne Sutton</p> <p>Building a Geographically-Stratified Internet-Based Panel - Matin Mirramezani</p> <p>Development of "State to Local" Approach to Recruiting People with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities for Cognitive Interviews - Amanda Titus</p> <p>So, You Have Retired: How Can You Continue to Help the Statistics and Data Science Education Professions? - Carol Joyce Blumberg</p>
12:15 - 1:30	Lunch (on your own)	

1:30 - 2:45	Session 3A: Experiences with multimode surveys	Session 3B: Qualitative research: methods and applications
	<p>Examination of Auxiliary Information Appended to Address Based Samples in Mixed Mode Studies - Ipek Bilgen</p> <p>Comparing the Telephone to Web Data Collection Transition Between the 2021 NYC Community Health Survey (CHS) and the 2021 NYC KIDS Survey - Martha McRoy</p> <p>Need Telephone Show Cards For Your In-Person Survey Due To A Pandemic-Induced Multimode Data Collection Shift? Path Study Lessons Learned 2020 to Present - Sarah Dipko</p> <p>Multimode Development And Data Quality Assessment in the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS) - Alisha Creel</p>	<p>Expanding Record-Keeping Study Methodology to Assess Structure and Availability of Data in Business Records - Melissa A. Cidade</p> <p>User satisfaction with the 2020 Census online questionnaire - Erica Olmsted-Hawala</p> <p>Protecting the Identity of Participants in Qualitative Research - Joanne Pascale</p> <p>Privacy Preserving Technologies in U.S. Education - Amy O'Hara</p>
2:45 - 3:15	Afternoon break/social	
3:15 - 4:45	Session 4A: A closer look into the General Social Survey	Session 4B: Sampling, weighting, reporting
	<p>Methodological Research using the General Social Survey - Rene Bautista</p> <p>Mailing intervention experiments and participation outcomes on the 2020 General Social Survey - Leah Christian</p> <p>Studying Open-Ended Codes Across Different Coding Teams: Analysis from the 2016-2020 GSS Panel - Benjamin Schapiro</p> <p>Household Screening on the Web: Participation outcomes based on experimental milestone incentives on the General Social Survey - Walter Hanley</p> <p>Transitions from Single to Multi-Mode Surveys- The NORC Experience - Ned English</p>	<p>Don't Use the UWE to Evaluate a Poststratified or Raking Estimator (Use Sometime Else Instead) - Phillip Kott</p> <p>Transparency in Documentation for Statistical Surveys using a Probability Panel - J. Michael Dennis</p> <p>Social Capital and Participation: Examining Hypotheses About Polling Problems in the 2020 Election Cycle - Robert Griffin</p> <p>Finding and Handling Bias in Clustered Randomized Trials - Brad Chaney</p>
4:45 - 6:30	GSS 50th reception	

## ABSTRACTS – CONCURRENT SESSIONS

### Session 1A: Language and questionnaire design

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Adapting the Advance Translation Method for use at Large U.S. Survey Organizations
<b>Authors</b>	Patricia Goerman (U.S. Census Bureau), Mikelyn Meyers (U.S. Census Bureau), Brita Dorer (GESIS), Elizabeth Gaumer (New York City Department of Housing Preservation & Development), Caitlin Waickman (New York City Department of Housing Preservation & Development)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	patricia.l.goerman@census.gov
<p>Working towards comparability across translations of survey instruments is a complex and challenging task faced by survey organizations throughout the world. The European Social Survey (ESS) has implemented a method called Advance Translation, which strives to simplify and improve the source questionnaire wording as a part of the source questionnaire design process, with a view to facilitate final translation (Dorer 2011; Fitzgerald 2015; Dorer 2020). Survey methodologists typically start with a draft source version of a questionnaire which is sent to translators for an initial “quick draft” translation. The translation is done independently by teams of translators, ideally in each language. The translators then review their first draft translation and code each question to indicate whether the source version was difficult to translate and whether they recommend any changes to the source wording prior to working on a final translation. In the final translation phase, the team members use the committee approach, consisting of translators and survey experts creating a single translation together with comments on the source text within each language. This consensus version includes the comments on which the translation team has agreed in their Review meeting. Implementing this method in the context of different survey organizations can require some adaptation, for instance, surveys run by Eurofound have made some adaptations to the method. In this talk we focus on modifications and lessons learned from using the method in the U.S. context, in a recent iteration of the New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. For example, in this project we faced challenges staffing in-house translators with the appropriate expertise, and ultimately used a combination of contracted translators and subject matter experts recruited from the local community. We conclude with future research proposals to improve the ease of implementation of the method for different surveys in the U.S.</p>	

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Crosslinguistic Analysis of "Language Spoken at Home" Questions
<b>Authors</b>	Marcus Berger (Census Bureau), Betsarí Otero Class (Census Bureau), Angie O'Brien (Census Bureau)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	marcus.p.berger@census.gov
<p>Questions about language spoken at home are common on surveys, and data from these questions are used for a variety of purposes. This project analyzes how questions about language use are interpreted by users of different languages. The study involves two rounds of cognitive testing, in which we interviewed monolingual speakers of English and Spanish, and users of American Sign Language (ASL). Some previous research has shown that, in some cases, Spanish speakers misreport themselves as English speakers, and there is an absence of research on how ASL users respond to such questions. Participants were divided into two groups: one group saw language use questions from a current production survey, and the other saw alternative question wording. Participants were probed later on their understanding of the questions, and preference between two designs. This research investigates whether users of different languages interpret questions about language use in the</p>	

same way. Particularly, we investigate (i) whether “speak” or “use” is understood better by users of ASL, (ii) whether providing examples of different languages as potential response options affects how users report the language they use at home, and (iii) how users of ASL self report when asked how well they speak English. The findings from this research will provide valuable insight into how language use questions are interpreted by speakers of different languages and what effect that has on the data collected by surveys.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Toward Respondent Self-Coding
<b>Authors</b>	Erica Yu (Bureau of Labor Statistics)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	yu.eric@bls.gov

Survey programs that rely on open-ended responses from respondents must categorize those text responses in order to create coded data for quantitative analysis. Coding can be costly, requiring time, skilled coders, and even the development of automated coding models. And yet, even with advanced systems of coding, measurement error may still remain due to the intrinsic open-ended nature of the question: the format often does not provide guidance to respondents on what level of detail they should include or how exhaustive their responses should be.

To make the shift toward respondent self-coding, there are multiple possible strategies, ranging from converting the open-end question to a closed-end question to building a real-time search algorithm for respondents to type in text and select a code from a list of search results. Each strategy has advantages and challenges that may affect whether it is suitable for a particular survey.

In this talk, I will describe our approaches to the development of self-coding protocols for multiple surveys. I will discuss the use cases for each.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Comparison of probability vs. nonprobability designs for questionnaire evaluation
<b>Authors</b>	Reanne Townsend (Westat), David Cantor (Westat), Darby Steiger (Westat)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	ReanneTownsend@westat.com

Many studies that evaluate survey instruments use data from nonprobability sources, assuming that conclusions are generalizable to probability designs. Nonprobability samples have been used to investigate a range of topics in questionnaire design, from the relationship between response latency and error in phone surveys (Draisma & Dijkstra 2004), to the use of progress indicators in web surveys (Yan, Conrad, Tourangeau & Couper 2011). There is a growing body of research that finds substantive point estimates differ between nonprobability and probability sample designs (Callegaro et al 2014, Yeager et al 2011). However, questions remain about whether other factors such as data quality measures and mode effects also differ significantly between these two designs. In this study, we examine the effect of sample design on results from quantitative questionnaire evaluation methods.

Data come from a Bureau of Justice Statistics study testing alternative measures of rape and sexual assault to support the redesign of the National Crime Victimization Survey. The study includes a probability design using address based sampling and random digit dialing of adult women, as well as a nonprobability design using a convenience sample of 2,116 female volunteers recruited from Craigslist. In both the probability and nonprobability designs, approximately half of the interviews were randomly assigned to be administered in-person via Audio Computer Assisted Self-Interview (ACASI), and half administered by an interviewer using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). Questionnaire evaluation measures such as rates of item

missing data, survey timing, test-retest reliability, respondent debriefing data, and behavior coding results will be compared between the probability and nonprobability designs. Respondent characteristics such as demographics and victimization rates will also be compared across designs.

### Session 1B: Recruiting respondents, data quality, and biases in samples

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Examination of Recruitment Mailing Design Decisions for a Probability-based Research Panel
<b>Authors</b>	Ipek Bilgen (NORC at the University of Chicago), Lindsay Liebert (NORC at the University of Chicago), Erlina Hendarwan (NORC at the University of Chicago), Roopam Singh (NORC at the University of Chicago), Vicki J. Pineau (NORC at the University of Chicago)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	bilgen-ipek@norc.org

The success of recruitment to a research panel is measured not only by response to the initial invitation, but also by the representativeness and level of engagement of the participants when invited to complete subsequent surveys. Accordingly, recruitment strategies (including recruitment materials) for probability-based web panels differ from recruitment strategies used in cross-sectional studies. This paper examines the impact of various recruitment material design approaches for a probability-based mostly web panel on sample response rates, panel composition, and retention rates. In this study, we examine the impact of different recruitment material design strategies on overall panel response rates and representation. We specifically assess the optimal recruitment material design strategies for sample members who are more reluctant to respond (such as young adults, those with high school education or less, and nonwhites). We use NORC's AmeriSpeak® Panel as the data source for this study. The probability-based AmeriSpeak Panel uses multiple modes of respondent contact, including mail, telephone, and in-person visits/interviews during the recruitment process.

During the AmeriSpeak Panel recruitment, we implemented randomized experiments to test several mailing material design variables such as: address naming conventions; the use of graphics/photos versus no graphics on invitation envelope, letter, brochure, and postcard; simplification of recruitment material content; and the enclosure of a magnet in the invitation packet mailing in addition to the pre- and post-completion incentives. We will present findings from analyses examining the individual and combined impact of these design variables on panel response rates. We will report on the efficiency of efforts that add costs to recruitment, such as the magnet. We will also examine the impact of the various mail design choices on response rates and retention rates among different demographics groups including sample members who are more likely to be reluctant respondents. Results of this recruitment efforts indicate significant improvement in recruitment response rates using plain language text and mixed results among subgroups regarding the use of photos and images in the recruitment materials. The results from this study shed light on whether, and in what ways, tailoring recruitment materials to varying subgroups may impact panel composition and retention.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	I Want My Two Dollars: Improving ROI of Enclosed Incentives
<b>Authors</b>	Kate Williams (Nielsen), Daman Cox (Nielsen), John Weisestein (Nielsen), Robin Gentry (Nielsen), Shaily Patel (Nielsen)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	kate.williams@nielsen.com

The survey industry is experiencing a general decline in survey participation, and direct mail surveys are no exception. Mailed screener questionnaires are sent at the beginning of the respondent pipeline for many surveys, including Nielsen's audio measurement services. Response rate for the screener is thus a key metric, as this is the first step of a multi-mode data collection process.

In December 2019, we tested the impact of visible cash incentives in mailed envelopes. Specifically, we sent our screener survey in an envelope where the enclosed cash incentive could be seen through a window on the back of the envelope. The tangible reward is made obvious to potential participants, increasing the likelihood they will open the envelope. Nielsen's previous qualitative research with the general population indicates people are likely to respond to the screener if they open the envelope (as opposed to sorting the envelope into the trash). We predicted this new material would have a net positive impact on screener response rate.

We acknowledged that having the cash incentive visible to all could increase the risk of theft by mail carriers and neighbors. Additionally, it could introduce a security risk for the person who picks up non-deliverable returned mail pieces from the post office. We will discuss fraud tracking and security mechanisms built into the study design to help mitigate these issues.

In this paper, we will describe the impact of the visible enclosed cash incentive. Screener response rate, respondent demographics, and answers to selected survey questions will be compared across the test and control conditions. We will discuss implementation considerations, including mail fraud, security, and cost-effectiveness. Additionally, we will share data for the first few months post-implementation.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	How do you know they did that? Exploring proxy response strategies in a survey of participation in the arts
<b>Authors</b>	Alfred Tuttle (US Census Bureau), Angie O'Brien (US Census Bureau), Jonathan Katz (US Census Bureau)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	alfred.d.tuttle@census.gov

Proxy responses are survey responses collected from one household member about or on behalf of another. Although accepting proxy responses in household surveys can improve response rates and efficiency of data collection, data quality may suffer, such as when the proxy respondent has limited knowledge about others in the household. Research on the congruence of proxies' and target respondents' answers has found that agreement of responses can be affected by various factors, including proxy respondents' social distance from the target respondent, proxies' motivation and level of cognitive effort, and characteristics of the survey (topic, task complexity, etc.).

To explore the issue of data quality resulting from proxy response, we incorporated an analysis of proxy response strategies into a small-scale pretesting evaluation of a CATI/CAPI national survey. We conducted cognitive interviews with 18 pairs of related and unrelated participants who share a household. In addition to assessing respondents' comprehension of the survey questions, we also probed proxies' strategies for formulating responses to questions about target respondents, i.e., whether they drew on direct or indirect knowledge, or developed responses based on assumptions, reasoned inferences, etc. We examined the strategies used by proxies in various relationships with target respondents (spouse/unmarried partner, parent-adult child, siblings, unrelated housemate). We also examined the relationship between question topic/format and proxies' response strategies. We used the level of agreement between proxies' and target respondents' answers to the survey questions as an indicator of the quality of proxies' responses.

In this presentation we will present the results of our analysis of the paired cognitive interviews. We will discuss

the response strategies used by proxies in various types of relationships and for different kinds of survey questions, and recommendations for maximizing data quality when using proxy respondents.

## Session 2A: Measuring sexual orientation and gender identity in federal surveys

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Who says that?: Demographic differences in open-ended responses to survey questions about sexual orientation
<b>Authors</b>	Shelley Feuer (U.S. Census Bureau), Matt Virgile, Jessica Holzberg, Renee Ellis
<b>Presenter Email</b>	shelley.b.feuer@census.gov
<p>Reliable measurement of sexual orientation is crucial to ensuring that marginalized populations are accurately represented. To capture the nuances of sexual identity, sexual orientation questions in surveys often include an open-ended "something else" response option, after closed options for "lesbian or gay," "straight," and "bisexual." However, diversity in who selects "something else" can pose challenges to analyzing and understanding data on sexual orientation. In one Census Bureau survey, most respondents who selected this category used it to assert they are "normal" or object to the question, leading to their exclusion from analyses. Yet, analysis of a national health survey focusing on sexual minority women, showed that most respondents chose "something else" because their sexuality is fluid; these respondents were also younger with unique social and health indicators. Perhaps one way to reduce measurement error in "something else," therefore, is by examining differences in open-ended "something else" responses for different populations.</p> <p>This paper addresses the extent to which the type of "something else" responses vary by sociodemographic characteristics in three large-scale federal surveys. We first discuss the development of a coding scheme to categorize open-ended responses by content and sentiment; then we examine the relationship between respondent characteristics such as age, sex, race, and education and the distribution of categories. For instance, we analyze whether younger respondents are more likely to report an alternate sexual identity (and which terms are most frequently used) and whether older respondents are more likely to write "normal" instead of selecting "straight." We also examine the profile of respondents whose responses show disapproval for the question. The findings suggest potential strategies for measurement of sexual orientation by determining when and for whom "something else" responses can be back-coded into closed-ended sexual minority options, taken seriously as alternate sexual minority identities, or treated as item nonresponse.</p>	

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Results of a Mixed-Method Study to Evaluate 2-Step Gender Identity Measures
<b>Authors</b>	Valerie Ryan (National Center for Health Statistics), Kristen Miller (NCHS), Stephanie Willson (NCHS)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	qsq6@cdc.gov
<p>This presentation covers a mixed-method study to investigate the performance of a 2-step gender identity measure whereby respondents are first asked sex assigned at birth followed by current gender identity. The study design consisted of a cognitive interviewing component in which patterns of error and interpretation were identified, followed by a 2x2 split-sample survey experiment. The experiment examined question order and two versions of the gender identity question. Additionally, the survey contained embedded follow-up questions (developed from cognitive interview findings) to identify cases of false positive and false negative error as well as reasoning for that error.</p> <p>Results of the cognitive interview component suggest that, while there is a broad range of understanding as to what constitutes the concepts of 'sex' and 'gender,' some respondents see little, if any, difference. While no</p>	



outright error was discovered, several interpretative patterns were identified that would explain causes of both false positive and false negative error among survey respondents. For the split sample survey experiment, results show both types of error occurring (regardless of version), with 22.9% of potential gender minorities being false positive cases. In covering the study's key findings, the presentation will illustrate the impact of the identified response error on key health characteristics also included on the survey and point toward directions for improved gender identity measurement.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Evaluation of Compensation Data Collected Through the EEO-1 Form
<b>Authors</b>	Jennifer Park (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine), William Rodgers, III (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis), Judith Hellerstein (University of Maryland at College Park)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	jpark@nas.edu
<p>The National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine's Committee on National Statistics conducted an evaluation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's first pay data collection of private employers. EEOC requested the evaluation to consider how the circumstances of the collection, which involved a stay in collection and court-ordered completion, may have affected data quality. Additionally, EEOC requested recommendations to inform future collections. The panel comprised labor economists, survey methodologists, statisticians, civil rights lawyers, and employer human resource experts. The panel assessed the quality of the data collected for its intended purposes: to assist EEOC in its initial investigation of pay discrimination claims; to assist employers in conducting self-assessment; and to enable further research on pay differences. During open panel meetings, stakeholders shared their views on the utility of the data for these purposes and provided recommendations for future collections. The panel conducted original data analysis of data collected. The panel will provide a summary of its findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future pay data collection.</p>	

## Session 2B: Hard-to-reach populations

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Examining Mode Effects in a Sample of Jewish Households: Differences Beyond Standard Demographics
<b>Authors</b>	Jazmyne Sutton (SSRS), Eran Ben-Porath, Cameron McPhee
<b>Presenter Email</b>	jsutton@ssrs.com
<p>Studies targeting low incidence populations often require multiple modes of administration in order to effectively reach respondents. In this study, adults in Jewish households in the greater New York area were reached through Address Based Sampling (ABS), stratified by likely Jewish incidence. In order to increase cooperation, a multi-mode multi-contact strategy was employed so that respondents could choose to take the survey online, by phone, or on paper. Because respondents could choose the mode of completion, systematic differences in selection into mode were expected. For example, more than half of phone respondents were age 65 or older compared to less than a third of web respondents.</p> <p>However, even when statistically controlling for demographic differences such as age, education, gender, and parental status, significant differences by mode were observed for key outcomes such as feelings of connectedness to the Jewish community, religious participation and membership, experiences with substance abuse, and mental health outcomes.</p> <p>In this paper, we explore specific factors that may help explain these modal differences. Notably, Jewish</p>	

denomination significantly contributed to the observed effects by mode. Additionally, issues of social desirability may also be at play when considering differences in response pattern by mode. We consider the implications of these findings for future usage of multi-mode designs in unique low-incidence populations.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Building a Geographically-Stratified Internet-Based Panel
<b>Authors</b>	Matin Mirramezani (Generation Lab), Rebecca Oh (Generation Lab), Cyrus Beschloss (Generation Lab)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	matin.mirramezani@gmail.com

Compared to traditional methods, emerging online survey methods have had equal - and usually higher - access to young respondents. According to the Pew Research Center, among young people, 100% are internet users, 96% own a smartphone, and 90% use at least one social media site. Guided by these statistics and borrowing from high-quality survey methods, the Generation Lab has developed a geographically-stratified internet-based methodology to survey young people across the United States. In our patent-pending approach, we leverage the near-universal reach of the internet to create a non-probability panel with the accuracy of a probability-based panel at a lower cost and higher speed. Although this approach does not yield a probability-based panel, we utilize a set of constraints and settings to reduce targeting and enhance randomness. We target a set of randomized geographic units, selected by applying probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling, to recruit participants and use location targeting based on physical location. We also narrow our target population to people aged 18-29. We further validate the demographic information through our intake process. The resulting panel is monitored across a variety of demographic variables to ensure representativeness compared to the population statistics. We employ a stratified random method of sampling. Surveys are deployed and sent out to the respondents who satisfy the qualification of our intended population. Throughout the polling process, we utilize a variety of features to ensure the integrity of the data that we collect, including survey protocols preventing multiple responses and flagging invalid inputs. An honorarium is given to the sampled respondents who complete the surveys.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Development of “State to Local” Approach to Recruiting People with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities for Cognitive Interviews
<b>Authors</b>	Amanda Titus (National Center for Health Statistics )
<b>Presenter Email</b>	kwc3@cdc.gov

Considerable obstacles while recruiting people with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (IDD) for a cognitive interview study led to the development and implementation of a “state to local” recruitment approach to reach individuals in the IDD community.

Recruiting hard-to reach populations to participate in research is always a challenge because of the difficulty finding individuals with very specific characteristics and getting past multiple gatekeepers for vulnerable groups. This was the challenge faced by the Collaborating Center for Questionnaire Design and Evaluation Research (CCQDER) during recruitment for an evaluation of survey questions designed to identify community-dwelling adults with IDD.

A “state to local” recruitment approach was developed by the CCQDER operations team. The approach begins with introductions to state-level representatives of organizations and groups which provided services and support to individuals with IDD and their families. These introductions laid the foundation to build relationships at the local level within the IDD community and ultimately our ability to reach respondents. While time intensive, the approach proved to be successful in recruiting individuals with IDD and their caregivers for cognitive interviews and could be modified and modeled for other studies involving hard-to-reach and

vulnerable populations.

This presentation will detail our recruitment approach and how it was implemented to gain access to the IDD community.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	So, You Have Retired: How Can You Continue to Help the Statistics and Data Science Education Professions?
<b>Authors</b>	Carol Joyce Blumberg (Retired from Winona State University and Energy Information Administration), Rebecca Nichols (American Statistical Association), Megan Murphy (American Statistical Association)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	cblumberg@gmail.com
<p>This presentation describes ways retirees have contributed as volunteers to the growth of statistics and data science education at the local, national, and international levels, with focus on help given to the American Statistical Association (ASA), its local chapters, and its specialized subject matter sections. Topics include mentoring, developing new materials for primary through post-secondary education, reviewing materials in development, reviewing journal submissions, and volunteering to help with competitions. ASA has benefitted from using volunteers because, by having volunteers do certain tasks, ASA employees have more time to work on other ways of improving statistics and data science education. Further, they have regular contact with experts with extensive experience. A major benefit for the volunteers is that volunteering helps them keep current on the newest trends.</p>	

### Session 3A: Experiences with multimode surveys

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Examination of Auxiliary Information Appended to Address Based Samples in Mixed Mode Studies
<b>Authors</b>	Ipek Bilgen (NORC at the University of Chicago), David Dutwin (NORC), Grace Xie (NORC), Chang Zhao (NORC)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	bilgen-ipek@norc.org
<p>The use of mixed mode methodology has been increasingly common during recruitment and data collection, especially in general population surveys. To be able to contact and interview individuals via various modes, researchers need auxiliary contact information to be appended to their sampling frames. One of the more commonly used strategies in multimode studies is to use address-based sample (ABS) frames given the efficiency and coverage properties of the ABS frames that are created using USPS Delivery Sequence File (DSF). In these studies, appending auxiliary contact information such as name, phone, and email to addresses is needed to enable the use of various modes during recruitment and increase the efficiency of the outreach. The incidence and accuracy rates of the appended auxiliary contact information match impact the success of the outreach efforts in multimode studies.</p> <p>Accordingly, we have conducted a study using NORC's AmeriSpeak probability-based panel and asked a representative sample of panelists whether initials, phone numbers, and emails provided by various data sources are currently used by anyone in their household. We have examined which data sources or combination of data sources produces the most optimal incidence and accuracy rates. Using additional data on the efficacy of the appended data by the providers, we built models designed to predict whether a given data point would in fact be accurate to a given sampled household. In this presentation, we will explore incidence and accuracy rates of appended names, emails, and phones (cell versus landline) both at the household and</p>	

individual level. We will present our examination of how much modeling strategies improve the accuracy of the auxiliary data sources for various populations. Overall, we will illustrate the incidence and accuracy rates of various strategies of deploying appended auxiliary contact information to utilize such data more efficiently and effectively in multimode surveys.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Comparing the Telephone to Web Data Collection Transition Between the 2021 NYC Community Health Survey (CHS) and the 2021 NYC KIDS Survey
<b>Authors</b>	Martha McRoy (Abt Associates), Michael Witt (Abt Associates), John Sokolowski (Abt Associates), Theresa Stroble (Abt Associates), Nicholas Ruther (Abt Associates), Amber Levanon Seligson (NYC DOHMH), Steven Fernandez (NYC DOHMH), Ariana Annibale (NYC DOHMH), Michael Sanderson (Utah Department of Health)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	martha_mcroy@abtassoc.com
<p>The NYC Community Health Survey (CHS) and KIDS Survey, both conducted by the NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH), fully transitioned from primarily telephone-based sample designs to multimode list frame/ABS designs in 2021 to optimize geographical targeting, provide additional stratification options, maximize response rates, reduce data collection costs, improve the sample weighting strategy and to expand analytic options. The CHS is an annual survey that collects self-reported data from 10,000 randomly selected adults that enables researchers to track the health of New Yorkers and measure the extent to which diseases, including COVID-19, and risk factors occur at the neighborhood, borough and city levels. The KIDS Survey collects data every other year from a parent/guardian on the health of 7,500 children randomly selected in NYC between the ages of 1 and 13 and provides data to understand and address the health care needs of children. The 2021 data collection protocol for both surveys involved a combination of multiple letter and postcard solicitations asking respondents to complete the survey via web followed by a paper survey mailing or a telephone follow-up effort to further minimize nonresponse bias. Bridge studies for both surveys were conducted during the 2021 data collection period utilizing the prior design methodology to measure the effect of design changes. This presentation will summarize the mode changes for both studies and their impact on the efficiency of collecting data and on final survey estimates. The effect of the mode change on estimates will be examined by comparing results from the bridge samples, with emphasis placed on any differences in the mode effect seen between CHS and KIDS. Any differences seen may be attributed to different target populations (adult vs child), a different subject person (self-report vs proxy) and/or slight differences in the data collection protocols.</p>	

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Need Telephone Show Cards For Your In-Person Survey Due To A Pandemic-Induced Multimode Data Collection Shift? Path Study Lessons Learned 2020 to Present
<b>Authors</b>	Sarah Dipko (Westat), Victoria Castleman (Westat)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	sarahdipko@westat.com
<p>The Population Assessment of Tobacco and Health (PATH) Study is a nationally representative longitudinal study which has interviewed respondents in-person since its inception in 2012. The study selects youth and adults for annual or biennial audio computer-assisted self-interviews (ACASI). These interviews contain a large volume of questions, many of which include on-screen images to illustrate a variety of tobacco products. Parent CAPI interviews also use on-screen images to provide response option lists for sensitive questions. In-person operations were suspended in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Work began immediately to transition to telephone administration. Show cards were developed to support telephone respondents through the new interviewer-administered response process, including creation of a nimble, flexible web design.</p>	

The PATH Study was able to resume data collection via telephone administration in July 2020. This paper reviews the issues and decisions involved in the initial creation of the PATH Study show cards, highlights how the instrument flow informed the web design, and notes the improvements made for subsequent rounds of the study.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Multimode Development And Data Quality Assessment in the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS)
<b>Authors</b>	Alisha Creel (Westat), Ralph DiGaetano (Westat), Hanyu Sun (Westat), Alexis Kokoska (Westat), David Cantor (Westat), Rick Dulaney (Westat), Brad Edwards (Westat)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	alishacreel@westat.com

The Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS) is the nation's primary source of medical expenditures, utilization and insurance coverage. On March 17, 2020 MEPS switched from face-to-face to telephone interviewing because of the COVID-19 pandemic. MEPS continues to rely heavily on both modes, while adding video interviewing and exploring the use of web. This presentation spotlights the evolution of modes on MEPS, including design changes made amidst the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure MEPS could continue to critically important collect data on changes in health care use during and after the pandemic. We describe analyses assessing the effect of switching to telephone interviewing on the data collected by the survey in 2020. These analyses take advantage of the longitudinal design of MEPS to isolate changes in survey mode from changes due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We discuss current and future efforts to build a more resilient study design for the future through an increasingly multimode design.

### Session 3B: Qualitative research: methods and applications

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Expanding Record-Keeping Study Methodology to Assess Structure and Availability of Data in Business Records
<b>Authors</b>	Melissa A. Cidade (US Census Bureau), Diane K. Willimack (US Census Bureau), Kristin Stettler (US Census Bureau), Demetria V. Hanna (US Census Bureau)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	melissa.cidade@census.gov

Record-keeping studies are used to investigate the way that companies store their data. In support of a harmonized annual economic survey, Census Bureau researchers used two innovative methods to conduct research into the record-keeping practices of medium sized businesses. The first method involved presenting respondents with a generic Chart of Accounts to focus the interview on similarities and differences to their own record-keeping. The second innovative method involved guiding respondents through a virtual card sort exercise, asking them to assess the accessibility of their data for various topics at various business units. The results demonstrate that these two methods could be useful tools in researching record-keeping practices. Future work will focus on additional testing of a harmonized instrument, moving toward the piloting of such an instrument.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	User satisfaction with the 2020 Census online questionnaire
<b>Authors</b>	Erica Olmsted-Hawala (U.S. Census Bureau), Elizabeth Nichols (U.S. Census Bureau), Shelley Feuer (U.S. Census Bureau)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	erica.l.olmsted.hawala@census.gov

The 2020 Census offered an online self-response option that over 53.5 percent of U.S. households used. The Census Bureau conducted a follow up user satisfaction survey with a sample of those respondents. The goal

was to get an overall user satisfaction rating with the online form, as well as to gather feedback from respondents on what areas of the decennial census were difficult or caused confusion. Throughout the decade leading up to the 2020 census, researchers at the Census Bureau had conducted usability tests of the online instrument prior to the field tests. We were interested in comparing usability results from across the decade with the UX2020 survey results.

While the overall satisfaction rating of the online decennial census questionnaire was high, there were variations across subgroups. For example, user satisfaction was higher for respondents whose address was prefilled on the form versus those who had to enter their addresses. Results also show that user satisfaction for early responders was higher than for late responders. Additionally, usability issues that were identified in user testing earlier in the decade, but had not been addressed, emerged as issues that respondents' mentioned as being problematic. For example, the Hispanic Origin question, separated from the race question, had caused confusion during usability testing and this was also reflected in respondents' feedback to the satisfaction survey. This talk will share these and other findings from the satisfaction survey of the decennial census, identifying issues we had suspected would cause confusion for respondents along with new results that we had not seen in user testing throughout the decade.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Protecting the Identity of Participants in Qualitative Research
<b>Authors</b>	Joanne Pascale (U.S. Census Bureau)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	joanne.pascale@census.gov
<p>Pledging to protect study participants' identities (aka disclosure avoidance or DA) is becoming more challenging given the relatively new threats brought about by the sheer volume of large publicly available datasets and powerful, affordable computing capabilities that enable data linkages and respondent re-identification. We summarize a range of conventional DA methods and then bring the focus to qualitative research specifically. We discuss the development of a novel approach to a systematic DA method for at least a subset of qualitative research products: typical research aimed at pretesting and evaluation of survey questions, data collection instruments, and related materials used for household surveys in the federal statistical system. We frame the discussion in terms of risk and mitigation. That is, we describe the nature of qualitative methods and data, the risks posed by the dissemination of qualitative information products and consider how these risks might reasonably be mitigated while maximizing utility. Finally, we pull back the lens and discuss how the method could be applied to research outside the context of the federal statistical system if certain criteria are met.</p>	

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Privacy Preserving Technologies in U.S. Education
<b>Authors</b>	Amy O'Hara (Massive Data Institute, Georgetown University), Stephanie Straus (Massive Data Institute, Georgetown University)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	amy.ohara@georgetown.edu
<p>The Massive Data Institute (MDI) at Georgetown's McCourt School of Public Policy, under a Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation grant, has conducted a landscape analysis of privacy preserving technologies (PPTs) in the K-12 education and higher education fields. Through over 40 stakeholder interviews with state education agencies, U.S. Department of Education officials, postsecondary institutional staff, and edtech providers, MDI investigated the existing efforts using, as well as interest in, secure multiparty computation, differential privacy, secure virtual enclaves, and the like. In this presentation, MDI identifies the barriers to PPT implementation, including lack of technical capacity, institutional setbacks, cultural opposition, and legal fears. MDI also lays out recommendations for government, foundations, and associations to help overcome these barriers, to enable greater insights into learner data that can inform student success.</p>	

## Session 4A: A closer look into the General Social Survey

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Methodological Research using the General Social Survey
<b>Authors</b>	Rene Bautista (NORC at the University of Chicago), Benjamin Schapiro, Jaesok Son, Michael Davern, Jodie Smylie
<b>Presenter Email</b>	bautista-rene@norc.org
<p>Conducted since 1972, the General Social Survey (GSS) is celebrating its 50th anniversary in 2022. It is the only nationally representative survey of non-institutionalized adults in the United States that has systematically studied major social topics. In the year of 2020 and 2021, the GSS was redesigned as a web survey to respond to the unprecedented challenges caused by the COVID19 pandemic. A series of methodological experiments were included in the redesigned web survey to understand the impact of survey design features such as grids, inclusion of middle categories (typically coded as “volunteered” responses in the face-to-face mode; for instance, “It depends”), and more inclusive wording for nouns —namely, gender-neutral wording. The sample for the 2021 GSS survey was released in three batches. Batch 1 was released to the field on December 1, 2020. Batches 2 and 3 were released on January 21, and February 24, 2021. This paper extends on preliminary analysis of the experiments conducted on batch 1 only. The preliminary analyses were conducted based on univariate unweighted statistics, as complex survey design variables were not available at the time. The preliminary analyses (batch 1) suggested that “volunteered” categories are more likely to change distribution responses compared to grid items or gender-neutral wording (Bautista et al, 2021). This paper aims to conduct analysis on the three batches accounting for survey design variables (strata, clusters, and weights) and be based on multivariate regression analysis. The analysis aims to identify socio demographic patterns associated with measures of quality. Also, the paper investigates sociodemographic patterns of the selection of “volunteered” responses. Finally, the paper also investigates the subgroups that may be more sensitive to gender-neutral wording in survey questions. This research helps to understand respondent dynamics as large studies such as the GSS pivot from face-to-face modes to web-based instruments.</p>	

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Mailing intervention experiments and participation outcomes on the 2020 General Social Survey
<b>Authors</b>	Leah Christian (NORC at the University of Chicago), Jodie Smylie (NORC), Katherine Burda (NORC), Beth Fisher (NORC)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	christian-leah@norc.org
<p>The General Social Survey (GSS) is a nationally representative survey conducted face-to-face every two years with the objective of collecting data on the attitudes and opinions of the general public of the United States. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2020 GSS cross-section study was adapted from a face-to-face CAPI to a mixed-mode web and telephone survey. Accordingly, GSS respondent recruitment materials were redesigned for an outreach strategy based on mail, email, and phone methods. The cross-section study sample was released in three batches, and mailing experiments were initiated in two of the batches to test how different mailing interventions would affect participation outcomes for the nationally representative sample. In one batch of cases, an experiment was run in the later stage of data collection where a group of cases were randomized to be sent either a “Last Chance” letter via FedEx or a “Last Chance” postcard via USPS, to test whether the priority mailing method of a FedEx letter or a USPS postcard (with entirely visible content) would be more effective in encouraging survey participation. In another case batch, cases were randomized to be sent an invitation packet that either had a window, or not, on the envelope revealing the prepaid incentive. Later for the same batch, taking into account experimental groups for the first experiment, another experiment was conducted where cases receiving the late-stage “Last Chance” FedEx letter were randomized to either receive or not receive an incentive escalation notification in the letter.</p>	

We will discuss participation outcomes from each experiment, such as any differentials in completion rates and the number of days taken to complete the interview after these interventions. This presentation will provide insight on the effectiveness of different mail-based interventions in boosting survey participation rates in the context of a major public health crisis.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Studying Open-Ended Codes Across Different Coding Teams: Analysis from the 2016-2020 GSS Panel
<b>Authors</b>	Benjamin Schapiro (NORC at the University of Chicago), Deanna Christianson (ICF), Abigail Norling Ruggles (NORC)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	schapiro-benjamin@norc.org

What is the impact of changing coding teams for an open-ended survey item that is coded back to a large potential code frame? Typically, practices for coding open-ended responses use training, reconciliation, and reliability measures to minimize the impact of any individual coder or survey agency on data quality. However, different institutions may use different training and different reconciliation methods. The need to maintain coding consistency at the respondent level as well as within coders and across survey agencies is paramount. This is especially important when the number of potential codes from open-ended text is large and different codes can be valid. Using the 2016-2020 General Social Survey Panel, we explore a unique opportunity to examine coding differences between different coding teams: respondents with similar occupational verbatim responses in two different waves of a panel, whose text was coded by two different coding teams. In both cases, the goal was to match open-ended text from respondents with one of 2010 Census Occupation Classification codes. Using this data, we examine how many respondents give similar verbatims in both waves, how many similar verbatims result in identical codes, and any patterns in coding differences. When perfect consistency cannot be ensured, understanding patterns of valid coding differences allows us to document and account for changes across rounds of data collection that may be attributed to switching from one coding team to another. While these data do not facilitate determining reliability in a formal sense (as the coding teams coded different sets of responses from the same respondents), this study examines consistency across multiple coding teams, and puts forth a framework and technique for measuring such consistency in the future.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Household Screening on the Web: Participation outcomes based on experimental milestone incentives on the General Social Survey
<b>Authors</b>	Walter Hanley (NORC at the University of Chicago), Beth Fisher (NORC), Jodie Smylie (NORC)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	hanley-walter@norc.org

The General Social Survey (GSS) is a nationally representative survey traditionally conducted face-to-face every two years with the objective of collecting data on the attitudes and opinions of the general public of the United States. The current round of the 2022 GSS is conducting an experiment to compare face to face and web-based data collection effort methods. Accordingly, GSS respondent recruitment methods and within-household respondent selection were modified for a data collection strategy based partly on online web data collection. As a part of the modifications to the respondent selection methods, the GSS implemented an experiment to evaluate the efficacy of milestone payments. Households were randomized to the within household selection condition of receiving a milestone incentive for completion of the screener where somebody other than the person completing the selection screener was selected to represent the household or to receive no milestone incentive.

We will discuss preliminary results from this experiment from the 2022 GSS, including participation rates in each group and any differentials in completion rates and the number of days taken to complete the interview. We will also discuss preliminary evaluation of the quality of data collected for cases that received a milestone



payment compared to those that did not. This presentation will provide insight on the effectiveness of milestone incentives in boosting survey participation rates in the context of conducting a mixed-mode data collection.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Transitions from Single to Multi-Mode Surveys- The NORC Experience
<b>Authors</b>	Ned English (NORC at the University of Chicago), Anna Wiencrot (NORC), Colm O'Muircheartaigh (NORC), Katie O'Doherty (NORC), Becki Curtis (NORC), and Rene Bautista (NORC)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	english-ned@norc.org
<p>Over the past fifteen years NORC has seen studies including Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH), the National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH), and others transition from random digit dial (RDD) to multi-mode, address-based designs (ABS) due to increased costs and other limitations associated with the RDD frame. Similarly, due to the COVID-19 pandemic we have seen flagship face-to-face studies such as the General Social Survey (GSS) and the National Social Life Health and Aging Project (NSHAP) also adopt multi-mode designs. We compare methodological and substantive results pre- and post-transition across study types and provide recommendations on when and how to adopt specific modes or mode combinations.</p>	

#### Session 4B: Sampling, weighting, reporting

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Don't Use the UWE to Evaluate a Poststratified or Raking Estimator (Use Sometime Else Instead)
<b>Authors</b>	Phillip Kott (RTI International)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	pkott@rti.org
<p>The unequal weighting effect (UWE) purports to measure the increase in variance of an estimated mean due to using unequal weights. It does that when the observations in the sample are independent and identically distributed, which is rarely the case in practice. When weights are unequal due to poststratification or raking, the UWE often does not provide a very good proxy for the relative "increase" in variance due to weighting. The variance may, in fact, decrease. This should not be surprising because these methods, although popular for bias reduction in the face of unit nonresponse or coverage error, have been shown to be effective for variance reduction. We will see the potential variance-reducing impact of poststratification and raking in a simple example employing nearly unbiased measures of variance that should be used instead of the UWE. A discussion of raking and an extension of raking for nonresponse (or coverage) adjustment follows.</p>	

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Transparency in Documentation for Statistical Surveys using a Probability Panel
<b>Authors</b>	J. Michael Dennis (), Jennifer Benz (NORC at the University of Chicago), Ed Mulrow (NORC at the University of Chicago)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	dennis-michael@norc.org
<p>Commercially available survey panels have been criticized for having proprietary "black box" sampling, data collection, and statistical weighting processes and solutions and for incomplete disclosure of key metrics such as the AAPOR response rate obtained for each stage of the panel recruitment and retention process. Proprietary panels are often silent or unclear about any sample lists, advertising campaigns, or social media used to identify potential panelists. The lack of appropriate disclosure and transparency, it can be argued, discourages the federal statistical community from more fully embracing such survey panels.</p>	

This paper will address descriptively the steps taken by NORC's AmeriSpeak Panel since its founding in 2015 to provide transparency in methods and response rate reporting. The steps include, but are not limited to, detailed annual updates to publicly available documentation specifying the processes used in the sampling and recruitment of research subjects to the panel; complete AAPOR response rate reporting; documentation on within-panel sampling methodology; data editing and cleaning procedures; and statistical weighting protocols, as well as measures taken to protect the rights of human research subjects.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Social Capital and Participation: Examining Hypotheses About Polling Problems in the 2020 Election Cycle
<b>Authors</b>	Robert Griffin (Democracy Fund), John Sides (Vanderbilt University)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	rgriffin@democracyfund.org

In the 2020 election cycle, polling continued to show signs of bias - specifically, overestimating the democratic vote share nationally and in many states. A number of hypotheses have been put forward to explain this phenomenon as well as offer potential fixes. Notably, one story has centered around non-response by those low in social capital and/or trust while another has noted the high rates of survey participation by highly active Democrats. Using unique data from Democracy Fund VOTER survey and the Democracy Fund + UCLA Nationscape project, we show:

- There is little evidence that introducing social capital and/or trust into the weighting scheme increases representativeness.
- There is evidence that reweighting by in-cycle measures of participation and activity increases representativeness.

While these findings cannot reasonably be portrayed as "fixes" to the problems faced by modern election polling given the ever-changing nature of those issues, they do shed light on the nature of polling problems in the 2020 election cycle.

<b>Presentation Title</b>	Finding and Handling Bias in Clustered Randomized Trials
<b>Authors</b>	Brad Chaney (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine)
<b>Presenter Email</b>	bradwchaney@gmail.com

A common view is that data from randomized control trials and clustered randomized trials are not subject to bias and do not require statistical adjustments for bias. The lack of bias is one of statistical expectation: any individual sample may be biased, even if simply from bad luck in the randomization, but across large samples and repeated replications one expects no bias. Clustered randomized trials face a greater risk of bias because people are not distributed equally in terms of demographic characteristics, and the number of clusters in an evaluation is more important in affecting the degree of bias than the number of individuals within the clusters. Using simulations, this paper finds that bias is common in random cluster samples of schools. For example, when comparing ten treatment group schools with ten control group schools, half of 1,000 samples showed differences greater than 11 percent in the percentage of students who were Black. We next examine multiple statistical models to evaluate their success in managing bias. Well-specified models successfully handled the bias, but not a standard black box approach, which produced incorrect and misleading estimates.



DC|AAPOR



Washington  
Statistical  
Society

**DC-AAPOR/WSS 2022 Fall Super Review Conference  
Eateries List**

**Coffee Shops/Bakeries**

Name	Address	Distance	Hours
Gregory's Coffee	1000 Vermont Ave NW	0.2	7:00 am-3:00 pm
Starbucks	1455 K St NW	0.2	5:00 am-8:30 pm
DUA DC Coffee	923 15th St NW	0.3	8:00 am-3:00 pm
Starbucks	1429 P St NW	0.4	5:00 am-7:30 pm
Compass Coffee	1401 I St NW	0.4	6:30 am-5:00 pm

**Fast Food/Fast Casual**

Name	Style	Address	Distance
Shake Shack	Burgers	1400 14th St NW	0.2
Chipotle	Mexican	1010 Vermont Ave NW	0.2
Potbelly	Sandwiches	1445 K St NW	0.2
Subway	Sandwiches	1015 15th St NW	0.2
Arepa Zone	Venezuelan/ Sandwiches	1121 14th St NW	0.2
Rice Bar	Korean	1015 15th St NW	0.2
Five Guys	Burgers	1400 I St NW	0.3
Cava	Mediterranean	1222 Connecticut Ave NW	0.5
Yafa Grille	Mediterranean	1400 I St NW	0.5
Call Your Mother	Bagels/Sandwiches	1471 P St NW	0.5

**Restaurants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Style</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Distance</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>Open for lunch</b>
Lady Madison	American Lounge	1177 15th St NW	0 (in hotel)	202-862-1600	Y
Lincoln	Modern American	1110 Vermont Ave NW	0.1	202-386-9200	N
Georgia Browns	Southern	950 15th St NW	0.2	202-393-4499	Y
Rare	Tavern Steakhouse	1501 K St NW	0.2	202-783-8212	N
Blue Duck Tavern	Upscale American	1201 24th St NW	0.3	202-419-6755	Y
Officina	Italian	1615 L St NW	0.3	202-747-5252	Y
Via Sophia	Italian	1001 14th St NW (in C8Hamilton Hotel)	0.3	202-218-7575	Y
Bobby Van's Steakhouse	Steakhouse	809 15th St NW	0.3	202-589-0060	N
Joe's Prime Steak	Seafood and Steak	750 15th St NW	0.4	202-489-0140	Y
Mccormick & Schmick's	Seafood and Steak	1652 K St NW	0.4	202-861-2233	Y
Joe's Snow Crab	Seafood	750 15th St NW	0.4	202-489-0140	Y
Mariscos	Latin Seafood	1133 11th St NW	0.5	202-836-4107	Y
Hamilton Restaurant	American	600 14th St NW	0.6	202-787-1000	Y
Mastro's	Upscale Steakhouse	600 13th St NW	0.6	202-347-1500	N
Hank's Oyster Bar	Casual Seafood	1624 Q St NW	0.6	202-462-4265	N
Del Frisco's Double Eagle	Upscale Steakhouse	950 I St NW	0.8	202-289-0201	Y
Founding Farmers	Comfort/Rustic	1924 Pennsylvania Ave NW	0.9	202-822-8783	Y
Tosca	Upscale Italian	1112 F St NW	0.9	202-367-1990	Y
Old Ebbitt Grill	American	675 15th St NW	1	202-347-4800	Y
Luke's Lobster Penn Quarter	Casual Seafood	624 E St NW	1	202-347-3355	Y