CHIS Working Paper Series

CHIS 2019-2020 Redesign: Rationale, Empirical Evaluation, and Trends

Brian M. Wells and Jiangzhou Fu, UCLA Center for Health Policy Research

September 2021

Executive Summary

The decline of telephone surveys due to low response rates and cultural shifts in telephone use motivated the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research to consider a methodological redesign for the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) in order to implement more cost-effective methods. The Center's redesign evaluation process included consultation with experts and two field experiments providing useful data regarding the impact a redesign would have on production. As a result, the overall design for CHIS 2019-2020 production is a **mixed-mode survey** design using an **address-based sampling** (ABS) frame with a **mail push-to-web survey followed by a telephone nonresponse follow-up**.

The primary purpose of this report is to evaluate how the methodological changes impact trending data across cycles. Looking across a broad subset of key CHIS variables in the adult, child, and adolescent surveys, we evaluate whether substantial changes are observed and try to identify the potential source of any shifting trends. Statewide pilot data from 2018 is used as a reference point to guide interpretations related to the redesign. There are four primary reasons for shifts in trends for CHIS 2019-2020:

1) **Sample compositional changes due to sampling frame and mode**

   By using a different sampling frame and introducing a self-administered data collection mode, a different set of households will respond potentially altering the final sample composition. Differences observed in the CHIS 2019-2020 sample composition are:

   - More respondents aged 25 to 64
   - More college graduate respondents, fewer without a high school diploma
   - Increased Asian representation
   - Reduction in Spanish and Vietnamese language completes
   - Double the number of child and nearly triple adolescent completes from previous two-year cycle

2) **Measurement changes related to mode**

   Adapting interviewer-administered questions to self-administered in some instances alters the stimulus presented to the respondent. We highlight three such changes:

   Previously unread responses. Response options that were originally only seen by telephone interviewers (and used if offered by the respondent) must be visually offered to web respondents. The most notable shifts related to this issue are:

   - Gender identity (Provided "other" category increasing reported gender non-conforming, historically grouped with transgendered individuals)
   - Sexual orientation (Provided "other" category increasing reported other sexual orientations besides straight, gay or lesbian, and bisexual)
   - Birth control (Provided "no sexual partner" category shifting "no birth control" responses to "no sexual partner"; considered a break in series)

- Hypertension (Provided "borderline or pre-hypertension" category shifting responses from both the "yes" and "no categories; considered a break in series)

***Social desirability and satisficing*.** Self-administered surveys typically see an increase in reporting of sensitive and undesirable behaviors as respondents may feel self-conscious or judged by an interviewer and choose to provide a more socially desirable response.

Serial-position effects. Aural stimulus, like in telephone interviews, often leads to respondent's choosing later response options (referred to as a recency effect) while web respondents are more likely to select earlier response options when reading through the available categories (primacy effect).

3) **Actual changes in the population over time**

   Observing temporal change is an important reason for conducting repeated cross-sectional survey. This is the type of change we want and endeavor to observe.

4) **Re-weighting impact on 2019 CHIS data**

   Post data collection statistical adjustments also impact the trend. Due to improvements of weighting tools for CHIS 2020, the CHIS 2019 data have also been re-weighted. Despite no comprehensive impact on CHIS 2019 data, it does yield changes to certain estimates.

Based on the evaluations conducted, **CHIS feels assured that data users will be able to trend most substantive variables** related to health conditions, health behaviors, and health care. For variables observed to have unanticipated shifts in trend, we encourage data users to **interpret trends with caution**. Some specific trends where we encourage interpretation with caution are:

- Self-rated health
  - Significant increase in better health categories (excellent, very good, good); possible primacy effect, or related to younger and reduced Latino sample composition.
- Current smoker status
  - Significant decrease for adults, but significant increase for adolescents; possible mode differences; for adolescents, possibly more honest self-reporting.
- Poverty status
  - More respondents in >300% federal poverty level (FPL) group; possibly due to the younger demographic profile, but trend is consistent with shifts observed in American Community Survey (ACS).
- Health insurance
  - Higher employer-based insurance and fewer Medicaid/Medi-Cal enrollees; possibly due to increase in >300% FPL group, but the trend is consistent with shifts in ACS.
- Family type
  - Increase in single parent households; possible change in sample composition.
- English proficiency

- Fewer limited English proficient; decrease in non-English completes, and increase in college educated respondents.

While this report cannot examine every trend for every variable, it should provide sufficient background and clear examples to help researchers interpret trends and make decisions about whether trending CHIS data across this methodological redesign is appropriate.

UPDATED NOVEMBER 2020

Version note: This updated report corrects errors in reported estimates for a select number of adult, child, and adolescent variables. Adult estimates updated include health insurance type, poverty status, and food security. Child estimates updated include health insurance type and poverty status. Adolescent estimates updated include health insurance type, usual source of care, poverty status, current smoker, and gender expression.

In addition, citations and acknowledgements previously overlooked have been added.

UPDATED JANUARY 2021

Version note: This updated report corrects an error in the reported estimates for serious psychological distress in the past month for adolescents.

UPDATE AUGUST 2021

Version note: This report is updated in two ways: 1) CHIS 2019 Revised Weight estimates are included, along with elucidation on re-weighting motivation and impact. 2) CHIS 2020 survey design, data collection methods and estimates are added in this report. This integration enables the whole report to use CHIS 2019-2020 as a two-year cycle.

Introduction

Since its inception in 2001, the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) has been an innovative and invaluable resource for policymakers, researchers, health experts, members of the media and others for credible and comprehensive data on the health of Californians. For nearly 20 years, the CHIS sample design and data collection methodology has remained relatively unchanged using random-digit dialing (RDD) computer-assisted telephone interviews (CATI), with the addition of cell phone RDD following the tremendous growth of cell phone ownership (Blumberg & Luke, 2020).

Over the last few decades, the telephone survey landscape has seen some major changes as new barriers and technologies have developed. The growth of cell phone only households and advent of the smartphone resulted in large cultural shifts in how we communicate (Lavrakas et al., 2017). Telephone interviewing has become more challenging with the proliferation of spam calls, robocalls, and call blocking, as well as the implementation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (Lavrakas et al., 2017; Dutwin et al., 2018). This has resulted in some of the lowest response rates ever for telephone surveys, primarily due to upward trends in "no answer" and answering machine call designations (Czajka & Beyler, 2016; Lavrakas et al., 2017; Marken, 2018; Kennedy & Hartig, 2019).

Simultaneously, new and more complete sampling frames based on addresses were developed and allowed for more survey modes to be easily used for data collection giving to the popular rise of mixed-mode surveys (Harter et al., 2016; Olson et al., 2019). Accessibility to the Internet within homes and on mobile devices also brought a new, less expensive way to collect data.

With all of these factors impacting survey research, the sustainability of a telephone-based methodology for CHIS was in question. It was time for the CHIS once again to innovate, and to explore alternative survey methods to remain relevant and viable.

This report will review the process CHIS went through to develop a new sample and data collection methodology and review the final design implemented in CHIS 2019-2020 cycle. With any change in methodology comes questions about what that means for those looking at trends over time. The remainder of this report will cover various comparisons between CHIS 2018 and the CHIS statewide pilot of the new methodology as well as trends of key variables from CHIS 2015-2020 along with the statewide pilot.

Redesign Process

In July 2017, the CHIS team organized the CHIS Redesign Working Group (RWG) made up of survey methodologists and subject matter experts from across the United States. Their goal was to evaluate where CHIS could improve and innovate to accomplish the specific goals of increasing responses, reducing respondent burden, and keeping data collection cost-efficient. The RWG was to provide current best practices used in the field for sample selection and data

collection, guidance and critique of proposed exploratory research developed by the CHIS team related to any methodological changes. In August 2017, the CHIS RWG met for the first time with its eight external experts (listed below with their position as of August 2017) and four ex-officio members from the CHIS team:

- David Dutwin, PhD – Executive Vice President and Chief Methodologist, SSRS; Vice President (2017-2018), American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)
- Jason Fields, PhD – Survey Director, National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH), United States Census Bureau
- Timothy Johnson, PhD – Director of the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) Survey Research Laboratory and Professor of Public Administration at UIC; President (2017-2018), American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)
- Kristen Olsen, PhD – Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Nebraska – Lincoln
- Nathaniel Schenker, PhD – Retired Deputy Director, National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS)
- Linette Scott, MD, MPH – Chief Medical Information Officer, California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)
- David Takeuchi, PhD – Professor and Associate Dean for Research, School of Social Work, Boston College
- Andrew Zukerberg – Chief of the Cross-Sectional Surveys Branch, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)
- Ninez Ponce, PhD, MPH (ex-officio) – Principal Investigator of the CHIS
- Todd Hughes (ex-officio) – Director of the CHIS
- Royce Park (ex-officio) – Assistant Director of the CHIS
- Brian Wells, MS (ex-officio) – CHIS Survey Methodologist and Data Quality Manager

As the RWG reviewed and discussed potential designs, it was done so under a redesign framework based on nine core dimensions founded on the CHIS mission statement:

- Ensure geographic representation
- Ensure diverse racial and ethnic representation
- Collect data for adults, adolescents, and children
- Reduce bias and minimize errors
- Provide cost-effective data collection
- Maintain longitudinal trends
- Ensure efficient data processing and timely dissemination
- Balance study complexity with respondent burden
- Support flexibility in content and collection

CHIS and the RWG considered many different designs. Of particular interest to CHIS and the RWG was transitioning to address-based sampling (ABS) frames and the use of mixed-mode data collection.

Switching to ABS has huge potential for improving response rates while lowering survey costs (de Leeuw, 2005; Dillman et al., 2014; Hoebel et al., 2014; Harter et al., 2016) especially with the increased difficulty with contacting cell-phone only households (Lavrakas et al., 2017). The United States Postal Service (USPS) Computerized Delivery Sequence (CDS) file arguably has the best frame of households in the United States as it is regularly updated and has very high coverage, with coverage as high as 100% in some areas (Harter et al., 2016).

Many researchers are conducting mixed-mode designs with the ABS frame in an effort to alleviate high nonresponse and rising costs of RDD (de Leeuw, 2005; Johnson & Williams, 2010; Harter et al., 2016; de Leeuw, 2018; Olson et al., 2019). Mixed-mode designs can refer to different modes for data collection as well as for recruitment (Harter et al., 2016). The versatility of using different mode options at different stages of the survey process has proven to be effective.

Push-to-web (also known as web-push) methods has emerged in an effort improve response rates via the Internet (Battaglia et al., 2016; Dillman, 2017; Olson et al., 2019). This mixed-mode strategy uses a mail invitation to encourage (or "push") households to participate in a web survey. Web collection is generally considered the least expensive mode of data collection significantly reducing the cost per complete. The American Community Survey (ACS) adopted this strategy in 2013 and many countries – including Japan, Canada, Australia, and most recently the United States – have used web-push methods for recent censuses (Battaglia et al., 2016; Dillman, 2017). This method is being tested for a variety of surveys as a potential replacement for RDD CATI and/or in-person interviews across the world (Olson et al., 2019).

However, a push-to-web strategy alone may systematically exclude important groups in California. The internet penetration rate in California is around 84% meaning that a sizable proportion of the state population would not be covered by only offering a web response option. Internet access differs by age, race/ethnicity, and poverty status in the state based on estimates from CHIS 2015-2016 (see Table 1). Self-administered surveys in general have not proven as successful for non-English speakers and significantly underrepresent low English proficient respondents (e.g., McGovern, 2004; Brick et al., 2012; Caporaso et al., 2013; Newsome et al., 2017). In total, differences in coverage, education and literacy concerns as well as language barriers emphasize the need to continue offering (for example) telephone as a potential data collection mode.

While many mixed-mode studies will often include a paper-and-pencil questionnaire, the length, complexity (i.e., health insurance), and three individual surveys (adult, child, and adolescent) of CHIS currently make it difficult to implement.

Table 1. California internet access by age, race, and poverty status.

	Internet Access
Statewide	84.2%

Age	Internet Access	Race (OMB/CA DOF)	Internet Access	Federal Poverty Level (FPL)	Internet Access
18-24	98.6%	Latino	74.3%	0-99% FPL	68.2%
25-39	94.4%	African American	83.4%	100-199% FPL	74.3%
40-64	82.8%	Asian	86.5%	200-299% FPL	83.1%
65-79	65.8%	White	91.5%	300% FPL and above	94.0%
80+	43.5%	Other	90.8%		

Source: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, California Health Interview Survey 2015-2016 (AskCHIS).
Note. OMB = Office of Management and Budget. CA DOF = California Department of Finance.

With the guidance of the RWG, CHIS decided on experimentally testing a data collection approach that best addressed the nine core redesign dimensions. The general design proposed was a mixed-mode survey design using an address-based sampling (ABS) frame with a mail push-to-web survey followed by a CATI nonresponse follow-up.

Spring Field Test

CHIS received a combined grant from the Kaiser Permanente Northern California Community Benefits Program, the Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Southern California Region, and the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan's National Program Offices. This grant included funding for a field experiment exploring a revised design for the CHIS that was less dependent on telephone data collection and would better position CHIS to efficiently collect accurate data in the current household survey environment in preparation for the 2019-2020 data collection cycle.

With input from the RWG, CHIS conducted an initial field test experiment between April and June of 2018. Three counties – Los Angeles, Santa Clara, and Tulare – were selected for the field test based on a variety of factors including CHIS response rates, American Community Survey (ACS) internet response rates, internet penetration rates, county size and urbanicity, geographic distribution across the state, and the relative Latino and Asian populations. This field test only offered an English web instrument, but CATI was available for all standard CHIS languages.

The spring feasibility test was generally a success showing improved response rates and lower data collection costs compared to classic CHIS telephone methods. In addition, multiple embedded experiments were included to test ways to ensure accurate within-household collection, increase completes on the third contact attempt, and improve adolescent collection. Full details of the field test and the associated experiments are available in Wells et al. (2018).

Fall Statewide Pilot

While the spring field test proved the feasibility and potential of the new methods, it was ideal to test the ABS mixed-mode design across the entire state and improve on weaknesses observed in the first test. With support from the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), CHIS was able to conduct a statewide pilot aimed to collect 10% of the single year CHIS sample size between October 2018 and January 2019.

The pilot expanded the web instrument to include Spanish and continued to include CATI interviews in all CHIS languages. In addition to including a Spanish web instrument, high density Latino communities (i.e., Census blocks with at least 70% Latinos) were divided into two experimental conditions where one was mailed the standard English-prominent materials and the other was mailed Spanish-prominent materials (more details below). While the response rates were relatively identical for the two groups, the Spanish dominant materials resulted in slightly more Spanish completes.

Additional embedded experiments also tested methods to increase child completes, and improving adolescent collection. Weighted and unweighted estimates from the Fall pilot were also compared to 2017 production for some key indicators to preliminarily assess the impact of the new methods on survey estimates. Full details of the statewide pilot and the associated experiments are available in Wells et al. (2019). In short, the statewide pilot confirmed the successes of the feasibility test, saw improvements in in-language, child and adolescent completes, but also identified some areas in which the design continued to lag behind expectations.

CHIS 2019-2020 Design

With all of the experiments completed, the CHIS team was able to decide on a final design for the 2019-2020 cycle. CHIS 2019 data collection occurred between September and December 2019 for the adult and child surveys and October 2019 through January 2020 for the adolescent survey. CHIS 2020 data collection occurred between March and October 2020 for the adult and child surveys, and March through November 2020 for the adolescent survey. In many respects, the 2019-2020 design greatly resembled the statewide pilot with a number of notable exceptions. The following sections discuss the overall sequence of contacts with respondents and alterations and improvements made to CHIS 2019-2020.

Recruitment Strategy

In general, the CHIS 2019-2020 design used a sequence of three mailings to each selected household followed by a CATI follow-up. The 2019 sequence of mailings included an initial invitation letter, a sealed postcard reminder, and a final reminder letter. In 2020, the sequence of mailings was altered to include an initial invitation letter, a sealed postcard reminder, a second reminder letter, and a sealed postcard final reminder. The first mailing contained the

initial invitation letter, a $2 pre-incentive, a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) sheet, and a multilingual insert in all non-English CHIS languages. The invitation letter prominently featured who should complete the survey, the survey URL, and a secure access code unique to the household. In addition, a toll-free number was offered for those who wished to complete the survey by phone. The multilingual letters in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, and Tagalog contained the same information as the main letter with instructions on how to complete the survey in-language over the phone if needed.

The Spanish dominant language condition was maintained in CHIS 2019-2020 to help increase the number of Spanish completes. The letters and FAQs for that condition were printed on an 11x17 sheet and folded as a booklet. In addition, the materials were printed and folded in a way so that the Spanish language materials would be displayed first upon opening the envelope. The envelopes also prominently featured Spanish on the front exterior, with the text reading, “Your health and opinion matter. Respond today.” The initial contact also included multilingual letters in Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, and Tagalog with instructions on how to complete the survey in-language over the phone if needed.

The second mailing was a pressure sealed postcard reminder sent to all sampled addresses. This invitation also included the survey URL and a secure access code unique to the household. Again, dominant language conditions were featured.

The third mailing was a letter with FAQ and was sent to households who had not yet responded, refused, or were designated as undeliverable. For most waves, this was sent using a United States Postal Service (USPS) Certified Mail® option. Certified mail requires a signature from the responding household when delivered. If no one is home, a delivery reminder slip is left in the mailbox by the letter carrier. This reminder informs the person a USPS Certified Mail® letter is being held at the local Post Office for pick-up. If no one picks up the letter after 5 to 7 days, USPS leaves a second delivery notice. Again, the delivery slip reminder is left by the letter carrier. Finally, after 5 to 7 days the final delivery attempt is made to the delivery address. After the final reminder is left the letter is taken back to the Post Office and held for 5 to 7 days prior to being returned to sender. The final wave in 2019 replaced the Certified mail with a standard First-class letter to help reduce burden during the holiday season.

In 2020, the fourth mailing was sent to households who had not yet responded, refused, or designated as undeliverable. This additional mailing was a sealed postcard reminder which included the survey URL and a secure access code specific to the household. The predominant language in the postcard was dependent on the modeling prediction.

Following delivery of the third mailing, interviewers attempted to complete a CATI interview with any remaining nonrespondents beginning about two weeks after mailing out if a phone number was linked to the address (~68% of total addresses).

Adjustments and Improvements

In terms of adjustments and improvements to the statewide pilot design, CHIS made five major changes that implemented to improve collection in 2019-2020.

Expanded web language options. Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese web questionnaires were introduced in 2019 and 2020 to better capture Asian language completes greatly underrepresented in the statewide pilot. Tagalog was available for CATI only. For more details on the in-language completes, please refer to *CHIS 2019-2020 Methodology Series: Report 2 – Data Collection Methods.*

Predictive modeling for oversampling. CHIS took advantage of recent developments in survey sampling to use Big Data and machine learning approaches to build predictive models of household attributes (e.g., Dutwin, 2018). By using ABS sample appended with auxiliary data (e.g., voting files, commercial consumer information, Census Planning Database) and then combining that with actual self-reported data from CHIS, we were able to develop models to predict self-reported survey outcomes to effectively target specific groups. In particular, CHIS targeted the following important or underrepresented groups: Asians (with particular emphasis on Korean and Vietnamese), Hispanic or Spanish-speakers, those with low educational attainment, non-citizens, and households with children under age 19. For more details on the predictive model methods and their relative success, please refer to *CHIS 2019-2020 Methodology Series: Report 1 – Sample Design.*

Expanded language dominant mailings. In conjunction with the predictive models, the Spanish dominant mailings (detailed above) were included for households predicted as likely to include Hispanics or Spanish-speakers. In addition, CHIS introduced an Asian dominant mailing for households predicted to include Koreans, Vietnamese, or other Asians. This Asian dominant condition included a message on the back envelope in all six CHIS languages with Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Tagalog at the top, with the text reading, “Your health and opinion matter. Respond today.” On the multilingual insert for the Asian dominant condition, Spanish was moved to the end of the series putting Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Tagalog first.

Child survey ordering. Following a child survey placement experiment in the statewide pilot (see Wells et al., 2019), CHIS moved the child survey between Section A and Section B of the adult survey in 2019-2020. The statewide pilot results demonstrated great improvement in the number of child completes without a subsequent negative effect on adult completes when the child survey was placed in this manner. Section A was chosen because it contains a bulk of demographic data regarding the adult respondent including marital status and provided a logical transition into asking about their spouse/partner, and rostering all of the children in the household which was originally placed in Section G. Consent to provide information about an eligible child was integrated into the adult consent language to streamline the consent procedure for the integrated adult and child surveys.

Adolescent data collection. Because the telephone hand-off could not be maintained with the new push-to-web design, the adolescent data collection experienced an expansive overhaul. Permission to survey the adolescent was obtained in Section G (about half way through the adult interview) as opposed to at the end of the adult survey to help improve permission rates. If the parent initially refused, they were re-asked with an offer to exclude questions on sensitive topics such as drugs and sexual behavior. Parents who agreed were asked for additional information about the adolescent including the best phone number for contact. Adolescents were offered a $10 gift card for completing the survey.

Once permission was received, a mailing was addressed to parent and a second envelope inside addressed to the adolescent. The letter to the parent thanked them for their permission to speak with their adolescent and reiterated the key points of the adolescent's selection and participation. The letter to the adolescent prominently featured the survey URL and their individual access code, as well as detailing the promised incentive. This nested letter attempted to replicate the phone hand-off that was key to the high adolescent cooperation rate under the CATI design. A follow-up letter about a week after the initial packet was sent directly to the adolescent. If a telephone number was provided, CATI follow-up would occur with the adolescent ideally preceded by a text reminder, if it was their personal cell phone and the parent had provided permission for their adolescent to receive a text.

For households who did not grant permission, a parental permission refusal conversion letter was sent to the household. The letter offered an incentive to the parent for providing permission, and included the same nested letter to the adolescent if they decided to now grant permission for the adolescent to participate. An experiment tested differential amounts and timings of the parental incentive as part of the refusal conversion process and is discussed in *CHIS 2019-2020 Methodology Series: Report 4 – Response Rates*.

Total Survey Error Framework

The investigation we engage in through this report is to observe the impact of changing sampling frame and survey modes on key estimates from CHIS, particularly as it relates to trends over time. However, changes due to the data collection mode are often confounded with other differences in survey administration. Thus, it is important to discuss the possible sources of error we are likely to experience and observe.

In the total survey error (TSE) framework, we generally focus on two major classes of error: measurement and representation (Biemer & Lyberg, 2003; Groves et al., 2009). Measurement has to do with the questions and responses themselves. Representation has to do with the "who", as in who participates and how they compare to the population of interest.

Measurement

Measurement can be separated into three error sources: specification, measurement, and processing. As specification error has to do with the questions used to measure a concept, this is not a major concern for this evaluation as the nature of the CHIS question development has not changed. Similarly, processing error has to do with the way data is processed after collection which has not significantly changed following the redesign. Thus, we are primarily concerned about measurement error which has many causes including the mode, the questionnaire, the respondent, and the interviewer (when applicable).

A word commonly used in this context is "mode effect." A mode effect by definition "refers to any influence on survey responses that is due to the mode of data collection" (Jans, 2008). Mode effect relates to measurement or the specific characteristics of a survey question as presented within that mode. Self-administered modes like pen-and-paper or web surveys are primarily visual mediums while interviewer-administered like CATI or face-to-face (FTF) modes are primarily aural/verbal (though a FTF interview can allow for visual communication as well) (Krosnick & Alwin, 1987; Schwarz et al., 1991; Tourangeau et al., 2000). This means that the stimulus for each mode differs engaging different cognitive processes. For example, the presence of an interviewer in CATI or FTF can alter the behavior and responses of a respondent. Generally this is seen in more social desirable responding and satisficing. Self-administered modes are generally considered to allow for better self-reporting of sensitive or undesirable behaviors (Tourangeau et al., 2000; Tourangeau & Yan, 2007; Kreuter et al., 2008; Krumpal, 2013). Another dimension of mode effect has to do with serial-position effects (Krosnick & Alwin, 1987; Schwarz et al., 1991, 1992). Visual modes are generally susceptible to a primacy effect, or the tendency to favor the first response options presented. Aural stimulus in interviewer-administered modes generally have respondents relying on short-term or working memory which favors the last options presented, known as a recency effect.

One particular issue related to mode and measurement utilized in CHIS is that a CATI survey can utilize unread response options, generally those you anticipate from a small number of respondents but do not want to outright offer to the respondent. Unread or unseen options cannot be implemented in self-administered modes. Consider the question, "Has a doctor ever told you that you have high blood pressure?" This is classically considered a yes/no question. However, a respondent may have been told by their doctor that they have "borderline hypertension." Cognitively, a respondent will make a decision whether to say "yes" because they consider a borderline status as an affirmative, or they could respond "no" because they know it is not an official diagnosis yet, or they could argue that their experience does not fit the question as presented and present a response not or provide no response. If the latter case occurred in an interviewer-administered survey, a respondent who responds, "My doctor told me I have pre-hypertension" could be recorded as "Pre-hypertension" assuming it is available as an unread option. In a self-administered mode, a simple yes/no response forces the

respondent to make a decision. If you want to capture those who have borderline or pre-hypertension, you must explicitly provide it as a third option.

Representation

While we will make specific mention of differences in questions by mode, these changes are relatively rare looking at 2019. The larger issue is related to representation which is made up of four error sources: coverage, sampling, nonresponse, and adjustment.

The transition to ABS hopes to reduce coverage bias as discussed earlier. Sampling error is simply the recognition of data coming from a sample and not a census, especially in relation to variance estimation. Adjustment error is also not as critical for this analysis as it focuses on adjustments needed for weighting procedures due to sample design choices, which has remained relatively constant in recent years. While new oversampling techniques were implemented in CHIS 2019, oversampling has generally been utilized in previous CHIS cycles.

Nonresponse error and bias is the largest source of concern for representation for many surveys and is the most likely source of error in this survey design transition for CHIS. However, nonresponse is not solely, or even accurately, measured by a common indicator of survey quality: response rates. One might intuitively expect that high nonresponse rates means larger nonresponse bias, but that is not completely true. Multiple studies have demonstrated that nonresponse rates are only indirectly related to nonresponse bias and only represents the "risk" of nonresponse bias (e.g., Groves, 2006; Groves & Peytcheva, 2008; Kennedy & Hartig, 2019). Surveys can avoid much of this risk if the topics of the survey are not strongly related with the reasons to choose or refuse to participate in the survey (Groves & Peytcheva, 2008). Some have reported that recent election polls, for example, are more accurate, on average, than polls conducted 20 years ago, even with lower response rates (e.g., Kennedy & Hartig, 2019). Given increasing response rates is not a silver bullet, this means that surveys facing dangerously low levels of response need to consider how to ensure representation outside of response rates through proper questionnaire design, appropriate and effective survey design features like incentives and recruitment materials, etc. (Brick & Tourangeau, 2017).

Nonresponse due to the mode of contact and/or the mode of completion is primarily related to the concept of survey cooperation. This might mistakenly be called a "mode effect", when in reality it is related to how the survey is administered. By using a different mode, you may obtain cooperation from a different type of respondent. For example, access to and availability of a computer with internet can limit who can participate in a household web survey even if they are generally willing to participate. Conversely, persons who utilize call blocker technology or heavily screen calls through use of Caller ID may be less likely to respond to a telephone survey. Therefore, a respondent's comfort in or preference for a particular mode may influence them to participate (or not participate) in a survey. While the new methods may be at risk for nonresponse error due to mode, it must also be recognized that the historical methods may also have suffered from errors related to survey mode.

A Word about Weighting and Re-weighting

While the raw sample data describes the "who" we talked to, surveys are often used to estimate population values. Weighting is used to correct imbalances between the final survey sample and the population. Weighting corrects for sampling for differential probabilities of selection, adjusts for undercoverage, and reduces biases occurring due to nonresponse. A respondent's weight is roughly how many individuals that respondent represents in the sample from the population. In other words, weighting of the survey data is thus required to "map" the sample back to an unbiased representation of the survey population (Heeringa et al., 2017). Two different samples can produce similar estimates when weighted to the population using equivalent methods. This does not make weighting a magic statistical technique that can correct all biases from the survey process.

CHIS 2017-2018 was weighted to California's Department of Finance (DOF) population estimates, American Community Survey (ACS) population estimates, and Census 2010 population figures. These are usually restricted to dimensions around sex, age, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, household size, and geography. CHIS 2019 was similarly weighted (for details see *CHIS 2017-2018 Methodology Series: Report 5 – Weighting and Variance Estimation* and *CHIS 2019-2020 Methodology Series: Report 5 – Weighting and Variance Estimation)*.

In processing the 2020 CHIS, the weighting methods were enhanced to better reflect the child probability of selection, to separate "South Asian, not Hispanic" from "Other Asian, not Hispanic" in weighting calibration, and to alter the jackknife replicate weight to enhance consistency with prior CHIS cycles. Additionally, during the processing of the 2020 CHIS, it was determined that the 2019 CHIS data needed to reflect a revised set of population estimates from the California Department of Finance (DOF)—a key input file used in the CHIS weighting process. Those DOF file changes most significantly impacted counts for American Indian/Alaska Native, Pacific Islander, and Multi-race groups, though there were minor changes to other groups as well. Given that this modification to the DOF estimates would require that the 2019 CHIS data be rerun, it was decided to apply the other weighting enhancements described above for the 2020 CHIS to the 2019 CHIS as well for congruence and comparability within the two-year cycle. Based on our data quality control assessment, we conclude that the re-weighting does not yield salient changes to most 2019 estimates, but the impact of the new DOF population projections does lead to significant changes for certain estimates.

Methods

With the Fall statewide pilot taking place simultaneously with CHIS 2018 production, we have a reasonable transition estimate to help measure how much change in 2019 might come from actual changes over time compared to those related to the methodological changes of frame and mode.

A series of 38 adult, 17 child, and 16 adolescent demographic and substantive survey variables were selected for comparison (see Table 2). These variables were chosen to represent a broad range of topics including demographics, health conditions, health care access, health insurance, and socioeconomic metrics. Most variables selected had a universe of the full sample population and represented a variety of core and funder-supported content to ensure a broad variety of areas of interest. We do not include variables that had universes changes (i.e., changes in whom was asked the question) where we would expect substantial differences in trends, including questions related to public program which moved from <300% federal poverty level (FPL) to <200% FPL.

As discussed before, we remodeled the weighting in 2020, and we decided to apply the updated weights to 2019 data. To enable transparency, both original and revised 2019 weighted estimates will be reported in this report. All estimates in sample composition and trend analysis are weighted via replicate weight method, unless otherwise specified (e.g., unweighted estimate or weighted estimate via Taylor Series Linearization (TLS) method).

The preliminary analysis will look at sample composition variation from 2018 to 2020, primarily focusing on demographic variables used for weighting. We particularly focus on those variables used for weighting as the final weighted estimates for these demographic variables will ultimately match those provided by the California Department of Finance (DOF) and the American Community Survey (ACS). Within this analysis, we will look at and compare both unweighted and weighted estimates.

The main analysis will focus on the overall trends from CHIS 2015 through 2020. We begin at 2015, because this was the cycle where CHIS transitioned to a 50/50 dual-frame RDD design (50% landline, 50% cell phone). This provides a relatively consistent overall design for the previous RDD CATI cycles[1]. Some exceptions are included for variables not, or differentially, collected in CHIS 2015-2016 (e.g., e-cigarette question fundamentally changed in between CHIS 2016 and CHIS 2017). The trend analyses also include estimates from the web experiment to provide needed context in understanding changes in the methodology[2]. Web experiment values are not included for the adolescent sample due to small sample sizes.

Looking only at the weighted estimates, we will primarily focus on substantive measures (e.g., health conditions, health care access, health insurance). In addition to statewide adult estimates, we will occasionally refer at specific adult subgroups to measure how differences in

[1] Some minor differences are observed in 2015-2018: 1) incentives for cell phone respondents in 2015-2016; 2) refusal conversion letters in 2015-2016; 3) out-of-state calling in 2017-2018; 4) advance letters with $2 pre-incentive to all households with a matched address in 2017 (typically only mailed to landline households with a matched address); and 5) oversample of American Indian/Alaska Natives (AIAN) statewide and non-Caucasians in San Francisco County in 2018.

[2] While CHIS production data is estimated with replicate weights, replicate weights were not produced for the Fall web experiment. Variance estimates, including confidence intervals, reported for the Fall web experiment are estimated using linearization.

sample composition may be influencing trends over time. These subgroups include age, race/ethnicity, and poverty status, and are broken up as detailed below:

- Age group (5 groups): 18-24, 25-39, 40-64, 65-79, 80+
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB) race/ethnicity (5 groups): Latino, non-Latino white, non-Latino Asian, non-Latino African American, non-Latino other
- Poverty (4 groups): 0-138% FPL, 139-250% FPL, 251-400% FPL, 400% FPL and over

No subgroups are examined for the child and adolescent samples. While subgroup estimates and changes are discussed as needed in the report, no plots of subgroup comparisons are included, but can be found in the associated *Appendix: Adult Subgroup Trend Analysis*.

Statistically unstable estimates, as defined by a coefficient of variation greater than 30%, are denoted with an asterisk. While no formal statistical tests between years are reported at this time, we do report the confidence interval of each estimate for each year, which can provide a simple way to examine statistically significant differences between years.

Table 2. Variables of interest

Adult	
Demographic	Age*
	Asian subgroups*
	Citizenship
	Country of birth
	English proficiency
	Family type
	Gender*
	Highest grade of education*
	Marital status
	Race (CHPR)
	Race (OMB)*
	Sexual orientation
	Transgender
Health behavior	Birth control (Male)
	Current smoker
	E-cigarette use
	Tried marijuana or hashish
Health care	Delay getting care
	Delay getting Rx
	Last dental visit
	Needed help for mental health
	Routine check-up in the past 12 mo.
	Usual source of care
	Visit counselor mental health/drugs
	Visit physician mental health/drugs
Health condition	Asthma
	BMI
	Diabetes
	Hypertension
	Self-rated health status
	Serious distress in the past month
	Suicide
Health insurance	Insurance type
Socioeconomic	Employment status
	Food security
	Housing tenure*
	People in neighborhood willing help
	Poverty status

Child	
Demographic	Age*
	Gender*
	Race (OMB)*
Health behavior	Five-a-day fruits/vegetables
Health care	Delay getting care
	Delay getting Rx
	Last dental visit
	Usual source of care
Health condition	Asthma
	Health status
	Overweight for age
Health insurance	Dental insurance
	Insurance type
Parental involvement	Days per week reading books
	Frequency singing songs
	Saw/heard 'Talk,Read,Sing'
Socioeconomic	Poverty status

Adolescent	
Demographic	Age*
	Gender*
	Gender expression
	Race (OMB)*
Health behavior	Current smoker
	Five-a-day fruits/vegetables
	Sedentary time on weekends
Health care	Delay getting Rx
	Delay getting care
	Usual source of care
Health condition	Asthma
	BMI
	Self-rated health status
	Serious distress in past mo.
Health insurance	Insurance type
Socioeconomic	Poverty status

Note. * = weighting dimension

Results

As we seek to measure the impact of the new sample and data collection design, we first consider a high-level comparison of the previous and new methodologies. Table 3 shares some common quantitative metrics to compare the designs: the number of completes and response rates by survey age group. Under the new methodology, we see the substantive increase in child and adolescent completes in CHIS 2019-2020, with doubled child completes and almost tripled adolescent completes compared with the prior two-year cycle. There are also salient gains in response rates across all three age categories in CHIS 2019-2020.

When breaking down the adolescent response rate into its two components (permission and completion), we see that the permission rate more than doubled for CHIS 2019-2020 going from 23.4% up to 54.5%, but the completion rate did go down somewhat from 74.5% to 60.1%. The loss of the telephone handoff characteristic of the CATI design does seem to have some impact on lower cooperation rate, though the higher permission rates ultimately results in more adolescents completing the survey.

90.8% of the final adult sample completed on the Web with nearly 9.2% completing over the phone. Nearly half of those CATI completes were from inbound calls.

Considering adult completes by language, we do see a noticeable reduction in Spanish and Vietnamese completes from previous cycles (see Table 4). This reduction could possibly be tied to lower rates of literacy and education levels in these groups which would result in lower cooperation in self-administered modes (Lee et al., 2008; Ramirez et al., 2017). The number of Chinese and Korean completes remained consistent or improved from previous cycles.

Table 3. CHIS 2017-2018 and CHIS 2019-2020 completes and response rates by age category

		CHIS 2017-2018	CHIS 2019-2020
Completes	Adult	42,330	44,109
	Child	3,186	6,557
	Adolescent	880	2,212
Response Rates[1]	Adult	3.4%	11.6%
	Child	58.3%	85.7%
	Adolescent	21.3%	33.2%
Adolescent Permission Rate		23.4%	54.5%
Adolescent Completion Rate[2]		74.5%	60.1%

Source: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, California Health Interview Survey 2017-2020.

[1] Adult response rate is reported as an unconditional weighted response. The child and adolescent response rates are reported as conditional weighted response rates.

[2] Completion rate is calculated as Completes / Permission Given.

Table 4. CHIS 2017-2018 and CHIS 2019-2020 adult completes by language

	CHIS 2017-2018		CHIS 2019-2020	
Language	Completes	% of total	Completes	% of total
English	38,818	91.70%	41,992	95.20%
Spanish	2,694	6.36%	1,354	3.07%
Chinese	299	0.71%	425	0.96%
Korean	233	0.55%	254	0.58%
Vietnamese	276	0.65%	83	0.19%
Tagalog	10	0.02%	1	0.00%
Total	42,330		44,109	

Source: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, California Health Interview Survey 2017-2020.

Sample Composition Breakdown

With the general positive results in mind, we transition our focus to a comparison of the sample composition across the redesign. For this breakdown, we focus on demographic characteristics that are used as weighting dimensions and are therefore designed to be consistent with population estimates from California DOF and ACS. Table 5 displays the frequencies, unweighted percentages, and weighted percentages for the six variables. Additionally, we report the estimates using both the original 2019 and revised 2019 weights. Our re-analysis of 2019 shows that only the revised estimate of Race (OMB) differs significantly from 2019 original estimate, which is expected because of the change of the race distribution in the new DOF population projection in 2019-2020.

We begin with age. CHIS, like many population-based surveys, naturally oversamples older parts of the population due to their general availability and willingness to participate in survey research. CHIS 2017-2018 actually excluded 75% of listed sample likely to be households with persons aged 65+ to help increase the younger population in the final sample (see *CHIS 2017-2018 Methodology Series: Report 5 – Weighting and Variance Estimation*). However, despite reductions in the aged 65+ sample given the web design, there is still large overrepresentation of those 65+ in the 2019 and 2020 sample. We also continue to see underrepresentation of those less than 40 years old from 2018 to 2020. While persons aged 18-39 are the most likely to have internet access, these households are also less likely to participate in survey research generally, especially those between 18 and 24 years old.

Throughout the most recent three CHIS cycles, females are more likely to complete the survey. The difference increases with the new design going from 53.9% of the sample in 2018 to 55.8% in 2019 and continues to go up, reaching 56.4% in 2020.

As anticipated from the literature (see earlier discussion), we continue to underrepresent Hispanics in the final sample. While 2018 saw on par representation of African Americans, there was some underrepresentation observed in 2019 and 2020, consistent with the lower internet

penetration rates discussed previously. While the percentage of American Indian and Alaska Natives (AIAN) seems smaller in 2019, this comparison does not account for the AIAN oversample conducted in 2018. The proportion of AIAN in 2020 sample is more aligned with 2019. With the change in the California DOF projections, the subsequent increase in Asian interviews, particularly of Chinese and Filipinos (as seen in the Asian subgroup weighting dimension), is somewhat minimized as the overall weighted percentage as goes up.

Education potentially sees the largest changes under the new design. We observe fewer without a high school diploma and many more college graduates in CHIS 2019 and 2020. This shift makes sense as education is highly correlated with literacy.

The last direct weighting dimension we examine is housing tenure. CHIS 2019 obtained significantly more home owners than CHIS 2018 in the unweighted sample, and even more home owners in CHIS 2020. It should be noted that this variable experiences a mode-related change in CHIS 2019 as "have other arrangement" was not originally presented as a response option to respondents on the telephone. While this did not seem to change the unweighted distribution, it may have had a small effect on the weighted percentage. This kind of mode-specific changes is discussed in greater detail in the following section.

Figure 1 displays the relative percentage point change[3] from the unweighted to the weighted percentages of the above variables showing the degree to which each response category is overestimated (above 0) or underestimated (below 0). A value of 1 denotes an unweighted percentage double the size of the weighted percentage, while a value of -0.5 denotes an unweighted percentage half the size of the weighted percentage. One change of note is the significant change of revised Asian group estimates in 2019. The relative percentage point change in the original estimate is -0.29 and the revised is -0.14, indicating that while Asian group is still underrepresented, the new DOF projection helps reduce the degree of underestimation. This trend is confirmed in Asian subgroups. There is a clear shift, reflecting that the degree of underestimation is reduced from 2018 to 2020 for every Asian subgroup.

There is sufficient evidence to say that the new methodology produces a slightly different sample composition, better in some ways and worse in others. However, when we repeat the new methodology in 2020, the sample composition demonstrates substantial consistency with 2019.

[3] The relative difference is calculated as: $\frac{(x_{unweighted} - x_{weighted})}{x_{weighted}}$

Table 5. CHIS 2018, 2019 and 2020 sample composition by weighting variables

		CHIS 2018			CHIS 2019				CHIS 2020		
		Frequency	Unweighted	Weighted	Frequency	Unweighted	Weighted	Revised Weighted	Frequency	Unweighted	Weighted
Age	18-24	1,812	8.56	13.72	800	3.61	13.91	11.91	1,040	4.74	11.60
	25-39	3,078	14.53	25.98	3,544	15.99	26.50	27.99	3,809	17.35	27.81
	40-64	8,129	38.39	41.08	9,309	42.01	40.09	39.88	9,417	42.90	39.62
	65-79	5,783	27.31	14.59	6,739	30.41	14.85	15.23	6,130	27.93	15.86
	80+	2,375	11.21	4.62	1,768	7.98	4.65	4.99	1,553	7.08	5.11
Gender	Male	9,754	46.06	48.83	9,785	44.16	48.79	49.08	9,575	43.62	49.07
	Female	11,423	53.94	51.17	12,375	55.84	51.21	50.91	12,374	56.38	50.93
Race (OMB)	Hispanic	4,709	22.24	36.10	4,044	18.25	36.13	39.31	4,317	19.67	39.25
	Non-Hispanic White	12,419	58.64	40.89	14,079	63.53	39.30	38.52	13,474	61.39	38.39
	African American	1,156	5.46	5.54	838	3.78	5.82	5.48	744	3.39	5.49
	American Indian/Alaska native[2]	351	1.66	0.44	101	0.46	0.49	0.38	86	0.39	0.43
	Asian	1,847	8.72	14.53	2,548	11.50	16.19	13.36	2,745	12.51	13.33
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	68	0.32	0.36	52	0.23	0.38	0.40	45	0.21	0.36
	Two or more races	627	2.96	2.13	498	2.25	1.69	2.72	538	2.45	2.75
Asian subgroup[1]	Chinese	630	2.97	5.28	770	3.47	4.53	3.85	752	3.43	3.96
	Korean	304	1.44	1.73	281	1.27	1.43	1.21	336	1.53	1.21
	Filipino	274	1.29	4.56	494	2.23	3.67	3.34	530	2.41	3.31
	Vietnamese	288	1.36	2.34	201	0.91	1.90	1.59	252	1.15	1.65
	Japanese	155	0.73	0.70	307	1.39	0.92	1.02	328	1.49	1.08
Educational attainment	Less than high school	1,718	8.11	16.44	795	3.59	14.53	14.67	760	3.46	15.16
	High school diploma	4,410	20.82	21.66	2,827	12.76	22.44	22.30	2,400	10.93	21.82
	Some college	5,995	28.31	22.98	6,642	29.97	22.82	22.87	6,276	28.59	21.94
	College graduate	9,054	42.75	38.92	11,896	53.68	40.21	40.16	12,513	57.01	41.08
Housing tenure	Own home	12,706	60.89	56.77	15,070	69.93	55.56	55.29	15,339	71.46	55.45
	Rent home	7,333	35.14	39.40	5,689	26.40	39.04	39.37	5,304	24.71	39.09
	Some other arrangement	828	3.97	3.84	792	3.68	5.40	5.34	822	3.83	5.46

Source: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, California Health Interview Survey 2018-2020.

[1] Reporting self-reported Asian subgroups.

[2] CHIS 2018 included an oversample of AIAN households.

Figure 1. Percentage point relative change from unweighted percentage to weighted percentage for CHIS 2018-2020



Note 1: Pay attention to the inconsistent y-axis scales when making comparisons across variables.
Note 2: CHIS 2018 included an oversample of AIAN households.

Adult Trend Analysis: 2015-2020

With the understanding of the shifting demographic profile from the RDD CATI methods to the ABS web methods, we focus on the trends for the remaining variables. For each variable, we share the trend from CHIS 2015 through 2020 for everyone 18+ years old unless otherwise specified. In addition, we include the preliminary estimates from the 2018 Fall web experiment in an attempt to add context to any transitions. However, it should be noted at the onset that there are multiple instances where the Fall web experiment point estimates were quite different from both 2018 and 2019. Given some of the previously noted limitations of that sample which resulted in changes to the 2019 design (e.g., minimal non-English completes leading to the expansion of Asian language web instruments and introduction of Asian dominant mailings) and 2019 re-weighting, we can see that these revisions to the design and re-weighting helped to correct certain estimates in our trend analysis.

All reported changes denote non-overlapping confidence intervals between 2018 and 2020 unless otherwise specified.

Given the dynamic nature of the questionnaire and the necessity to adapt to a new data collection mode, we divide this section based on some known characteristics. We begin with variables where we expected there to be observed differences, specifically those that underwent adaptation for self-administration. We then discuss the remaining variables by content area in an order generally corresponding with their placement in the questionnaire: demographics, health conditions, health behaviors, health insurance, health care, and socioeconomic.

Mode-specific changes

We begin with those question-related adjustments required by the change in mode. This primarily is made up of presenting response options previously unread. This includes the current gender identity question (“none of these”), sexual orientation (“none of these”), birth control (“no male/female sex partner”), and hypertension (“borderline or pre-hypertension”). As mentioned previously, the weighting dimension of housing tenure also had an unread response option for “have other arrangement” in previous cycles, but is not discussed here, except to say that data products like AskCHIS have long reported “have other arrangement” and given minimal changes to the distribution can generally be trended across cycles.

Given the explicit inclusion of the “none of these” category in the current gender identity question, we see a large uptick in our estimate of transgender or gender non-conforming persons, about 0.3% in 2018 up to 1.0% in 2019 (consistent result in 2019 revised weight, 1.0%), while slightly down to 0.6% in 2020. Further investigation shows that this is directly due to an increase in “none of these” responses with corresponding other specify responses like “genderfluid” and “nonbinary”.



Transgender or gender non-conforming	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	99.7*	99.6*	99.5*	99.7	99.2*	99.0	99.0	99.4
	(99.5, 99.9)	(99.3, 99.9)	(99.3, 99.8)	(99.5, 99.8)	(98.4, 99.9)	(98.8, 99.3)	(98.8, 99.2)	(99.2, 99.5)
Yes	0.3*	0.4*	0.5*	0.3	0.8*	1.0	1.0	0.6
	(0.1, 0.5)	(0.1, 0.7)	(0.2, 0.7)	(0.2, 0.5)	(0.1, 1.6)	(0.7, 1.2)	(0.8, 1.2)	(0.8, 1.2)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Similarly for sexual orientation, the CATI wording only specified “straight/heterosexual”, “gay/lesbian/homosexual”, and “bisexual” as response options. While CHIS 2015-2016 saw slightly higher rates of “other” responses (~2.0%) compared to CHIS 2017-2018 (~0.67%), the estimate of CHIS 2019, CHIS 2019 revised and CHIS 2020 is higher than 2015-2016 at a consistent 3.3%. In addition, we see an uptick in those reporting as “gay/lesbian/homosexual” from 2.4% to 3.3% and a resulting drop in “straight/heterosexual” from 92.6% down to 89.5%.



Sexual orientation	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Straight	92.9	93.3	93.5	92.6	90.5	89.5	89.6	90.4
	(92.1, 93.6)	(92.3, 94.4)	(92.8, 94.2)	(91.7, 93.5)	(88.3, 92.8)	(88.9, 90.2)	(89.1, 90.0)	(89.9, 90.8)
Gay/Lesbian/ Homosexual	2.6	2.0	2.4	2.4	2.9	3.3	3.3	3.3
	(2.1, 3.1)	(1.6, 2.4)	(1.9, 2.8)	(2.1, 2.8)	(1.7, 4.1)	(2.9, 3.6)	(3.1, 3.6)	(3.0, 3.6)
Bisexual	2.5	2.8	3.3	4.4	3.1	4.0	4.0	3.3
	(2.0, 3.0)	(2.0, 3.5)	(2.8, 3.9)	(3.8, 5.1)	(1.6, 4.5)	(3.5, 4.4)	(3.7, 4.3)	(3.0, 3.6)
Other	2.1	1.9	0.8	0.5	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.0
	(1.6, 2.5)	(1.3, 2.5)	(0.5, 1.1)	(0.3, 0.8)	(2.1, 4.8)	(2.9, 3.6)	(2.9, 3.4)	(2.8, 3.3)

For male birth control, there is a large increase in responses to “no female sexual partner” from 12.6% in 2019 up to 22.2% in 2019. We can see the direct reduction from no birth control used suggesting that previous respondents provided “no” as a verbal response when they had no female sexual partner. This pattern remains in 2020. Thus, it is recommendation of this author that this be considered a break in trend. The birth control variable for females is not examined here, because of a universe change from 2018 to 2019 from ages 18-49 to ages 18-44.



Birth control (male)	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Yes	32.6	33.2	27.4	31.3	31.5	31.0
	(30.5, 34.8)	(31.1, 35.4)	(21.8, 33.0)	(29.8, 32.9)	(30.5, 32.5)	(30.2, 31.9)
No	56.9	54.2	52.0	46.5	46.8	48.4
	(54.9, 58.9)	(51.8, 56.6)	(45.6, 58.4)	(44.9, 48.0)	(45.7, 47.8)	(47.5, 49.3)
No Female Sexual Partner	10.5	12.6	20.6	22.2	21.7	20.6
	(9.0, 11.9)	(11.0, 14.1)	(14.6, 26.6)	(20.8, 23.6)	(20.7, 22.8)	(19.7 ,21,4)

Hypertension presents an interesting change illuminating the cognitive difficulties respondents face in the interviewer-administered mode. We saw that the percentage of those reporting their doctor telling them they have "borderline or pre-hypertension" increases from a historical 1.0% up to 7.2% in 2019. The estimates of pre-hypertension confirm this growth amongst the web experiment, CHIS 2019 Revised Weight and CHIS 2020. We see decreases in both "yes" and "no" responses potentially suggesting that many pre-hypertension respondents may have chosen "yes" because they considered the diagnosis equivalent while some responded "no" feeling it was not completely accurate. The previous decision to group "no" and "borderline or pre-hypertension" will result in significantly lower rates of hypertension in this and future cycles. Thus, it is recommendation of this author that "borderline or pre-hypertension" be treated independently from the "yes" and "no" categories beginning with 2019.



Hypertension	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Yes	28.8	28.4	29.0	29.8	26.7	25.9	26.4	25.1
	(27.4, 30.1)	(27.1, 29.7)	(27.0, 31.1)	(28.7, 31.0)	(23.4, 29.9)	(25.0, 26.8)	(25.7, 27.0)	(24.5, 25.6)
No	70.2	70.8	70.0	69.1	67.4	67.0	66.5	67.2
	(68.9, 71.6)	(69.6, 72.0)	(68.2, 71.8)	(68.0, 70.2)	(64.0, 70.9)	(66.0, 67.9)	(65.8, 67.2)	(66.5, 67.8)
Borderline	1.0	0.8	1.0	1.1	5.9	7.2	7.2	7.8
	(0.7, 1.3)	(0.6, 1.1)	(0.5, 1.5)	(0.7, 1.4)	(4.5, 7.3)	(6.7, 7.6)	(6.8, 7.5)	(7.4, 8.1)

With the major construct and wording changes covered, we now move on to the more difficult task of determining what variables remained stable measurement-wise from the old to the new methods. We discuss the remaining content by topic area.

Demographics

First, we consider demographic characteristics. Given age, gender, race/ethnicity (as defined by California DOF and the American Community Survey), and education are part of the weighting variables, these are guaranteed to match population estimates and are thus not discussed here. We begin with family type which see shifts increasing the number of single adult households with children (5.5% to ~10%) and decreasing those without (43.9% to ~40%) from 2018 to 2020. While this could be reflective of the oversampling of households with children as part of the predictive modeling, the web experiment values, while seemingly as outliers in the line chart, are consistent in the directional change observed, suggesting an overall difference due to the methodological changes.



Family type	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Married with kids	23.0	22.7	21.6	21.4	21.2	19.9	20.2	19.8
	(21.9, 24.2)	(21.4, 24.1)	(19.8, 23.5)	(20.4, 22.5)	(18.0, 24.3)	(19.1, 20.7)	(19.6, 20.8)	(19.3, 20.4)
Married, no kids	26.5	25.8	29.0	29.2	32.8	30.6	30.9	29.9
	(25.4, 27.6)	(24.5, 27.2)	(27.3, 30.7)	(28.2, 30.2)	(29.5, 36.1)	(29.9, 31.3)	(30.4, 31.5)	(29.3, 30.4)
Single with kids	5.8	6.9	5.1	5.5	11.5	9.9	9.8	9.6
	(5.0, 6.6)	(5.7, 8.0)	(4.4, 5.8)	(5.0, 6.1)	(8.1, 14.8)	(9.1, 10.6)	(9.3, 10.2)	(9.1, 10.1)
Single, no kids	44.7	44.6	44.3	43.9	34.6	39.6	39.1	40.7
	(43.4, 46.0)	(42.9, 46.2)	(42.9, 45.8)	(42.7, 45.0)	(30.8, 38.4)	(38.6, 40.6)	(38.4, 39.8)	(40.1, 41.3)

Next, we look at marital status. We see a drop in those never married (from ~27.8% to ~25%), with significant increase living with a partner (from 7.2% to 9.5%) from 2015 to 2020. This shift may be somewhat related to the difficulty in obtaining younger respondents.



Marital status	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Married	48.4	47.4	49.6	50.2	53.3	51.0	51.6	50.5
	(47.1, 49.7)	(45.7, 49.1)	(48.2, 50.9)	(48.9, 51.4)	(49.4, 57.2)	(50.2, 51.9)	(51.0, 52.3)	(49.8, 51.1)
Living with partner	7.2	7.4	7.2	7.2	6.8	8.8	8.9	9.5
	(6.2, 8.2)	(6.5, 8.2)	(6.2, 8.2)	(6.3, 8.1)	(5.0, 8.7)	(8.1, 9.5)	(8.5, 9.4)	(9.0, 10.1)
Widowed/ Separated/ Divorced	17.1	17.5	15.3	15.1	12.4	14.5	14.8	14.6
	(16.0, 18.2)	(16.0, 19.1)	(14.3, 16.4)	(14.3, 15.9)	(10.5, 14.3)	(13.9, 15.1)	(14.4, 15.2)	(14.2, 15.1)
Never married	27.3	27.7	27.8	27.6	27.5	25.7	24.6	25.4
	(26.1, 28.4)	(26.2, 29.2)	(26.5, 29.2)	(26.6, 28.6)	(23.4, 31.7)	(25.0, 26.4)	(24.0, 25.2)	(24.8, 25.9)

Next, we consider citizenship status. While the naturalized citizens estimate shows stable trend (~17%) from 2015 to 2018, we can see a clear shift upward during 2018 to 2020, at ~20%.



Citizenship	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
US born	65.9	66.0	68.2	68.6	74.4	67.1	67.5	67.5
	(64.8, 67.0)	(64.8, 67.3)	(66.2, 70.1)	(67.5, 69.8)	(71.1, 77.8)	(66.1, 68.0)	(66.8, 68.2)	(66.9, 68.1)
Naturalized	17.9	17.5	17.3	17.7	16.6	20.0	19.5	19.9
	(16.8, 19.1)	(16.2, 18.8)	(16.2, 18.5)	(16.4, 19.1)	(14.2, 19.1)	(19.1, 20.8)	(18.9, 20.0)	(19.4, 20.4)
Non-Citizen w/ green card	8.3	8.8	7.8	7.8	5.2	7.0	6.9	7.1
	(7.4, 9.2)	(7.8, 9.7)	(6.6, 8.9)	(7.0, 8.6)	(3.2, 7.2)	(6.3, 7.6)	(6.5, 7.4)	(6.7, 7.5)
Non-Citizen w/o green card	7.9	7.7	6.7	5.8	3.8	6.0	6.1	5.5
	(7.1, 8.7)	(6.6, 8.8)	(4.7, 8.7)	(5.0, 6.6)	(1.8, 5.7)	(5.4, 6.6)	(5.7, 6.6)	(5.1, 5.9)

Regarding country of birth[4], we note that there are significant changes in "Mexico/Central America" and "Asia and Pacific Islands" between original and revised estimates in 2019, which is anticipated mainly because of California DOF population projection change.

[4] The web presentation for the country of birth question (AH33) allowed for substantial improvements in coding to regions. A new country of birth variable (CNTRYS2) will be available for CHIS 2019 to provide better, more specific geographic coding and will eventually replace CNTRYS.



Country of birth	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
United States	65.9	66.0	68.2	68.6	74.1	67.1	67.1	67.5
	(64.8, 67.0)	(64.8, 67.3)	(66.2, 70.1)	(67.5, 69.8)	(70.7, 77.5)	(66.1, 68.0)	(66.5, 67.8)	(66.9, 68.1)
Mexico/ Central America	20.1	19.7	18.5	16.7	13.0	16.7	18.1	17.8
	(19.4, 20.7)	(18.6, 20.9)	(17.2, 19.8)	(15.9, 17.5)	(10.2, 15.9)	(16.0, 17.5)	(17.6, 18.7)	(17.3, 18.3)
Asia and Pacific Islands	10.6	11.2	10.3	11.7	9.2	12.9	11.4	11.5
	(9.9, 11.3)	(10.3, 12.2)	(9.1, 11.5)	(11.0, 12.3)	(7.3, 11.1)	(12.4, 13.4)	(11.1, 11.8)	(11.2, 11.8)
Other	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.2
	(2.9, 3.9)	(2.4, 3.5)	(2.4, 3.7)	(2.5, 3.5)	(2.3, 5.0)	(2.9, 3.7)	(3.1, 3.5)	(3.0, 3.4)

English proficiency does see noticeable differences from previous cycles. The increase in those speaking English “very well” or “well” is partly due to the decrease in non-English language interviews and that self-administered modes bring in more highly educated persons who are more likely to be speak some English. This upward trend is maintained from the 2018 Web Experiment to CHIS 2020.



English Proficiency	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Inapplicable	56.0	53.0	56.4	56.1	60.6	55.4	55.1	55.0
	(54.8, 57.2)	(51.3, 54.6)	(55.3, 57.5)	(54.9, 57.4)	(56.6, 64.5)	(54.4, 56.4)	(54.4, 55.8)	(54.5, 55.6)
Very well	17.8	19.8	20.1	19.9	24.4	24.3	24.6	24.8
	(16.7, 18.9)	(18.5, 21.1)	(17.9, 22.3)	(18.7, 21.0)	(20.6, 28.1)	(23.2, 25.3)	(23.9, 25.3)	(24.3, 25.4)
Well	10.9	11.7	9.2	9.1	8.1	11.9	12.0	11.1
	(9.8, 11.9)	(10.5, 12.9)	(8.0, 10.3)	(8.1, 10.1)	(6.0, 10.3)	(11.2, 12.7)	(11.5, 12.4)	(10.6, 11.6)
Not well	10.0	10.3	8.7	10.4	6.4	6.7	6.6	7.0
	(9.0, 11.0)	(9.2, 11.3)	(6.7, 10.6)	(9.6, 11.2)	(4.2, 8.7)	(6.1, 7.3)	(6.2, 7.0)	(6.6, 7.4)
Not at all	5.3	5.2	5.6	4.5	0.5*	1.7	1.7	2.1
	(4.6, 6.0)	(4.3, 6.1)	(4.6, 6.6)	(3.8, 5.3)	(0.1, 0.9)	(1.3, 2.1)	(1.4, 2.0)	(1.8, 2.3)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Health conditions

Next, we move on to health conditions. We begin with self-rated health (SRH) which has a noticeable increase those classified as excellent, very good, or good, particularly for the two highest categories. SRH being higher on web compared to other modes is consistent with previous research (e.g., Shim, Shin, & Johnson, 2013) and may be somewhat related to a potential primacy effect (Garbarski, Schaeffer, & Dykema, 2015). With the decrease in Spanish language interviews, which has been shown to have lower (Lee & Grant, 2009; Lee & Schwarz, 2014), due to a potential lack of cross-cultural validity (Lee, 2014). Our trend analysis shows that the estimates of healthier categories in SRH in ABS web mode is substantially higher compared with CATI mode, and this ascending trend is not impacted by the revised weight in 2019.



Self-rated health	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Excellent/ Very Good/ Good	78.0	78.9	79.6	77.6	84.8	84.6	84.5	85.1
	(76.7, 79.4)	(77.7, 80.2)	(77.8, 81.5)	(76.5, 78.7)	(81.9, 87.7)	(83.6, 85.6)	(83.8, 85.2)	(84.6, 85.7)
Fair/Poor	22.0	21.1	20.4	22.4	15.2	15.4	15.5	14.9
	(20.6, 23.3)	(19.8, 22.3)	(18.5, 22.2)	(21.3, 23.5)	(12.3, 18.1)	(14.4, 16.4)	(14.8, 16.2)	(14.3, 15.4)

Ever diagnosed with asthma and ever diagnosed with diabetes look consistent with previous trends. As for BMI, the underweight/normal is slightly descending in the recent two years, although confidence intervals overlap.



Asthma	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	84.4	85.7	84.2	84.0	83.8	84.0	83.8	83.9
	(83.2, 85.5)	(84.3, 87.2)	(83.2, 85.1)	(83.0, 85.1)	(80.9, 86.6)	(83.2, 84.8)	(83.2, 84.3)	(83.4, 84.3)
Yes	15.6	14.3	15.8	16.0	16.2	16.0	16.2	16.1
	(14.5, 16.8)	(12.8, 15.7)	(14.9, 16.8)	(14.9, 17.0)	(13.4, 19.1)	(15.2, 16.8)	(15.7, 16.8)	(15.7, 16.1)



Diabetes	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	90.2	90.9	89.3	89.9	90.6	90.1	89.8	89.1
	(89.2, 91.1)	(89.9, 91.9)	(88.2, 90.4)	(89.1, 90.7)	(88.6, 92.5)	(89.4, 90.7)	(89.3, 90.3)	(88.7, 89.5)
Yes	9.8	9.1	10.7	10.1	9.4	9.9	10.2	10.9
	(8.9, 10.8)	(8.1, 10.1)	(9.6, 11.8)	(9.3, 10.9)	(7.5, 11.4)	(9.3, 10.6)	(9.7, 10.7)	(10.5, 11.3)



Body mass index (BMI)	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Underweight/ Normal	37.4 (36.2, 38.6)	37.3 (35.4, 39.3)	39.6 (37.0, 42.2)	39.9 (38.4, 41.4)	42.0 (38.1, 45.9)	40.3 (39.5, 41.2)	39.0 (38.4, 39.6)	38.0 (37.4, 38.7)
Overweight	34.7 (33.3, 36.1)	34.8 (32.5, 37.1)	33.9 (31.2, 36.7)	33.1 (31.7, 34.4)	33.2 (29.7, 36.8)	32.4 (31.4, 33.4)	33.0 (32.3, 33.7)	33.4 (32.8, 34.1)
Obese	27.9 (26.5, 29.3)	27.9 (26.1, 29.7)	26.4 (25.4, 27.5)	27.1 (25.9, 28.3)	24.8 (21.4, 28.2)	27.3 (26.5, 28.1)	28.0 (27.3, 28.6)	28.5 (27.9, 29.1)

Ever seriously thought about committing suicide continues to steadily increase over time consistent with previous cycles. However, there is a significant drop in 2020, from 14% to 12.2%.



Suicide ideation	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	90.3	90.7	88.4	86.6	86.1	86.0	86.0	87.8
	(89.5, 91.2)	(89.6, 91.8)	(87.4, 89.4)	(85.6, 87.5)	(82.9, 89.3)	(85.2, 86.7)	(85.4, 86.5)	(87.4, 88.2)
Yes	9.7	9.3	11.6	13.4	13.9	14.0	14.0	12.2
	(8.8, 10.5)	(8.2, 10.4)	(10.6, 12.6)	(12.5, 14.4)	(10.7, 17.1)	(13.3, 14.8)	(13.5, 14.6)	(11.8, 12.6)

However, related to another mental health variable, we do see increased prevalence of severe psychological distress within the past month from 4.9% to 6.7% in 2019. This is mostly in the 18-24 and 25-39 age groups with the former raising from 8.9% to 15.1%, the latter 5.3% to 8.1%. CHIS 2019 Revised Weight and CHIS 2020 confirms the trend. In CHIS 2020, younger age groups still show strong tendency to have serious distress compared with other age groups, with 16.7% and 7.9% reporting serious distress within the past month in the 18-24 and 25-39 age groups respectively.



Serious distress in the past month	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	95.6	96.1	95.5	95.1	92.5	93.3	93.4	93.8
	(95.1, 96.0)	(95.5, 96.7)	(94.6, 96.5)	(94.4, 95.8)	(90.0, 95.0)	(92.8, 93.8)	(93.0, 93.8)	(93.5, 94.1)
Yes	4.4	3.9	4.5	4.9	7.5	6.7	6.6	6.2
	(4.0, 4.9)	(3.3, 4.5)	(3.5, 5.4)	(4.2, 5.6)	(5.0, 10.0)	(6.2, 7.2)	(6.2, 7.0)	(5.9, 6.5)

Health behaviors

Moving on to health behaviors, the rate of current smokers continues to decline year-to-year, however, the drop from 2018 to 2019 is statistically significant from 11.2% to 6.9%. Examining this trend by age, we see that there is a significant drop in reported smoking for those aged 25-39 from 15.4% to 6.8%. Examining by race/ethnic group, a particularly large drop in the other race category which includes NHPI, AIAN, and two or more race persons. This decrease in current smoking status due to mode differences has been observed by other research (e.g., Link & Mokdad, 2005). Similarly, the proportion of current smokers in the younger age group continues to decline from CHIS 2019 Revised Weight to CHIS 2020. The reported current smokers in the 18-24 age group reduces from 5.6% to 3.1%.



Current smoker	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	87.0	88.1	89.8	88.8	92.9	93.1	93.2	93.5
	(86.0, 88.1)	(86.9, 89.3)	(88.8, 90.7)	(87.9, 89.8)	(90.9, 95.0)	(92.5, 93.7)	(92.8, 93.6)	(93.1, 93.8)
Yes	13.0	11.9	10.2	11.2	7.1	6.9	6.8	6.5
	(11.9, 14.0)	(10.7, 13.1)	(9.3, 11.2)	(10.2, 12.1)	(5.0, 9.1)	(6.3, 7.5)	(6.4, 7.2)	(6.2, 6.9)

For ever used marijuana, we see a drop from 53.6% in 2018 to 48.1% in 2019 with the stable trend at ~48% both in 2019 revised weight and 2020. By age group these trends look very different. Those aged 25-64 fit the overall trend, while those aged 65+ saw increasing rates of marijuana usage. As a potentially sensitive variable, we might expect increased reporting of marijuana usage.



Tried marijuana ever	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Yes	50.9	53.6	52.4	48.1	48.2	48.8
	(49.4, 52.4)	(52.2, 55.0)	(48.6, 56.2)	(47.1, 49.2)	(47.4, 49.0)	(48.1, 49.5)
No	49.1	46.4	47.6	51.9	51.8	51.2
	(47.6, 50.6)	(45.0, 47.8)	(43.8, 51.4)	(50.8, 52.9)	(51.0, 52.6)	(50.5, 51.9)

For e-cigarette use, we first need to note the change in question presentation. In CHIS 2018, the respondent was asked, “Have you ever used any type of e-cigarette, vape pen or e-hookah, such as Blu, NJOY, or Vuse, or any larger devices for vaping, sometimes called vapes, tanks or mods?” In order to simplify the question while still providing necessary context, CHIS 2019 used an introduction screen providing the necessary definitions along with examples[5] and then asking a more generic question that did not mention specific e-cigarette brands and products. The final question was, “Have you ever used an e-cigarette or other electronic vaping product, even just once in your lifetime?” Despite the multiple changes to the question format, we feel that these questions are more conceptually equivalent compared to the e-cigarette use questions asked before 2017. The estimate remained consistent between 2018 and 2019. While the re-weighting does not change the 2019 e-cigarette estimate substantially, we observe a significant drop from 2019 to 2020. There is a sharp drop in e-cigarette use in the 18-24 age group from 2019 (38.0%) to 2020 (29.5%), leading to the overall downward trend.



E-cigarette use ever	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	84.8	82.7	86.9	82.8	83.1	84.5
	(83.6, 86.0)	(81.7, 83.7)	(84.0, 89.7)	(82.0, 83.6)	(82.5, 83.7)	(84.0, 85.0)
Yes	15.2	17.3	13.1	17.2	16.9	15.5
	(14.0, 16.4)	(16.3, 18.3)	(10.3, 16.0)	(16.4, 18.0)	(16.3, 17.5)	(15.0, 16.0)

[5] E-cigarette introduction: “The next questions are about electronic cigarettes and other electronic vaping products. These products typically contain nicotine, flavors, and other ingredients. They may also be called e-cigs, vape pens, pod mods, hookah pens or e-hookah. Popular brands include JUUL, Blu, NJOY, Suorin, and Vuse.”

Health insurance

Considering the type of health insurance for all adults 18+ years old, we observe large increases in employer-based only insurance rising from 42.6% in 2017 and 2018 up to 49.3% in 2020. There is a subsequent decrease in Medicaid (Medi-Cal) from around 20.3% down to 16.5%. However, it is worth nothing that we may underestimate Medicaid (Medi-Cal) in the original 2019 estimates. The estimate of Medicaid (Medi-Cal) using the 2019 revised weight is more consistent with prior years as well as 2020, and the confidence interval barely overlaps with the original 2019 estimate. However, comparisons to the 1-year estimates from ACS 2018 and 2019 suggest that the revised CHIS 2019 is much closer to ACS estimates of employer-based and Medicaid insurance coverage than CHIS 2018 (see Table 6 and Figure 2).



Insurance type	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Employer-based only	42.0 (40.9, 43.2)	41.3 (39.6, 42.9)	42.6 (39.8, 45.5)	42.6 (41.4, 43.9)	53.3 (49.5, 57.2)	48.3 (47.3, 49.3)	48.1 (47.4, 48.8)	49.3 (48.7, 50.0)
Medicaid (Medi-Cal)	21.4 (20.2, 22.6)	22.7 (21.1, 24.3)	19.6 (18.3, 20.8)	20.3 (19.1, 21.5)	13.0 (9.8, 16.2)	16.5 (15.5, 17.6)	18.3 (17.7, 18.9)	18.6 (18.0, 19.3)
Medicare	18.4 (18.0, 18.7)	18.8 (18.4, 19.3)	19.9 (18.5, 21.4)	20.5 (19.9, 21.0)	20.1 (17.8, 22.5)	20.0 (19.7, 20.3)	18.5 (18.2, 18.8)	18.7 (18.4, 18.9)
Privately Purchased	6.8 (5.9, 7.8)	6.7 (5.6, 7.8)	7.3 (6.2, 8.5)	6.5 (5.5, 7.4)	5.7 (4.1, 7.4)	5.4 (4.8, 6.0)	5.3 (4.9, 5.7)	5.1 (4.8, 5.4)
Other Public	1.4 (1.0, 1.8)	1.2 (0.8, 1.6)	1.6 (1.1, 2.0)	1.3 (1.0, 1.7)	0.8* (0.1, 1.6)	1.0 (0.7, 1.2)	- -	1.0 (0.8, 1.2)
Uninsured	10.0 (9.2, 10.8)	9.3 (8.0, 10.6)	9.0 (8.2, 9.8)	8.8 (8.0, 9.6)	6.9 (4.5, 9.4)	8.8 (8.1, 9.5)	8.8 (8.2, 9.3)	7.2 (6.7, 7.8)

Note. * = statistically unstable. -- = suppressed due to small sample size.

Table 6. Insurance type comparison between CHIS and ACS

	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	ACS 2018	ACS 2019
Employer-based				
18+	49.42	55.38	52.57	53.18
18-64	56.85	62.35	57.64	58.58
65+	18.19	27.86	30.29	30.23
Medicare				
18+	20.47	20.63	19.67	20.08
18-64	2.87	2.10	2.67	2.61
65+	94.45	93.79	94.30	94.34
Medicaid (Medi-Cal)				
18+	26.87	20.41	21.63	20.72
18-64	26.72	21.26	21.70	20.66
65+	27.50	17.05	21.33	20.98

Source: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, California Health Interview Survey 2018-2019; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2018-2019.

Note 1. Differences between these percentages and the above table are due to differential categorizations (e.g., employer-based only to employer-based any).

Note 2. Because of the underlying quality concerns with the 2020 ACS given the COVID-19 pandemic, the Census Bureau is not releasing the standard 2020 ACS 1-year estimates.

Figure 2. Percentage point relative change between CHIS annual estimates with ACS 1-year estimates.



Health care

Considering health care utilization measures, we begin with usual source of care. While there has been some minor variability across previous cycles (i.e., average percentage in 2015-2016 vs. 2017-2018), the confidence interval for the 2019 estimate crosses with all of the previous years examined except 2018. Additionally, the weight revision shows little impact on estimates in 2019 and confidence intervals continue to intersect with prior years. So, while that specific comparison suggests a statistical difference, it should be argued that the rate of those utilizing a doctor, clinic, or hospital as their usual source of care is relatively consistent with previous years.



Usual source of care	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Doctor/Clinic/ Hospital	81.9 (81.0, 82.9)	80.8 (79.2, 82.4)	83.5 (82.2, 84.7)	84.5 (83.4, 85.5)	83.3 (79.9, 86.8)	82.2 (81.3, 83.0)	82.6 (81.9, 83.3)	83.4 (82.9, 84.0)
ER/Urgent Care/ None	18.1 (17.1, 19.0)	19.2 (17.6, 20.8)	16.5 (15.3, 17.8)	15.5 (14.5, 16.6)	16.7 (13.2, 20.1)	17.8 (17.0, 18.7)	17.4 (16.7, 18.1)	16.6 (16.0, 17.1)

Considering visits to the doctor, we see a decrease in adults having a routine check-up in past 12 months go down to 70.9% from 74.9%. However, the confidence interval estimates for 2019 do often cross with confidence intervals for years previous to 2018 suggesting some degree of stability over years. In CHIS 2020, the descending trend is still observed, with the proportion of adults with a routine doctor visit in the past 12 months reducing to 67.9%. It is reasonable to speculate that the COVID-19 pandemic reduced people's seeking of routine check-ups in 2020.



Doctors visit in past 12 months	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Yes	72.7	73.3	74.0	74.9	69.1	70.9	71.1	67.9
	(71.3, 74.1)	(71.6, 74.9)	(71.6, 76.4)	(73.6, 76.2)	(65.3, 72.9)	(69.8, 72.0)	(70.3, 71.9)	(67.2, 68.7)
No	24.2	23.6	23.5	22.7	25.4	26.5	26.3	29.2
	(22.9, 25.6)	(22.0, 25.3)	(20.8, 26.1)	(21.5, 24.0)	(21.9, 28.9)	(25.4, 27.6)	(25.5, 27.0)	(28.5, 29.0)
Never had a routine check-up	3.1	3.1	2.6	2.4	5.5	2.6	2.6	2.9
	(2.4, 3.7)	(2.3, 3.9)	(1.9, 3.2)	(2.0, 2.8)	(3.1, 7.8)	(2.2, 3.0)	(2.4, 2.9)	(2.6, 3.1)

We next consider delays in prescription and health care. Delays getting prescription seem consistent with previous cycles, but we see an obvious drop in 2020. Delays in getting care seem to have shifted upwards (13.5% in 2018 vs. 17.1% in 2019) and moves slightly downward to 16.6% in 2020. The change is differential from what was observed in the web experiment.



Delay getting Rx	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	88.9	89.8	89.9	89.0	92.9	89.4	89.3	90.7
	(88.0, 89.8)	(88.6, 91.1)	(88.3, 91.5)	(87.9, 90.1)	(91.3, 94.5)	(88.6, 90.2)	(88.9, 89.8)	(90.3, 91.1)
Yes	11.1	10.2	10.1	11.0	7.1	10.6	10.7	9.3
	(10.2, 12.0)	(8.9, 11.4)	(8.5, 11.7)	(9.9, 12.1)	(5.5, 8.7)	(9.8, 11.4)	(10.2, 11.1)	(8.9, 9.7)



Delay getting care	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	86.2	88.2	87.6	86.5	85.8	82.9	82.8	83.4
	(85.2, 87.2)	(86.9, 89.5)	(86.5, 88.7)	(85.4, 87.5)	(83.1, 88.6)	(82.1, 83.8)	(82.2, 83.4)	(82.9, 84.0)
Yes	13.8	11.8	12.4	13.5	14.2	17.1	17.2	16.6
	(12.8, 14.8)	(10.5, 13.1)	(11.3, 13.5)	(12.5, 14.6)	(11.4, 16.9)	(16.2, 17.9)	(16.6, 17.8)	(16.0, 17.1)

Considering need and use of mental health care, the need for mental health help is consistent with the trend observed in previous cycles. We see there is statistically significant drop from previous cycles for visits to a physician for mental health in 2020, which is congruent with the downward trend for physician visits in 2020. The use of a counselor for mental health or drug abuse also seems consistent with previous cycles. We see no impact on the three estimates in 2019 due to the revised weights.



Needed help for mental health	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	82.4	83.6	81.5	78.8	79.1	78.3	78.4	79.1
	(81.1, 83.7)	(82.1, 85.1)	(80.3, 82.7)	(77.7, 79.9)	(75.9, 82.3)	(77.4, 79.1)	(77.8, 79.1)	(78.7, 79.6)
Yes	17.6	16.4	18.5	21.2	20.9	21.7	21.6	20.9
	(16.3, 18.9)	(14.9, 17.9)	(17.3, 19.7)	(20.1, 22.3)	(17.7, 24.1)	(20.9, 22.6)	(20.9, 22.2)	(20.4, 21.3)



Physician for mental health	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	91.7	91.9	91.3	91.0	92.3	89.7	89.6	91.0
	(90.9, 92.5)	(90.7, 93.0)	(90.3, 92.3)	(90.2, 91.9)	(90.5, 94.1)	(89.0, 90.5)	(89.2, 90.1)	(90.6, 91.4)
Yes	8.3	8.1	8.7	9.0	7.7	10.3	10.4	9.0
	(7.5, 9.1)	(7.0, 9.3)	(7.7, 9.7)	(8.1, 9.8)	(5.9, 9.5)	(9.5, 11.0)	(9.9, 10.8)	(8.6, 9.4)



Counselor for mental health	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	89.5	89.7	88.3	87.0	91.8	88.4	88.4	88.7
	(88.4, 90.6)	(88.4, 90.9)	(86.7, 89.9)	(85.9, 88.1)	(90.1, 93.6)	(87.8, 89.0)	(88.0, 88.9)	(88.3, 89.1)
Yes	10.5	10.3	11.7	13.0	8.2	11.6	11.6	11.3
	(9.4, 11.6)	(9.1, 11.6)	(10.1, 13.3)	(11.9, 14.1)	(6.4, 9.9)	(11.0, 12.2)	(11.1, 12.0)	(10.9, 11.7)

Finally, our one adult measure of dental health, last dental visit, is relatively consistent across the various groups. The confidence interval for "more than 1 year up to 2 years ago" does show significant upward change (10.0% in 2018 and 12.2% in 2019) with no other category seeing significant downward changes. Like the downward trend potentially due to COVID-19 pandemic observed for medical doctor visits, there is a substantive drop in 2020 of the proportion for those whose last dental visit within 6 months ago or less.



Last dental visit	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Have never been to dentist	2.4 (1.8, 3.0)	2.5 (1.9, 3.0)	2.7 (2.1, 3.3)	0.4* (0.1, 0.7)	2.3 (2.0, 2.7)	2.4 (2.1, 2.6)	2.9 (2.6, 3.2)
6 months ago, or less	54.5 (53.0, 56.0)	57.6 (54.7, 60.5)	57.2 (55.8, 58.6)	58.5 (54.5, 62.4)	54.9 (53.7, 56.1)	54.7 (53.9, 55.6)	45.3 (44.6, 46.0)
More than 6 months up to 1 year ago	15.8 (14.6, 17.0)	15.1 (13.8, 16.5)	15.2 (14.2, 16.2)	13.9 (10.6, 17.1)	15.1 (14.1, 16.0)	15.0 (14.4, 15.7)	21.9 (21.3, 22.4)
More than 1 year up to 2 years ago	9.8 (8.7, 11.0)	10.2 (9.0, 11.4)	10.0 (8.9, 11.1)	12.6 (9.7, 15.5)	12.2 (11.5, 13.0)	12.2 (11.7, 12.7)	13.2 (12.7, 13.7)
More than 2 years up to 5 years ago	9.7 (8.6, 10.7)	7.8 (6.0, 9.5)	8.1 (7.1, 9.1)	8.5 (6.1, 10.8)	8.3 (7.8, 8.9)	8.4 (8.0, 8.9)	9.5 (8.9, 10.0)
More than 5 years ago	7.8 (6.7, 8.9)	6.8 (6.0, 7.6)	6.8 (6.1, 7.6)	6.2 (4.5, 7.9)	7.1 (6.5, 7.7)	7.3 (6.8, 7.7)	7.3 (6.9, 7.7)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Socioeconomic

Finally for adults, we examine socioeconomic factors. As referenced previously, we saw some differences in metrics like health insurance by FPL. Looking directly at FPL, we see that CHIS contains to shift upwards seeing more affluent households this ascending trend continues in 2020. However, a comparison with ACS 1-year weighted estimates (see Table 7) shows CHIS 2019 revised is slightly closer to ACS estimates reducing the relative difference especially for 200-299% FPL (see Figure 3; for details on relative difference, refer to the notes in section *Sample Composition Breakdown*).



Poverty status	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
0-99% FPL	18.1	17.5	15.4	15.7	10.3	14.6	14.3	13.2
	(17.1, 19.2)	(16.0, 19.0)	(13.1, 17.8)	(14.7, 16.7)	(7.0, 13.6)	(13.8, 15.4)	(13.8, 14.9)	(12.8, 13.7)
100-199% FPL	19.1	18.7	17.7	17.7	16.8	16.7	17.1	15.7
	(18.0, 20.1)	(17.4, 20.0)	(16.4, 18.9)	(16.6, 18.8)	(13.1, 20.5)	(15.8, 17.6)	(16.5, 17.7)	(15.2, 16.3)
200-299% FPL	14.0	13.4	12.7	13.7	12.0	13.8	13.9	13.7
	(13.0, 15.0)	(11.8, 15.0)	(11.4, 14.0)	(12.5, 14.8)	(9.4, 14.7)	(13.1, 14.6)	(13.3, 14.5)	(13.1, 14.2)
300% FPL or above	48.8	50.4	54.2	52.9	60.8	54.9	54.6	57.4
	(47.7, 49.9)	(48.6, 52.2)	(51.9, 56.5)	(51.6, 54.2)	(56.5, 65.2)	(53.8, 55.9)	(53.9, 55.3)	(56.7, 58.1)

Table 7. Poverty status comparison between CHIS and ACS

	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	ACS 2018	ACS 2019
0-99% FPL	15.70	14.34	12.73	11.77
100-199% FPL	17.74	17.07	17.04	16.18
200-299% FPL	13.67	13.93	14.98	14.94
>300% FPL	52.89	54.65	55.26	57.11

Source: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, California Health Interview Survey 2018 and 2019 Revised Weight; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2018-2019.
Note. FPL = Federal poverty level.

Figure 3. Percentage point relative change between CHIS annual estimates of federal poverty level groups with ACS 1-year estimates



Food security (asked only of adults with an income less than 200% FPL) remains stable between previous cycles and 2019 and showcases another example of needed corrections from the Fall web experiment. While the 2019 weight revision has no effect on food security in 2019, we observe that the proportion of those who reported to have food security in 2020 significantly increases by 6%, compared with prior cycles.



Food security	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weights	CHIS 2020
Food secure	56.7	55.6	59.2	62.6	79.1	58.1	58.1	64.2
	(54.5, 58.9)	(52.5, 58.8)	(56.5, 61.9)	(60.0, 65.3)	(73.8, 84.4)	(55.7, 60.5)	(56.6, 59.7)	(62.7, 65.7)
Food insecure without hunger	28.0	27.9	29.4	25.5	12.1	28.3	28.1	24.8
	(25.8, 30.2)	(25.5, 30.2)	(26.6, 32.2)	(23.2, 27.9)	(8.1, 16.2)	(26.1, 30.5)	(26.5, 29.7)	(23.4, 26.1)
Food insecure with hunger	15.3	16.5	11.3	11.8	8.8	13.6	13.8	11.0
	(13.6, 17.1)	(13.9, 19.1)	(9.5, 13.2)	(10.4, 13.2)	(4.9, 12.7)	(12.1, 15.1)	(12.8, 14.7)	(10.1, 12.0)

Regarding current employment, we see some shifts in the division of unemployed in specific relation to whether they are or are not looking for work, with the percentage looking for work increasing from 4.3% of total to 6.1% compared to 32.2% to 30.0% for those not looking for work. The percentage of unemployed not looking for work in CHIS 2019 is more consistent with CHIS 2015 and 2016. While fluctuating slightly, the estimates of employment status in CHIS 2020 are congruent with CHIS 2019/CHIS 2019 Revised Weight.



Employment status	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Full-time employed (21+ hrs/week)	56.2 (54.6, 57.7)	54.1 (52.4, 55.7)	54.7 (53.0, 56.4)	54.1 (52.7, 55.5)	51.6 (47.8, 55.4)	53.2 (52.2, 54.2)	53.5 (52.9, 54.1)	53.4 (52.7, 54.1)
Part-time employed (0-20 hrs/week)	9.0 (8.2, 9.9)	9.4 (8.1, 10.7)	9.4 (8.6, 10.3)	9.1 (8.2, 10.1)	10.3 (7.9, 12.7)	9.6 (8.9, 10.4)	9.4 (8.9, 9.9)	9.7 (9.3, 10.2)
Employed, not at work	0.3 (0.2, 0.5)	0.3 (0.1, 0.4)	0.2 (0.0, 0.4)	0.3 (0.1, 0.4)	0.3* (0.0, 0.5)	1.0 (0.7, 1.2)	0.9 (0.8, 1.1)	1.3 (1.1, 1.4)
Unemployed, looking for work	4.4 (3.7, 5.2)	5.3 (4.3, 6.3)	3.9 (3.2, 4.5)	4.3 (3.7, 4.8)	5.0 (2.9, 7.0)	6.1 (5.6, 6.7)	5.8 (5.4, 6.2)	6.1 (5.7, 6.5)
Unemployed, not looking for work	30.0 (28.9, 31.2)	31.0 (29.5, 32.6)	31.9 (30.1, 33.7)	32.2 (31.0, 33.5)	32.9 (29.4, 36.3)	30.0 (29.2, 30.9)	30.3 (29.8, 30.9)	29.4 (29.0, 29.9)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

While intended to be paired alongside home ownership discussed previously, our last variable to consider is a whether people in their neighborhood were willing to help each other. There is some major rearranging among strongly agree and disagree responses in 2019. There is potential social desirability in responding on CATI with respondents providing potentially more honest responses on web. However, we see moderately increase in "strongly agree" and decrease in "disagree" in 2020.



People in neighborhood willing to help	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Strongly agree	21.0	18.1	23.6	22.8	22.4	16.2	16.3	18.7
	(19.7, 22.2)	(16.7, 19.4)	(22.5, 24.8)	(21.6, 24.0)	(19.1, 25.7)	(15.5, 17.0)	(15.8, 16.8)	(18.3, 19.1)
Agree	61.1	63.3	60.9	61.0	58.5	60.4	60.1	61.1
	(59.4, 62.8)	(61.3, 65.4)	(59.6, 62.2)	(59.5, 62.4)	(54.5, 62.5)	(59.5, 61.3)	(59.5, 60.7)	(60.5, 61.8)
Disagree	14.8	15.0	12.4	12.7	17.0	18.5	18.7	16.6
	(13.3, 16.3)	(13.6, 16.3)	(11.5, 13.3)	(11.5, 13.9)	(13.6, 20.4)	(17.7, 19.4)	(18.1, 19.2)	(16.0, 17.2)
Strongly disagree	3.1	3.6	3.1	3.5	2.1	4.8	4.9	3.6
	(2.6, 3.6)	(2.7, 4.5)	(2.5, 3.7)	(3.0, 4.1)	(0.9, 3.3)	(4.2, 5.4)	(4.6, 5.2)	(3.3, 3.9)

Child Trend Analysis: 2015-2020

Child estimates saw similar corrections from the Fall web experiment due to potential corrections in the adult survey. In general, about half of the child estimates are consistent with previous cycles including ever had asthma, dental insurance, usual source of care, overweight for age, and reading books and singing to children[6] and re-weighting has no impact on these estimates. Meanwhile, it is worth noting that child's last dental visit[7] shows the same downward trend as adult, with dental visit within 6 months dramatically decreasing from 72.8% to 59.2% in 2020.



Asthma	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised weight	CHIS 2020
No	89.4	86.4	89.6	90.4	94.2*	91.1	91.7	89.9
	(86.7, 92.1)	(82.6, 90.3)	(87.1, 92.0)	(88.1, 92.8)	(90.1, 98.3)	(89.5, 92.8)	(90.6, 92.7)	(88.7, 91.1)
Yes	10.6	13.6	10.4	9.6	5.8*	8.9	8.3	10.1
	(7.9, 13.3)	(9.7, 17.4)	(8.0, 12.9)	(7.2, 11.9)	(1.7, 9.9)	(7.2, 10.5)	(7.3, 9.4)	(8.9, 11.3)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

[6] Asked of children under 5 years old.

[7] Asked of all children 2 years of age or older, and of children under 2 years old if they have teeth.



Last dental visit	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Never	14.9	13.3	14.0	15.1	16.4	13.4	13.2	16.3
	(12.3, 17.6)	(10.2, 16.4)	(11.1, 16.8)	(11.7, 18.5)	(10.2, 22.6)	(11.7, 15.1)	(12.1, 14.4)	(15.1, 17.6)
Less than 6 months ago	70.4	73.5	75.1	70.9	65.6	72.8	72.8	59.2
	(66.3, 74.4)	(68.5, 78.5)	(70.7, 79.6)	(66.3, 75.4)	(57.1, 74.1)	(70.1, 75.5)	(70.9, 74.7)	(57.5, 60.9)
6 months to 1 year ago	11.0	9.5	9.2	10.6	14.3	9.6	9.4	20.2
	(8.0, 13.9)	(6.1, 13.0)	(4.0, 14.5)	(7.2, 14.1)	(8.6, 19.9)	(7.8, 11.3)	(8.1, 10.7)	(18.8, 21.7)
More than 1 year ago	3.7	3.7*	1.7*	3.4	3.7*	4.3	4.5	4.2
	(1.9, 5.5)	(1.1, 6.2)	(0.0, 3.6)	(1.7, 5.2)	(0.8, 6.5)	(3.0, 5.6)	(3.5, 5.5)	(3.5, 5.0)

Note. * = statistically unstable.



Dental insurance	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Yes	91.3	91.3	87.6	88.1	94.2*	92.2	92.1	93.1
	(88.7, 94.0)	(87.9, 94.7)	(83.9, 91.3)	(85.3, 91.0)	(90.4, 98.0)	(90.6, 93.7)	(91.2, 92.8)	(92.0, 94.2)
No	8.7	8.7	12.4	11.9	5.8*	7.8	7.9	6.9
	(6.0, 11.3)	(5.3, 12.1)	(8.7, 16.1)	(9.0, 14.7)	(2.0, 9.6)	(6.3, 9.4)	(7.0, 8.7)	(5.7, 8.0)

Note. * = statistically unstable.



Usual source of care	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weights	CHIS 2020
Doctor/Clinic/ Hospital	93.2 (91.4, 95.1)	93.4 (90.5, 96.4)	94.4 (92.2, 96.5)	92.9 (90.2, 95.6)	90.6* (83.0, 98.1)	92.8 (91.4, 94.3)	92.6 (91.5, 93.8)	93.0 (91.4, 94.7)
ER/Urgent Care/ None	6.8 (4.9, 8.6)	6.6 (3.6, 9.5)	5.6 (3.5, 7.8)	7.1 (4.4, 9.8)	9.4* (1.9, 17.0)	7.2 (5.7, 8.6)	7.4 (6.2, 8.5)	7.0 (5.3, 8.6)

Note. * = statistically unstable.



Overweight for age	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	85.0	83.4	85.5	86.4	96.1*	85.2	86.0	87.2
	(81.4, 88.7)	(78.9, 87.9)	(81.5, 89.6)	(83.2, 89.6)	(92.8, 99.5)	(83.5, 87.0)	(84.4, 87.6)	(85.8, 88.7)
Yes	15.0	16.6	14.5	13.6	3.9*	14.8	14.0	12.8
	(11.3, 18.6)	(12.1, 21.1)	(10.4, 18.5)	(10.4, 16.8)	(0.5, 7.2)	(13.0, 16.5)	(12.4, 15.6)	(11.3, 14.2)

Note. * = statistically unstable.



Days per week reading books	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Every Day	64.1	62.9	67.3	63.2	55.3	63.1	64.1	62.0
	(57.3, 70.8)	(54.6, 71.1)	(59.2, 75.4)	(56.1, 70.3)	(43.8, 66.9)	(58.9, 67.3)	(61.3, 66.9)	(59.4, 64.6)
3-6 Days	25.1	25.0	22.8	19.1	25.4	22.7	22.0	21.7
	(19.8, 30.4)	(19.1, 30.8)	(15.8, 29.7)	(12.9, 25.2)	(15.4, 35.4)	(19.5, 25.9)	(19.4, 24.6)	(19.3, 24.1)
1-2 Days	9.2	9.2	7.9	12.8	17.0*	11.6	11.2	12.3
	(5.0, 13.5)	(4.9, 13.6)	(4.9, 10.9)	(7.5, 18.1)	(6.9, 27.0)	(8.9, 14.3)	(9.1, 13.2)	(10.8, 15.1)
Never	1.6*	2.9*	2.1*	4.9*	2.3*	2.6	2.7	3.4
	(0.2, 3.0)	(0.2, 5.7)	(0.1, 4.0)	(1.8, 8.0)	(0.0, 5.5)	(1.1, 4.2)	(1.3, 4.0)	(2.1, 4.6)

Note. * = statistically unstable.



Frequency singing songs	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Every Day	70.5	67.2	72.5	71.9	62.6	68.8	69.8	67.8
	(64.4, 76.5)	(60.5, 73.8)	(67.2, 77.8)	(64.8, 78.9)	(50.6, 74.6)	(65.5, 72.0)	(67.4, 72.3)	(65.0, 70.7)
3-6 Days	19.8	23.6	20.1	17.2	20.9	21.2	20.5	20.2
	(15.2, 24.5)	(17.7, 29.5)	(15.2, 25.1)	(11.2, 23.1)	(11.0, 30.8)	(18.1, 24.4)	(18.2, 22.8)	(18.1, 22.3)
1-2 Days	6.8	5.0	4.4	6.5	14.6*	8.4	8.3	11.2
	(3.2, 10.3)	(2.2, 7.7)	(1.9, 6.9)	(2.8, 10.2)	(4.8, 24.3)	(6.4, 10.5)	(6.8, 9.8)	(9.25, 13.2)
Never	2.9*	4.3*	2.9*	4.5*	1.9*	1.6	1.4	0.77
	(0.7, 5.2)	(1.2, 7.4)	(0.1, 5.8)	(1.3, 7.7)	(0.0, 4.8)	(0.8, 2.3)	(0.9, 1.8)	(0.3, 1.2)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

However, there are a number of variables that experience similar differences to those discussed in conjunction with the adult variables. The first we examine is health status of the child as rated by the parent. We see similar increases in the healthier categories comparing 2018 and 2019, though the confidence interval for 2019 does cross with the estimates from 2016 and 2017. In 2020, the healthier categories go down marginally but overall remain steady.



Health status	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Excellent/ Very Good/ Good	95.5	96.6	97.2*	95.7	96.8	98.7	98.7	98.2
	(93.8, 97.3)	(94.9, 98.3)	(95.4, 98.9)	(93.9, 97.5)	(95.8, 97.7)	(98.1, 99.3)	(98.2, 99.1)	(97.6, 98.6)
Fair/Poor	4.5	3.4	2.8*	4.3	3.2	1.3	1.3	1.8
	(2.7, 6.2)	(1.7, 5.1)	(1.1, 4.6)	(2.5, 6.1)	(2.3, 4.2)	(0.7, 1.9)	(0.8, 1.8)	(1.2, 2.4)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Similarly, we see a difference between 2018 and 2019 in children having delays in receiving health care, but the confidence intervals cross for earlier years with 2019. In 2020, delays in receiving health care and prescriptions falls slightly but aligns with previous cycles. The 2019 estimate does boast the highest rate of delays in care in recent years. Delays in obtaining prescriptions for a child see a similar pattern also estimating the highest rate of delays in prescriptions in the examined time frame.



Delay getting care	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	97.2	97.5	97.2*	98.2*	97.4*	95.8	96.0	96.3
	(95.7, 98.6)	(96.2, 98.8)	(94.9, 99.6)	(97.1, 99.3)	(95.0, 99.8)	(94.6, 96.9)	(95.3, 96.7)	(95.7, 96.9)
Yes	2.8	2.5	2.8*	1.8*	2.6*	4.2	4.0	3.7
	(1.4, 4.3)	(1.2, 3.8)	(0.4, 5.1)	(0.7, 2.9)	(0.2, 5.0)	(3.1, 5.4)	(3.3, 4.7)	(3.1, 4.3)

Note. * = statistically unstable.



Delay getting Rx	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	96.1	95.7	98.1*	97.8*	96.7*	95.6	95.6	96.7
	(94.8, 97.5)	(93.8, 97.6)	(96.8, 99.3)	(96.4, 99.1)	(94.5, 98.8)	(94.6, 96.7)	(94.8, 96.3)	(96.2, 97.2)
Yes	3.9	4.3	1.9*	2.2*	3.3*	4.4	4.4	3.3
	(2.5, 5.2)	(2.4, 6.2)	(0.7, 3.2)	(0.9, 3.6)	(1.2, 5.5)	(3.3, 5.4)	(3.7, 5.2)	(2.8, 3.8)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Regarding a child at least 2 years of age achieving the recommended five-a-day fruits and vegetables, the 2019 estimate is more in line with 2015-2016 estimates than the 2017-2018 estimates. The confidence intervals for those cycles do not cross, but 2019 displays the smallest standard errors and resulting confidence intervals. In 2020, the estimate of child receiving five-a-day fruits and vegetables edged upward, peaking at 38.6%.



Five-a-day fruits/vegetables	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	66.2	63.1	73.3	73.0	62.7	64.0	63.0	61.4
	(61.7, 70.8)	(56.4, 69.7)	(67.9, 78.6)	(68.1, 77.8)	(51.4, 74.1)	(61.4, 66.6)	(61.0, 64.9)	(59.0, 63.8)
Yes	33.8	36.9	26.7	27.0	37.3	36.0	37.0	38.6
	(29.2, 38.3)	(30.3, 43.6)	(21.4, 32.1)	(22.2, 31.9)	(25.9, 48.6)	(33.4, 38.6)	(35.1, 39.0)	(36.2, 41.0)

Regarding First 5 California's "Talk, Read, Sing" program[8], we see an increase in exposure going from a up to nearly 90% in 2019 from the 83% average in the previous two cycles. However, the confidence intervals for 2019 do overlap with previous years. The estimates in CHIS 2019 Revised Weight and CHIS 2020 demonstrate consistency with the original CHIS 2019 estimates.



Saw/heard 'Talk,Read,Sing'	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Yes	82.9	84.5	84.3	83.1	82.6	89.5	88.5	88.4
	(77.8, 88.1)	(78.7, 90.4)	(80.3, 88.4)	(78.3, 88.0)	(72.7, 92.4)	(87.4, 91.7)	(86.8, 90.1)	(86.8, 90.0)
No	17.1	15.5	15.7	16.9	17.4	10.5	11.5	11.6
	(11.9, 22.2)	(9.6, 21.3)	(11.6, 19.7)	(12.0, 21.7)	(7.6, 27.3)	(8.3, 12.6)	(9.9, 13.2)	(10.0, 13.1)

[8] Asked of households with children with at least one child under the age of 5.

Poverty status changes reflect what is observed in the adult survey. There are the largest gains in the 300% FPL grouping in CHIS 2020, reaching a peak of 61.9%.



Poverty status	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	Web Experiment	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
0-99% FPL	26.1	26.4	21.4	21.7	14.6*	17.0	17.4	15.5
	(21.9, 30.4)	(22.9, 29.9)	(15.3, 27.4)	(18.3, 25.1)	(4.2, 25.0)	(14.7, 19.3)	(15.5, 19.2)	(12.9, 18.2)
100-199% FPL	22.0	20.8	20.3	20.9	25.7	19.0	17.6	12.4
	(17.7, 26.3)	(16.8, 24.7)	(14.6, 26.0)	(17.6, 24.3)	(16.4, 34.9)	(16.9, 21.2)	(16.1, 19.1)	(10.9, 13.9)
200-299% FPL	13.6	9.5	13.9	12.9	13.9	11.6	11.5	10.1
	(10.8, 16.4)	(6.1, 12.9)	(10.2, 17.7)	(9.5, 16.3)	(6.6, 21.2)	(9.8, 13.4)	(10.1, 12.9)	(8.7, 11.7)
300% FPL or above	38.3	43.3	44.3	44.5	45.8	52.4	53.5	61.9
	(35.4, 41.2)	(38.2, 48.5)	(39.3, 49.4)	(40.9, 48.1)	(35.9, 55.7)	(49.9, 54.8)	(51.7, 55.3)	(58.9, 65.0)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Again, we observe similar increases in employer-based insurance like with adult survey with drops in Medicaid (Medi-Cal).



Insurance type	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Employer-based only	43.3	43.7	49.5	50.7	53.9	54.8	59.1
	(39.5, 47.0)	(39.3, 48.1)	(44.8, 54.2)	(46.3, 55.2)	(51.4, 56.3)	(53.2, 56.5)	(55.5, 63.7)
Medicaid (Medi-Cal)	48.6	48.1	43.7	43.1	40.2	39.3	34.2
	(44.1, 53.2)	(43.6, 52.6)	(38.6, 48.8)	(38.6, 47.5)	(37.9, 42.5)	(37.7, 41.0)	(30.2, 36.7)
Privately Purchased	3.2	4.5	3.4	3.5	2.9	3.0	3.4
	(1.7, 4.8)	(2.5, 6.6)	(1.9, 4.9)	(2.1, 4.8)	(2.0, 3.8)	(2.3, 3.7)	(2.5, 4.8)
Other Public	1.6*	2.2*	1.6*	1.5*	0.7	0.6	1.6
	(0.2, 2.9)	(0.6, 3.8)	(0.4, 2.7)	(0.4, 2.7)	(0.3, 1.0)	(0.4, 0.9)	(1,2, 2.0)
Uninsured	3.3	1.4*	1.9*	1.2*	2.4	2.2	1.7
	(1.7, 4.8)	(0.0, 2.8)	(0.2, 3.6)	(0.3, 2.1)	(1.5, 3.2)	(1.7, 2.7)	(1.1, 2.3)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Adolescent Trend Analysis: 2015-2020

Finally, we examine trends for the adolescent sample. The following plots and tables do not include estimates from the Fall web experiment given the small sample sizes obtained.

Similar to the child estimates, there is a degree of consistency with a number of adolescent variables including asthma, BMI, serious psychological distress in past month, five-a-day fruits and vegetables, and delay getting care and prescriptions in 2019 and 2019 revised weight.

However, we can see variation in CHIS 2020. There is an obvious gain in proportion of teens who report underweight/normal from 67% to 70.1%. Likewise, we can see that the percentage of adolescents who self-identify to have serious distress in the past month steadily increases from 2016 to 2020. The percentage of adolescents who achieve the recommended five-a-day fruits and vegetables also shows an ascending trend from 2018 to 2020. Although we observe the noticeable increase from 2019 to 2020 regarding these estimates mentioned above, we need to interpret this uptrend with caveats, because the confidence intervals overlap with each other.



Asthma	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	81.5	79.7	81.3	76.8	82.5	82.5	83.5
	(74.5, 88.5)	(70.6, 88.9)	(73.9, 88.6)	(69.7, 83.8)	(79.2, 85.8)	(80.2, 84.7)	(81.4, 85.6)
Yes	18.5	20.3	18.7	23.2	17.5	17.5	16.5
	(11.5, 25.5)	(11.1, 29.4)	(11.4, 26.1)	(16.2, 30.3)	(14.2, 20.8)	(15.3, 19.8)	(14.4, 18.6)



Body Mass Index (BMI)	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Underweight/ Normal	65.4	59.3	70.3	64.5	65.3	67.0	70.1
	(57.6, 73.2)	(47.9, 70.6)	(63.7, 76.9)	(57.3, 71.8)	(60.8, 69.8)	(64.3, 69.8)	(66.9, 73.3)
Overweight	17.5	18.1	15.1	15.8	16.0	15.2	12.1
	(11.3, 23.6)	(9.8, 26.5)	(9.4, 20.7)	(9.8, 21.9)	(12.8, 19.1)	(13.0, 17.3)	(10.0, 14.2)
Obese	17.2	22.6	14.6	19.6	18.7	17.8	17.8
	(10.0, 24.3)	(14.5, 30.7)	(8.6, 20.6)	(12.2, 27.0)	(15.1, 22.3)	(15.8, 19.8)	(14.8, 20.7)



Serious distress in past month	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	94.2*	98.6*	96.3*	91.3*	87.5	87.4	86.8
	(90.1, 98.3)	(97.4, 99.9)	(93.3, 99.3)	(84.9, 97.6)	(84.7, 90.2)	(85.6, 89.2)	(84.8, 88.8)
Yes	5.8*	1.4*	3.7*	8.7*	12.5	12.6	13.2
	(1.7, 9.9)	(0.1, 2.6)	(0.7, 6.7)	(2.4, 15.1)	(9.8, 15.3)	(10.8, 14.4)	(11.2, 15.1)

Note. * = statistically unstable.



Five-a-day fruits/vegetables	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	74.9	73.6	74.4	76.0	74.2	73.9	66.7
	(66.2, 83.5)	(65.4, 81.7)	(67.0, 81.8)	(68.3, 83.8)	(71.0, 77.4)	(71.6, 76.2)	(62.9, 70.5)
Yes	25.1	26.4	25.6	24.0	25.8	26.1	33.3
	(16.5, 33.8)	(18.3, 34.6)	(18.2, 33.0)	(16.2, 31.7)	(22.6, 29.0)	(23.8, 28.4)	(29.5, 37.1)



Delay getting care	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	93.6	94.5*	94.4*	96.2*	92.1	92.2	92.7
	(90.0, 97.1)	(89.5, 99.6)	(91.0, 97.9)	(92.9, 99.5)	(89.9, 94.3)	(90.6, 93.9)	(90.4, 94.9)
Yes	6.4	5.5*	5.6*	3.8*	7.9	7.8	7.3
	(2.9, 10.0)	(0.4, 10.5)	(2.1, 9.0)	(0.5, 7.1)	(5.7, 10.1)	(6.1, 9.4)	(5.1, 9.6)

Note. * = statistically unstable.



Delay getting Rx	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	93.7	92.7*	93.7	95.1*	94.0	93.7	94.5
	(90.1, 97.4)	(88.0, 97.5)	(90.4, 97.0)	(91.4, 98.7)	(91.9, 96.1)	(92.3, 95.0)	(92.5, 96.4)
Yes	6.3	7.3*	6.3	4.9*	6.0	6.3	5.5
	(2.6, 9.9)	(2.5, 12.0)	(3.0, 9.6)	(1.3, 8.6)	(3.9, 8.1)	(5.0, 7.7)	(3.6, 7.5)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Like with adult self-rated health, we see an increase in adolescents expressing either "excellent", "very good", or "good" statuses from 2018 to 2019 and marginal loss in 2020, though the confidence intervals across the years are all consistent suggesting less of an impact on adolescents than adults and children via adult proxy.



Self-rated health	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Excellent/ Very Good/ Good	93.3*	91.9*	91.8	90.7	94.4	94.7	93.2
	(88.0, 98.6)	(85.0, 98.9)	(87.0, 96.7)	(86.4, 95.1)	(92.4, 96.4)	(93.3, 96.1)	(91.3, 95.1)
Fair/Poor	6.7*	8.1*	8.2	9.3	5.6	5.3	6.8
	(1.4, 12.0)	(1.1, 15.0)	(3.3, 13.0)	(4.9, 13.6)	(3.6, 7.6)	(3.9, 6.7)	(5.0, 8.7)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Like with the adult and child estimates of insurance type, we see similar increases in employer-based insurance with a corresponding drop in Medicaid (Medi-Cal).



Insurance type	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Employer-based	50.9	47.0	51.7	54.0	59.2	63.2	56.2
	(44.5, 57.3)	(35.8, 58.2)	(44.8, 58.6)	(44.7, 63.3)	(54.6, 63.9)	(60.1, 66.3)	(52.1, 60.3)
Medicaid (Medi-Cal)	39.8	48.6	39.5	39.1	34.7	31.7	37.4
	(33.1, 46.4)	(39.0, 58.2)	(31.9, 47.1)	(30.5, 47.6)	(29.9, 39.4)	(28.9, 34.5)	(33.6, 41.2)
Privately Purchased	4.7*	2.3*	4.7*	4.2*	3.3	3.3	3.6
	(1.0, 8.4)	(0.0, 4.8)	(1.7, 7.7)	(0.8, 7.6)	(1.7, 4.9)	(2.3, 4.3)	(2.5, 4.6)
Other Public	1.3*	1.0*	1.3*	1.3*	-	0.2	0.7
	(0.0, 3.5)	(0.0, 3.8)	(0.0, 3.3)	(0.0, 3.0)	-	(0, 0.4)	(0.1, 1.4)
Uninsured	3.3*	1.1*	2.8*	1.4*	2.5*	1.6	2.1
	(0.8, 5.9)	(0.0, 3.2)	(0.0, 6.3)	(0.0, 3.9)	(0.8, 4.2)	(0.7, 2.5)	(1.3, 2.9)

Note. * = statistically unstable. -- = suppressed due to small sample size.

An adolescent having a doctor's office, clinic, or hospital as their usual source of care seemed to stabilize in 2019 from earlier years at 80.9%, which sits in between 79.0% in 2017 and 83.4% in 2018. In 2020, there is moderate loss, while the confidence intervals in 2019/2019 revised and 2020 overlap.



Usual source of care	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Doctor/Clinic/Hospital	75.3	75.7	79.0	83.4	80.9	82.1	77.3
	(68.4, 82.2)	(64.6, 86.8)	(72.9, 85.0)	(77.8, 89.1)	(77.5, 84.4)	(80.0, 84.2)	(73.7, 81.0)
ER/Urgent Care/None	24.7	24.3	21.0	16.6	19.1	17.9	22.7
	(17.8, 31.6)	(13.2, 35.4)	(15.0, 27.1)	(10.9, 22.2)	(15.6, 22.5)	(15.8, 20.0)	(19.0, 26.3)

We see that FPL for adolescents is generally consistent with estimates for CHIS 2018 breaking from the trends observed in the adult and child surveys. Similar to adult and child estimates, 300% FPL or above remain uptrend, peaking at 55.9% in 2020.



Poverty status	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
0-99% FPL	23.2	30.0	20.3	15.4	14.4	13.1	14.3
	(17.2, 29.1)	(21.3, 38.8)	(14.5, 26.2)	(8.9, 22.0)	(10.6, 18.1)	(10.7, 15.6)	(11.8, 16.9)
100-199% FPL	21.7	19.7	18.0	25.1	22.6	19.25	17.7
	(14.7, 28.6)	(9.4, 29.9)	(9.9, 26.1)	(17.9, 32.2)	(18.7, 26.5)	(16.5, 22.0)	(14.2, 21.1)
200-299% FPL	15.4	13.5	12.3	8.7	11.8	12.5	12.1
	(7.5, 23.4)	(5.7, 21.3)	(6.3, 18.3)	(4.7, 12.7)	(8.8, 14.8)	(10.2, 14.8)	(9.3, 14.8)
300% FPL or above	39.8	36.9	49.4	50.8	51.3	55.1	55.9
	(32.3, 47.2)	(24.7, 49.1)	(41.4, 57.3)	(42.4, 59.2)	(46.6, 55.9)	(52.5, 57.8)	(52.6, 59.2)

The percent of adolescent smokers continues to remain low with an estimated rate of 0.5% in 2019 and 0.6% in 2020. Revising the 2019 weight has no impact on teen current smoker estimates.



Current smoker	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
No	99.0*	97.4*	99.2*	99.8*	99.5	99.6	99.4*
	(98.0, 100.0)	(94.3, 100.0)	(98.0, 100.0)	(99.4, 100.0)	(99.2, 99.8)	(99.4, 99.8)	(99.0, 99.4)
Yes	1.0*	2.6*	0.8*	0.2*	0.5	0.4	0.6*
	(0.0, 2.0)	(0.0, 5.7)	(0.0, 2.0)	0.2*	(1.9, 5.6)	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.2, 1.0)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

We do observe increases in sedentary time on weekends with the largest gains in the 5 to 8 hours (22.2% to 31.5%) and 8 or more hours (17.0% to 24.4%) groups. In 2020, the percentage of sedentary time on weekends of 8 or more hours continues to go up, reaching a new peak for the past six CHIS cycles. Large variances for each estimate do result in crossing confidence intervals when comparing 2018 to 2019.



Sedentary time on weekends	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Less than 1 hour	7.7*	6.0*	5.2*	5.7*	2.3*	2.5	0.1
	(3.1, 12.4)	(0.0, 12.9)	(1.9, 8.5)	(2.1, 9.4)	(0.7, 3.9)	(1.4, 3.5)	(0, 0.2)
1 to less than 2 hours	8.2	12.8*	7.4*	7.3*	5.6	5.2	2.3
	(4.3, 12.2)	(2.3, 23.2)	(2.3, 12.5)	(2.8, 11.7)	(3.5, 7.6)	(3.8, 6.5)	(1.0, 3.6)
2 to less than 3 hours	14.8	14.9	17.7	18.8	11.1	9.9	9.7
	(9.2, 20.3)	(7.6, 22.2)	(11.3, 24.2)	(10.8, 26.8)	(7.4, 14.9)	(8.0, 11.8)	(7.5, 11.9)
3 to less than 5 hours	33.1	31.7	33.0	26.9	25.1	26.0	24.1
	(24.7, 41.6)	(22.9, 40.4)	(25.7, 40.3)	(18.9, 34.9)	(21.2, 29.0)	(23.1, 28.8)	(20.7, 27.5)
5 to less than 8 hours	22.2	18	19.7	22.2	31.5	31.8	31.5
	(15.5, 29.0)	(10.6, 25.4)	(10.7, 28.6)	(16.0, 28.5)	(27.4, 35.6)	(29.1, 34.5)	(28.3, 34.6)
8 or more hours	13.9	16.7	17.0	19.1	24.4	24.8	32.3
	(7.5, 20.3)	(7.8, 25.5)	(11.3, 22.6)	(12.6, 25.5)	(20.6, 28.2)	(22.3, 27.3)	(28.7, 35.9)

Note. * = statistically unstable.

Finally, we examine perceived adolescent gender expression. While there seems to be a drop in gender non-conforming adolescents, the confidence intervals for the 2019 estimates overlap with the previous years. In the most recent cycle, there is a moderate increase in gender non-conforming, albeit with confidence intervals for 2020 estimates intersecting prior years.



Gender expression	CHIS 2015	CHIS 2016	CHIS 2017	CHIS 2018	CHIS 2019	CHIS 2019 Revised Weight	CHIS 2020
Gender conforming	73.2	72.9	76.8	70.4	81.2	80.5	78.5
	(64.8, 81.5)	(63.4, 82.4)	(69.9, 83.7)	(63.4, 77.5)	(77.1, 85.3)	(78.1, 83.0)	(75.1, 81.8)
Gender non-conforming	26.8	27.1	23.2	29.6	18.8	19.5	21.5
	(18.5, 35.2)	(17.6, 36.6)	(16.3, 30.1)	(22.5, 36.6)	(14.7, 22.9)	(17.0, 21.9)	(18.2, 24.9)

Discussion and Conclusions

The implementation of a new sampling and data collection methodology for a repeated cross-sectional survey provides a challenge for many data users who want to trend over time. Despite smaller methodological changes since CHIS 2001, the move to address-based sampling and a mixed-mode survey in CHIS 2019-2020 represents a fundamental shift in how health data in California is collected. The new design shows tremendous promise for CHIS by reversing historically declining response rates, doubling child and nearly tripling adolescent completes compared with prior two-year cycle, and obtaining some improvements in demographic characteristics.

Additionally, while we observe certain changes due to revision and enhancement of our weighting tools, there is no comprehensive impact on CHIS 2019 estimates.

Despite these overall improvements, CHIS should continue to take innovative steps to improve representation of underrepresented groups including the less educated, low FPL households, respondents age 18-24, and limited English proficient speakers, especially those who speak Spanish, Vietnamese, and Tagalog. Improvements to CHIS 2021-2022 should attempt to address these particular limitations.

With regards to data trends and the redesign, we feel that a large majority of substantive survey items are consistent across the methodological changes. With some exceptions, the general recommendation of this report is that most trends can be maintained across the methodological shift. However, there are major variables where trends need to be **interpreted with caution** given the methodological changes. These include:

- Family type
- English proficiency
- Self-rated health
- Current smoker
- Health insurance
- Poverty status

In addition, variables where response options were originally unread that became explicit in the web survey mode should potentially be considered a break in series. These include:

- Birth control (male)
- Hypertension

While variables like gender identity, sexual orientation, and housing tenure also experienced response option changes, we do not feel that these mode-specific additions necessitate a break in series from previous cycles.

While the Fall web experiment was helpful in vetting the new design and identifying early weaknesses, the pilot study clearly experienced a number of distributional differences that, if uncorrected, would have resulted in disparate estimates for purposes of trending CHIS 2019-2020 with previous cycles. The methodological changes applied in CHIS 2019-2020 should be maintained in future cycles, along with the added improvements noted above.

Author Information

Brian M. Wells, PhD, is the Data Quality and Survey Methodology Manager of the California Health Interview Survey at the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research.

Jiangzhou Fu, MS, is the Assistant Survey Methodologist of the California Health Interview Survey at the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Todd Hughes, Royce Park, and Ninez Ponce of the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research for their review and comments. The author also wishes to thank Analissa Avila for her preliminary analyses and data visualization on this project.

Disclaimer

The analyses, interpretations, conclusions, and views expressed in this methodology brief are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, the Regents of the University of California, or collaborating organizations or funders.

Suggested Citation

Wells, B. M. & Fu, J. (2021). *CHIS 2019-2020 Redesign: Rationale, Empirical Evaluation, and Trends.* Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research.

References

Battaglia, M. P., Dillman, D. A., Frankel, M. R., Harter, R., Buskirk, T. D., McPhee, C. B., DeMatteis, J. M., & Yancey, T. (2016). Sampling, Data Collection, and Weighting Procedures for Address-Based Sample Surveys. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology, 4*(4), 476-500. doi:10.1093/jssam/smw025

Biemer, P. P. & Lyberg, L. E. (2003). *Introduction to survey quality.* New York: Wiley.

Blumberg, S. & Luke, J. (2020). *Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, January – June 2019.* Division of Health Interview Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics report. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhis/earlyrelease/wireless202005-508.pdf

Brick, J. M., Montaquila, J. M., Han, D., & Williams, D. (2012). Improving response rates for Spanish speakers in two-phase mail surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 76*(4), 721-732.

Brick, J. M. & Tourangeau, R. (2017). Responsive survey designs for reducing nonresponse bias. *Journal of Official Statistics, 33*(3), 735-752.

Caporaso, A., Cantor, D., Maitland, A., & Hesse, B. (2013, May). *An experiment to improve Spanish language response rates to a mail questionnaire*. Poster presented at the 68th

Annual Conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Boston, MA.

Czajka, J. L. & Beyler, A. (2016). *Declining response rates in federal surveys: Trends and implications.* Retrieved from https://aspe.hhs.gov/system/files/pdf/255531/Decliningresponserates.pdf

de Leeuw, E.D. (2005). To mix or not to mix data collection modes in surveys. *Journal of Official Statistics*, *21*(2), 233–255.

de Leeuw, E.D. (2018). Mixed-mode: Past, present, and future. *Survey Research Methods, 12*(2), 75-89. doi:10.18148/srm/2018.v12i2.7402

Dillman, D. A. (2017). The promise and challenge of pushing respondents to the Web in mixed-mode surveys. *Survey Methodology, 43*(1), 3-30.

Dillman, D., Smyth, J.D., & Christian, L.M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method.* Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dutwin, D. (2018, Oct.). *Feedback loop: Using surveys to build and assess registration-based sample religious flags for survey research.* Paper presented at the BigSurv18 Conference, Barcelona, Spain.

Dutwin, D., Blum, M., Copeland, K., Fienberg, H., Jackson, C., Jodts, E., Koly, O., Malarek, D., Holzbaur, G., Marken, S., Matuzak, J., Pierannunzi, C., Ridenhour, J., Sheppard, D., Staehli, M. E., Stalone, L., Thompson, J., & Vrudhula, S. (2018). *Spam Flagging and Call Blocking and Its Impact on Survey Research.* Oakbrook Terrace, IL: American Association for Public Opinion Research. https://www.aapor.org/Education-Resources/Reports/Transitions-from-Telephone-Surveys-to-Self-Adminis.aspx

Garbarski, D., Schaeffer, N. C., & Dykema, J. (2015). The effects of response option order and question order on self-rated health. *Quality of Life Research, 24,* 1443-1453.

Groves, R. M (2006). Nonresponse rates and nonresponse bias in household surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 70*(5), 646-675.

Groves, R. M. & Peytcheva, E. (2008). The impact of nonresponse rates on nonresponse bias: A meta-analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 72*(2), 167-189.

Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau R. (2009). *Survey methodology* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Harter, R., Battaglia, M. P., Buskirk, T. D., Dillman, D. A., English, N., Fahimi, M., Frankel, M. R., Kennel, T., McMichael, J. P., McPhee, C. B., Montaquila, J., Yancey, T., & Zukerberg, A. L. (2016*). Address-based Sampling*. Oakbrook Terrace, IL: American Association for Public

Opinion Research. https://www.aapor.org/Education-Resources/Reports/Address-based-Sampling.aspx.

Heeringa, S. G., West, B. T., & Berglund, P. A. (2017). Applied survey data analysis. chapman and hall/CRC.

Hoebel, J., von der Lippe, E., Lange, C., & Ziese, T. (2014). Mode differences in a mixed-mode health interview survey among adults. *Archives of Public Health*, *72*, 46. http://doi.org/10.1186/2049-3258-72-46

Jans, M. (2008). Mode effects. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods,* P. J. Lavrakas... https://methods.sagepub.com/reference/encyclopedia-of-survey-research-methods/n302.xml

Johnson, P. S., & Williams, D. (2010). Comparing ABS vs. Landline RDD Sampling Frames on the Phone Mode. *Survey Practice, 3*(3), 1-10. doi:10.29115/sp-2010-0012.

Kennedy, C. & Hartig, H. (2019, February 27). Response rates in telephone surveys have resumed their decline [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/02/27/response-rates-in-telephone-surveys-have-resumed-their-decline/

Krosnick, J. A. & Alwin, D. F. (1987). An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response-order effects in survey measurement. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 51*(2), 201-219.

Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: a literature review. *Quality & Quantity, 47*(4), 2025-2047.

Lavrakas, P. J., Benson, G., Blumberg, S., Buskirk, T., Cervantes, I. F., Christian, L., Dutwin, D., Fahimi, M., Fienberg, H., Guterbock, T., Keeter, S., Kelly, J., Kennedy, C., Peytchev, A., Piekarski, L., & Shuttles, C. (2017). *The Future of U.S. General Population Telephone Survey Research*. Oakbrook Terrace, IL: American Association for Public Opinion Research. https://www.aapor.org/Education-Resources/Reports/The-Future-Of-U-S-General-Population-Telephone-Sur.aspx.

Lee, S. (2014). Self-rated health in health surveys. *Health Survey Methods,* 193-216.

Lee, S. & Grant, D. (2009). The effect of question order on self-rated general health status in a multilingual survey context. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 169*(12), 1525-1530.

Lee, S., Nguyen, H. A., Jawad, M., & Kurata, J. (2008). Linguistic minorities in a health survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 72*(3), 470-486.

Lee, S. & Schwarz, N. (2014). Question context and priming meaning of health: Effect on differences in self-rated health between Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites. *American Journal of Public Health, 104*(1), 179-185.

Link, M. W. & Mokdad, A. H. (2005). Alternative modes for health surveillance surveys: An experiment with web, mail, and telephone. *Epidemiology, 16*(5), 701-704.

Marken, S. (2018, January 11). Still listening: The state of telephone surveys [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://news.gallup.com/opinion/methodology/225143/listening-state-telephone-surveys.aspx

McGovern, P. D. (2004). A quality assessment of data collected in the American Community Survey (ACS) from households with low English proficiency. Survey Methodology Series #2004-1. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Newsome, J., McNulty, J. A., & Levin, K. (2017, May). *Reaching out to Spanish-speaking respondents in an IRS household survey.* Paper presented at the 72nd Annual Conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, New Orleans, LA.

Olson, K., Smyth, J. D., Horwitz, R., Keeter, S., Lesser, V., Marken, S., Mathiowetz, N., McCarthy, J., O'Brien, E., Opsomer, J., Steiger, D., Sterrett, D., Su, J., Suzer-Gurtekin, Z. T., Turakhia, C., & Wagner, J. (2019). *Transitions from Telephone Surveys to Self-Administered and Mixed-Mode Surveys.* Oakbrook Terrace, IL: American Association for Public Opinion Research. https://www.aapor.org/Education-Resources/Reports/Transitions-from-Telephone-Surveys-to-Self-Adminis.aspx

Ramirez, A. S., Willis, G., & Rutten, L. F. (2017). Understanding Spanish-language response in a national health communication survey: Implications for health communications research. *Journal of Health Communication,* 22(5), 442-450.

Schwarz, N., Strack, F., Hippler, H. J., & Bishop, G. (1991). The impact of administration mode on response effects in survey measurement. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 5*(3), 193-212.

Schwarz, N., Hippler, H. J., & Noelle-Neumann, E. (1992). A cognitive model of response-order effects in survey measurement. In *Context effects in social and psychological research*, pp. 187-201. New York, NY: Springer.

Shim, J., Shin, E., & Johnson, T. P. (2013). Self-rated health assessed by web versus mail modes in a mixed mode survey: The digital divide effect and the genuine survey mode effect. *Medical Care, 51*(9), 774-781.

Tourangeau, R., Rips, L. J., & Rasinski, K. (2000). *The Psychology of Survey Response.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tourangeau, R. & Yan, T. (2007). Sensitive questions in surveys. *Psychological Bulletin, 133*(5), 859-883.

Wells, B. M., Hughes, T., Park, R., CHIS Redesign Working Group, Rogers, T. B., & Ponce, N. (2018). *Evaluating the California Health Interview Survey of the Future: Results from a Methodological Experiment to Test an Address-based Sampling Mail Push-to-web Data*

Collection. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research. https://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/design/Documents/CHIS%20Spring%202018%20ABS%20Web%20Field%20Experiment%20Report.pdf

Wells, B. M., Hughes, T., Park, R., CHIS Redesign Working Group, & Ponce, N. (2019). *Evaluating the California Health Interview Survey of the Future: Results from a Statewide Pilot of an Address-based Sampling Mail Push-to-web Data Collection.* Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research. http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/design/Documents/CHIS%20Fall%202018%20ABS%20Web%20Pilot%20Report%20for%20DHCS%20(July%202019).pdf