

Appendix I: Methodology

METHODOLOGY

This Appendix describes the methodology used for the surveys. It discusses the questionnaire design and pretest, samples, data collection procedures, survey response rates, and sample cleaning and weighting procedures.

Questionnaire Design and Pretest

Research associates at the Urban Institute developed six survey instruments in conjunction with HUD personnel, organizations that represent various HUD partners, and senior staff of the Survey Operations Center of Aspen Systems Corporation—a subcontractor to the Urban Institute. A separate survey instrument was designed for:

- Directors of Community Development Departments
- Mayors
- Directors of Public Housing Agencies
- Directors of Fair Housing Assistance Program Agencies
- Owners of Multifamily Housing Properties

- Directors of Non-profit Housing Organizations affiliated with the National Association of Housing Partnerships

Questionnaires ranged in length from 13 items for NAHP-affiliated partners to 21 items for owners of multifamily properties. The first eight questions for each of the partner groups are considered core items and, therefore, are identical for all of the groups. Remaining questions are tailored to each specific group, with the exception of two final items—one dealing with HUD's overall performance and the other asking respondents to identify the HUD field office(s) with which they deal.¹

In June 2000, Aspen Systems Corporation conducted a preliminary telephone pretest of the survey instruments. Its purpose was to identify question wording or ordering issues, provide an estimate of respondent burden, and indicate the feasibility of contacting agency directors, mayors, and owners or the likelihood of delegation of the survey to others. Once the instruments and procedures were finalized, the survey forms were sent to HUD for submission to the Office of Management and Budget, which approves all survey forms that involve public funding and burden.

¹ Facsimiles of the questionnaires are included as Appendix II.

Descriptions Of the Samples

Samples for each of the respondent groups were drawn from the following lists:

- A list of all local (city and county) Community Development (CD) Departments that are entitled to HUD's Community Development Block Grant funds was obtained from Aspen Systems Corporation, which maintains such a list for HUD. The 50 largest CD agencies were selected into the sample with certainty, and an additional 450 were selected randomly from the remainder of the list.
 - A list of Mayors was also obtained from Aspen Systems Corporation, which maintains such a list for HUD. All communities with populations larger than 50,000 were selected for the sample, totaling 620.
 - A list of all Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) was obtained from HUD. From the universe, all PHAs that own and manage 100 or more units of conventional public housing were extracted. From the extract, the 50 largest PHAs were selected into the sample with certainty; and an additional 450 were selected randomly from the remainder of the list.
- A list of all 80 Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP) agencies was obtained from HUD, and all of them were included in the survey.
 - A list of multifamily property owners was obtained from HUD, which maintains such a list in its Real Estate Management System (REMS). The list was collated in such a way as to cluster properties by ownership entity—as best as is possible from the information contained in the list. Hence, the property list was modified to produce a list of owners.² The list was cleaned to eliminate clearly invalid records, properties outside the U.S., and owners lacking any contact information. The list was further subdivided into four clusters: entities that exclusively owned Section 202 or Section 811 properties; entities that exclusively owned HUD-insured (unsubsidized) multifamily properties; entities that exclusively owned HUD-assisted (subsidized) properties; and entities that owned properties that crossed these three categories. Four hundred ownership entities were selected randomly from each of the first three

² Data from two separate sources were used to identify owners or other appropriate contacts for the Multifamily Housing sample. One source specified the property owner, while the second source specified the contact person (who may or may not have been the owner). In order to be included in the starting sample, a contact name had to be listed in at least one of the databases. In cases where a contact name was listed in both databases, information from the "owner" file was used.

clusters, and an additional 50 were selected to represent ownership entities from the fourth cluster.³

- A list of the 59 non-profit housing organizations affiliated with the National Association of Housing Partnerships (NAHP) was obtained from the NAHP, and all of them were included in the survey.

Table A.1.1. shows the starting sample size for each group and/or stratum⁴.

**Table A.1.1
Universe and Starting Sample Size by Respondent Group**

RESPONDENT GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	UNIVERSE
Community Development Departments	500	988
Mayors	620	620
Public Housing Agencies	500	1668
Fair Housing Assistance program Agencies	85	85
Owners of Multifamily Housing	1250	12652
202/811	400	3176
Subsidized	400	5890
Unsubsidized	400	2831
Multi 1 and 2	20	306
Multi 1 and 3	2	28
Multi 2 and 3	25	384
Multi 1, 2 and 3	3	37
Non-profit Organizations	59	59
Total Sample (All Groups)	3,014	

³ For reporting purposes, each of the first three clusters is presented and analyzed separately; it is possible with the data collected, however, to combine the three with the fourth cluster into a single multifamily property owners partner group.

⁴The Multifamily Housing Owner sample was stratified by property type for weighting and reporting purposes. In addition, the top 50 Community Development Departments and Public Housing Agencies were selected with certainty.

Data Collection Procedures and Survey Response Rates

Aspen Systems Corporation conducted the data collection. It began on December 12, 2000 and continued through June 7, 2001. Table A.1.2 shows the total and adjusted survey response rates for each group.⁵

Table A.1.2
Total and Adjusted Response Rates by Respondent Group

RESPONDENT GROUP	TOTAL RESPONSE RATE	ADJUSTED RESPONSE RATE
Community Development Departments	90%	90%
Mayors	85%	86%
Public Housing Agencies	83%	83%
Fair Housing Assistance Program Agencies	92%	92%
Owners of Multifamily Housing	62%	75%
Non-profit Organizations	86%	86%

⁵Total survey response rates were calculated by dividing the number of completed surveys by the total sample. Adjusted response rates were calculated by dividing the number of completed surveys by the total sample minus those agencies and organizations that could not be located. The latter include undeliverable addresses without a valid telephone number, fax/modem lines, non-working telephone numbers, wrong telephone numbers, language problems, no appropriate respondent, and duplicate sample.

A mixed-mode (mail and telephone) data collection approach was used to ensure the highest possible response rates. Survey administration included an initial survey mailing (including a cover letter and questionnaire), a post card reminder, a second survey mailing (including a second cover letter and questionnaire), telephone follow-up calls as reminders, and a Federal Express mailing to selected respondent groups. In addition, surveys were prepared for Fax Broadcast and were faxed to respondents upon request.

The surveys were mailed in three waves. During the first wave, beginning on December 12, 2000, surveys were mailed to Community Development Department directors, Public Housing Agency directors, Fair Housing Assistance Program Agency directors, and NAHP-affiliated non-profit housing directors. During the second wave, beginning on January 22, 2001, surveys were mailed to Mayors. During the third wave, surveys were mailed to multifamily housing owners, beginning on January 26, 2001.⁶ A second survey mailing to non-respondents was conducted five weeks after the initial mailing for the first four partner groups (wave one), and two weeks after the initial mailing for the remaining groups (waves two and three). A reminder postcard was sent between two and three weeks after the second mailing.

⁶Seventy-seven survey forms sent to multifamily property owners that were returned as undeliverable, both the U.S. Postal Service and FedEx. These were randomly replaced with additional property owners.

Telephone interviews were attempted with those who did not respond to the mail questionnaire, using Aspen Systems Corporation's Computer-Assisted-Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system. Up to eleven attempts were made to reach each qualified respondent. Finally, where mailed surveys were not returned and a telephone interview was not feasible, a follow up mailing—using Federal Express—was attempted for Mayors, Fair Housing Assistance Program agency directors, multifamily property owners, and NAHP-affiliated non-profit housing organizations directors.⁷

Sample Cleaning And Weighting Procedures

In some instances, multiple surveys were completed and returned from some organizations, either because respondent returned surveys crossed in the mail second or third wave mailings, or for various other reasons. All duplicate surveys were eliminated from the data set. If different respondents completed the surveys (e.g., "Agency Director" and "Agency Deputy Director"), the respondent who indicated the highest level title (i.e., "Agency Director") was included in the data set. If duplicate survey forms indicated the same title, the first survey returned was included in the data set.

⁷ Finally, some respondents completed both mail and telephone surveys (e.g., cases where surveys crossed in the mail). In these cases, only the mail survey was used since this was the primary method of data collection.

Because the CD and PHA directors partner samples were selected with differential probabilities based on size strata—city size (for CD directors) and agency size (for PHA directors)—weights were assigned to account for the differential probabilities.⁸ The selection strategy ensured a sufficient sized sub-sample of larger communities and PHAs for analysis purposes, and the weights allow the sample to be representative of all CD and Public Housing Agencies regardless of size.

In addition, weights for the multi-family property owners were calculated according to the distribution of the various program types, to allow for the possibility of combining the sub-groups into a multifamily property owners partner group with the appropriate proportion of each sub-group.

⁸ Weights were calculated using the inverse of the selection probability. For public housing authorities and community development directors, where the largest 50 entities were selected with certainty, the 50 largest were given a weight of 1 and all others were given a weight of $(\text{universe}-50)/450$.

