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1. Introduction/Problem Statement
High-quality survey data provide the foundation for research and policymaking across many fields. While novel data sources are actively being examined for use in transport applications, both currently and for the foreseeable future, traditional travel surveys will continue to play an irreplaceable role in providing critical data for use in travel demand modeling, regional planning, and policymaking. However, survey response rates are in continuous and significant decline, thus requiring increased efforts toward respondent recruitment. Further necessitating these increased efforts is the fact that low response rates and their accompanying nonresponse biases can threaten the validity of survey data, and thus contingent research findings (National Research Council, 2013).

Survey teams have employed a range of efforts aimed at increasing response rates and improving survey data quality. One of the most common tools is the use of passive datasets such as GPS records (Bohte and Maat, 2009), targeted marketing data (Shaw et al., 2019), novel survey formats (e.g., interactive surveys; Collins et al., 2012), and targeted sampling frames (e.g., online panels; Circella et al., 2016), to name a few. Among these efforts, another approach, which is the focus of this study, is to recruit survey respondents who had expressed willingness to be contacted again in a previous survey; this approach has been shown to produce a significantly higher response rate and lower cost per valid response relative to random sampling (Amarov and Rendtel, 2013; Kim et al., 2019; Circella et al., 2020).

This recruitment method is similar to the approach used in panel studies in that both recruit respondents from preceding surveys. The differences, however, reside in the survey purpose, contents, or outcome. Specifically, panel surveys focus on repeated observations on a set of variables for the same sample unit over time (Lavrakas, 2008), which allows the tracking of specific variables or study interests. Moreover, since panel surveys recruit the same respondents periodically, it also introduces attrition biases. In contrast, recruiting respondents from a previous survey is not a periodical behavior. The use of this recruitment method: (1) increases the survey response rates obtained on follow-up surveys; (2) reduces the financial burden for local transportation agencies and researchers; and (3) facilitates the expansion of the variable set of the preceding survey and enables data fusion across datasets (Shaw et al., 2020).

However, in the transportation domain, this recruitment method has not been widely adopted nor carefully examined. A major potential drawback of recruiting respondents based on their willingness expressed in a preceding survey is the non-representativeness that may be inherent in that sample (Couper et al., 2007). The proposed study plans to explore the extent and nature of that non-representativeness.
2. Project Objectives
The proposed study plans to answer the following questions: (1) Who is more likely to respond to a follow-up survey? (2) How does recruiting respondents based on their willingness expressed in a preceding travel survey bias the follow-up survey sample? (3) What survey sample could we expect if we recruited respondents from the 2017 NHTS respondents in different geographic regions in the U.S.?

3. Proposed Methodology and Data
The study proposes to do the following:

(1) Analyze the two-stage self-selection/non-response biases simultaneously (i.e., willingness to participate in a follow-up survey and actual response behavior) for respondents recruited from a previous travel survey (the National Household Travel Survey, NHTS), using a probit with sample selection (PSS) model, which could remedy the model coefficient biases. We also propose several standardized PSS model performance measures to enable model comparisons.

(2) Apply the PSS model to a holdout sample to decompose biases (e.g., dataset bias, self-selection bias, non-response bias) accumulated along the way and further analyze the representativeness of the recruited survey respondents by comparing sample and population marginal distributions for various variables.

(3) Predict follow-up survey samples from different geographic regions in the U.S. as another PSS model application example, and check the model’s generalizability.

The study will use two datasets: the NHTS, and a Georgia DOT (GDOT)-sponsored follow-up survey developed by the research team of the PI for the proposed project. The National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) is a repeated cross-sectional travel survey conducted by the Federal Highway Administration, and is widely used by regional planning agencies across the United States. The NHTS typically obtains household, individual, vehicle, and trip information using several survey instruments; these include a recruitment survey, a retrieval survey, travel logs, and a vehicle odometer mileage form. In 2017, for the first time, NHTS allowed states to opt into including a question regarding respondents’ willingness to participate in follow-up travel surveys, and Georgia was one of the six states/regions that chose to do so. We will focus on the Georgia subset of the NHTS for the model estimation process.

The final working dataset will contain about 8,400 Georgia respondents to the NHTS, nearly 5,000 of whom indicated a willingness to participate in a follow-up survey. That willingness was put to the test with the GDOT survey (Kim et al., 2019). The GDOT survey is a 15-page attitudinally-rich travel survey with an emphasis on the impacts of emerging technologies on travel behavior. Our research team mailed the GDOT survey to the Georgia NHTS respondents in September 2017. Ultimately, about 1,400 of the 5,000 “willing” NHTS respondents replied to the GDOT survey. We note that for the purpose of this study, the GDOT survey was used only to determine respondents’ decision to complete the follow-up survey; all other respondent data was obtained from the NHTS. In the study, we will separate the final working dataset into a training set (60%) and a test set (40%) to enable appropriate model evaluation.

After finalizing the model, we will apply it to the entire US NHTS sample, as well as to NHTS subsamples for selected states, to assess how well it generalizes to regions other than Georgia.

4. Work Plan (Project Tasks)
The proposed project can be divided into the following tasks.

Task 1: Literature review.
We will monitor the literature on survey response and probit with sample selection for the duration of the project.
**Task 2: Data preparation.**
As mentioned above, the study relies primarily on the Georgia subsample of the NHTS, but also uses the full NHTS dataset, the subsets for several other states, and knowledge of whether Georgia NHTS respondents who expressed willingness to complete a follow-up survey actually did so. Accordingly, quite a bit of manipulation will be required to format the data appropriately.

**Task 3: Estimate and evaluate the PSS model.**
The probit with sample selection model has two components: a selection model (reflecting whether a respondent expresses willingness to complete a follow-up survey or not) and an outcome model (reflecting whether or not willing respondents actually do complete a subsequent survey). We will identify and apply several different model performance measures, including final log-likelihood compared to benchmarks (all zeros, constants only), McFadden’s pseudo $R^2$, information criteria (AIC and BIC), point-biserial correlations, root mean squared error (RMSE) between the actual choice and the predicted probability), and success table.

**Task 4: Validate (inside Georgia) and apply (outside Georgia) the model.**
First, we will apply the model to the holdout sample among the Georgia NHTS respondents to predict participation in the follow-up survey, and compare the marginal distributions of several selected variables with the corresponding population distributions derived from the 2018 American Community Survey five-year estimates (https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs). By analyzing the divergence in those distributions between the follow-up survey respondents and the population, we will be able to summarize the potential biases residing in the sampling method, i.e., recruiting respondents from a preceding travel survey. We will identify different sources of bias (e.g., dataset bias and self-selection bias), and will analyze the role of each source in the divergences observed, as well as the total extent of divergence using a measure of effect size (Cohen, 1977). A small distribution divergence indicates that the follow-up survey sample is expected to be representative of the population, which is a positive sign that recruiting respondents from a preceding survey is efficient and reasonable. Otherwise, a large divergence indicates that a biased follow-up survey sample is expected, which may call for some sampling remedies to improve its representativeness.

Next, we will test the transferability of the PSS model to different populations, by checking the representativeness of follow-up survey respondents for selected states in diverse geographic regions of the US (west to east: California, Minnesota, North Carolina, New York and Massachusetts) and the full 2017 NHTS national sample. Specifically, we will apply the model estimated for Georgia to the NHTS (sub)samples in each of those regions, and use the effect size measure to evaluate divergence between the expected demographic distributions of follow-up survey respondents and the associated population distributions.

**Task 5: Document the results for dissemination.**
We will incorporate the results into a master’s thesis, and prepare a paper for submission to a high-quality peer-reviewed journal. In addition, we plan to present the paper at one or more professional conferences (see Section 7).
5. Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Literature review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Data preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Estimate and evaluate the PSS model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Validate (Inside Georgia) and apply (outside Georgia) the model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Document the results for dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Relevance to the Center Theme/Mission
TOMNET’s mission is to advance data and methods to reflect the role of attitudes, perceptions, values, and preferences in travel behavior models. While passive data sources such as GPS traces and farecard usage measure travel behavior, the measurement of attitudes (and the like) generally requires administering a survey instrument of some kind. For the resulting data to be most useful, the sample needs to represent the population as completely as possible. The proposed study investigates an auspicious approach to sample recruitment: one that promises to reduce costs and improve sample sizes, but also threatens to diminish representativeness. By understanding the dataset biases that can result when respondents are recruited from a preceding survey (e.g., NHTS), researchers/practitioners can better assess the tradeoff between data quality and resource constraints associated with respondent recruitment. Moreover, understanding these biases will allow survey developers to adjust their invited sample – for example, by oversampling underrepresented groups in the follow-up surveys.

7. Anticipated Outcomes and Deliverables
As indicated in the Introduction, it has become increasingly difficult to recruit survey respondents, and yet hearing from a representative cross-section of society is critical to monitoring trends and assessing responses to new technologies and policies. Recruiting survey respondents from among those who had expressed willingness to be contacted again in a previous survey has been shown to produce a significantly higher response rate and lower cost per valid response relative to random sampling. However, such a recruitment strategy is likely to introduce or exaggerate biases in the resulting sample, and this issue has not been well-studied, particularly in transportation. Accordingly, in terms of research outcomes/benefits, this study will help survey developers assess the representativeness and cost-effectiveness of recruiting respondents from a pool of willing respondents to a previous survey, which in turn will suggest adjustments to the sampling frame that can improve the representativeness of the new sample. These findings will contribute to improving the quality and reducing the cost of future transportation surveys. Even outside of the transportation field, the contributions of this study will have general findings and implications for researchers using the approach of recruiting respondents from prior surveys.

With respect to tangible outcomes/deliverables, we expect this project to contribute to the student’s master’s thesis (to be completed “on the way” to the PhD), to produce a paper that will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal, and to be presented at one or more conferences, such as the 2021 Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board.
8. Research Team and Management Plan

Principal Investigator Patricia Mokhtarian is an internationally-known travel behavior scholar, who has specialized in measuring and modeling attitudes and incorporating them into models of travel-related behaviors. In particular, she directed the design, administration, and prior analysis of the follow-up survey data that plays a peripheral role in this project. She will be responsible for the overall direction of the project, and will be directly engaged with its ongoing progress. Co-PI Kari Watkins is also a well-known and -respected travel behavior scholar, specializing in transit planning and operations, traveler information, mode choice, and complete streets design.

In addition, one PhD student will be responsible for the day-to-day execution of substantive project tasks.

The project team will meet weekly for in-depth reports on progress and tactical planning. All members are local, so communication will be straightforward, of course including online video meetings and e-mail. An internal project website will serve as a working repository for literature, presentations prepared by the project, data, and analyses. Milestone products, including papers, presentations, and reports will be provided to the central TOMNET repository.

9. Technology Transfer Plan

The project leadership has proven track records of scholarly productivity and research dissemination. In July 2020, we will prepare a paper to be submitted for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board in January 2021, and for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Based on past history, we expect multiple opportunities to present project findings throughout the life of the study and beyond, and we will seek out and volunteer for such opportunities as appropriate.

10. Workforce Development and Outreach Plan

The PI, co-PI, and PhD student associated with the proposed project are all women. The leadership team is devoted to the careful mentoring of female graduate students, including with respect to career-life balance, a major reason why female PhD students do not choose academia (Mason et al., 2009). Research has shown that mentoring and positive role models can make a big difference in the attraction of women to STEM fields (Hill et al., 2010). This project will contribute heavily to the professional development of this female PhD student, who in turn is already serving as a role model to other women.
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Institution: Georgia Institute of Technology
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<table>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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