

Survey of State Consumer Surveys

Prepared by:

Caroline Kaufmann, Ph.D.
and
Daniel Phillips III, Ph.D.

For:

Survey and Analysis Branch
Division of State and Community Systems Development
Center for Mental Health Services
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
5600 Fishers Lane 15C-04
Rockville, MD 20857
(301) 443-3343

February 2000

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	2
II. Description of Sample	2
III. Methods	2
A. Instrument	3
B. Report Outline	5
IV. Results	5
A. Resources and Funding.....	5
Participation by Constituent Groups	5
State Ratings of Constituent Groups	6
Sources of Support for Survey Support.....	9
B. Administration.....	11
Sample for Surveys and Response Rate	11
Consumers/Family Members as Interviewers	14
Questionnaires: Anonymity, Format and Length	15
Survey: Questions about Recovery	17
Reliability and Validity of Surveys.....	18
C. Findings.....	20
Responses Tracked by Demographics and Level of	

Functioning.....	20
Problems Encountered during Interview	20
D. Validation Survey	21
V. Conclusions	23
A. Resources Used to Design and Conduct Survey	23
B. Implementation of the Consumer Pilot Survey	23
C. Implementation of Full Survey	24
D. Validation Survey	24
Appendix I: Survey Instrument and Script	25
Appendix II: Data Codebook	35

List of Tables

Table 1: State Report on Participation by Constituent Groups	6
Table 1a: State Rating of Participation by Constituent Groups, Survey Design/Content.....	7
Table 1b: State Ratings of Participation by Constituent Groups, Survey Administration.....	8
Table 1c: State Ratings of Participation by Constituent Groups, Data Analysis.....	9
Table 2: Current MHSIP Grant Funding and Funding for the Future.....	10
Table 3: Survey Support from MHSIP and Other Sources.....	10
Table 4: Percent using Particular Sample Frame and Average Size of Sample.....	11
Table 5: Characteristics of Pilots and Full Survey.....	12
Table 6: Type of Sample Used.....	12
Table 7: Randomness of Sample.....	13
Table 8: Range of Sample Sizes and Average Sample Size.....	13
Table 9: Response Rates for Pilot Study and Full Survey, by Category..	14
Table 10: Consumers and/or Family Members used as Interviewers.....	14
Table 11: Overall Rating of Consumers and Family Member Interviewers.....	15
Table 12: Anonymity/Confidentiality of Survey Respondents.....	15
Table 13: Importance of Open-Ended Questions to the Consumer Survey.....	15
Table 14: Number of Questions on Survey.....	16
Table 15: Length of Questionnaire.....	16
Table 16: Questions Asked About Recovery.....	17
Table 17: Defining Recovery.....	18
Table 18: Reliability of Surveys.....	18
Table 19: Mean Reliability.....	19
Table 20: Type of Validity Measure Employed.....	19
Table 21: Responses Tracked by Demographics and Level of Functioning	20
Table 22: Types of Problems Encountered During Interview.....	20
Table 23: Consumers/Family Member Comment on State Administrators' Involvement of Consumers in Survey.....	22
Table 24: Consumers/Family Members Rate State Administrators' Efforts ...	23

List of Figures

Figure 1.....	4
---------------	---

Executive Summary

This project was conducted by the Kentucky Center for Mental Health Studies (KCMHS) at the suggestion of the Center for Mental Health Services, SAMHSA. The Survey of State Surveys (the Survey) is intended to provide information on which states are conducting a survey of their consumers and, if so, the details of their survey process. The sampling frame includes each state as well as Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. All 52 potential respondents were contacted, and 49 completed interviews for a completion rate of 94.2%. In addition to the survey of state respondents, a validation survey was conducted. The validation survey interviewed consumers, a small number from states that had responded to the survey that allows for a comparison between state and consumer respondents. For the validation survey, 5 consumer organizations were contacted. The state survey reveals that mental health providers, state administrators, consumers, and family members are all involved heavily in the survey process. The validation survey, however, showed that consumers believed they were less involved (40%) than did state administrators (76.9%). State survey respondents rated the participation of consumers and other participants as relatively high, varying between a 4.76 and 6.00 on a 6-point Likert scale.

Of all the respondents, 13.5% conducted a pilot survey only. One out of every four (25%) respondents conducted a full survey without first conducting a pilot survey. A pilot study and full survey were conducted by 36.5% of the sample and 13.5% of the sample reported that they had not conducted a pilot study nor a full survey. For 11.5% of the cases there was missing data. Pilot surveys using face-to-face and self-administered questionnaires had the highest response rates while face-to-face and telephone surveys had the highest response rates in the full survey. Two-thirds (67.3%) of respondents said that their survey asked questions about recovery. Respondents relayed problems that they had during the survey process. Having a poor response rate was the most often cited specific problem.

For the pilot survey, response rates ranged from 26% for mail survey to 73% for self-administered surveys to 84% for face-to-face surveys. For the full survey, the response rates were 31% for mail surveys, 49% for self-administered, and 73% for face-to-face surveys. Clearly, face-to-face surveys yielded the greatest results for both the pilot survey and the full survey.

Two-thirds of the states measured recovery and 46% used the MHSIP or some variation to measure recovery.

INTRODUCTION

The Survey of State Consumer Surveys (the Survey) is a project undertaken by the Kentucky Center for Mental Health Studies (KCMHS) in agreement with the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS). The Survey uses a sampling frame that includes each state as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. The goal of the project is to determine which states are conducting a survey of their consumers and, if so, obtain details about their design and implementation. The Survey asks specific questions concerning resources used to design and conduct the consumer survey, implementation of a pilot study, findings from the pilot study, implementation of a full survey, findings from the full consumer survey, and recommendations for other states that are implementing consumer surveys. Finally, the Survey includes a small validation study. The validation study asks representatives from 5 selected states to answer questions about their perceptions about consumer participation in the state survey process. The purpose of the validation study is to obtain some basis to compare states' perceptions of consumer involvement in consumer surveys with the perceptions of the consumers. Approximately thirty states/territories have received Mental Health Statistics Improvement Program (MHSIP) grants to conduct consumer satisfaction surveys in their states.

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Each of the 50 states along with the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico were contacted to participate in the Survey. Forty-nine of the potential 52 participants responded and are included in the analysis. For each state, a state representative was contacted. In many cases this person was able to answer questions for the Survey. In the cases where this was not possible, the initial person contacted was able to provide the name of another who was able to answer questions for the Survey. Respondents were typically state government employees who were identified as the person in that state who was involved in conducting the consumer surveys.

METHODS

The Survey of State Surveys was conducted by phone between January 28 and April 7, 1999. The average interview lasted 20 minutes. Forty-nine of 52 possible participants responded for a response rate of 94.2%. The high response rate is due in part to the willingness of respondents to participate and the number of times each respondent was contacted. The average number of call backs was 3. During January 28 and April 7, 1999 those who had not responded were contacted a minimum of 10 times and requested to participate. A check of the keystroke errors for data entry revealed an error rate of one half of one percent (0.5%).

Instrument

The Survey instrument is a 21-item questionnaire (see Appendix A) designed specifically for this project. The questionnaire includes both quantitative questions and qualitative questions. The quantitative responses were a mixture of yes/no and 5-6 point Likert-scales. The questionnaire allowed for explanations or qualifications of survey responses with qualitative remarks. The instrument was reviewed thoroughly by members of the Recovery Advisory Group (RAG) and other national experts. These experts provided suggestions and reviews of previous drafts of the instrument. However, final decisions regarding the content and format of the questionnaire were the responsibility of KCMHS staff, and not all suggested changes were incorporated into the final survey instrument.

Figure 1

I. Resources Used to Design and Conduct Survey

1. Participation and Rating of Performance

Constituents who Participated in the Design
Implementation, and Analysis of SurveyTable 1
Overall PerformanceTable 1a
Performance of AdministrationTable 1b
Performance Rating of AnalysesTable 1c

2. Funding

Survey FundingTables 2 and 3
Survey Target PopulationsTable 4

II. Implementation of the Consumer Pilot Survey

Conducted Pilot Study and Full SurveyTable 5
Type of Sample UsedTable 6
Randomness of SampleTable 7
Sample SizeTable 8
Response RateTable 9

Implementation of Full Survey

Conducted Pilot Study and Full SurveyTable 5
Type of Sample UsedTable 6
Randomness of SampleTable 7
Sample SizeTable 8
Response RateTable 9
Use of Consumers/Family Members as InterviewersTables 10 and 11
Anonymity of SurveyTable 12
Importance of Open-Ended QuestionsTable 13
Number of Survey QuestionsTable 14
Length of QuestionnaireTable 15
Recovery QuestionsTable 16
Defining RecoveryTable 17
Reliability of SurveysTable 18
Reliability MeanTable 19
Type of Validity Measure EmployedTable 20
Responses Tracked/Matched by Consumer DemographicsTable 21
Responses Tracked/Matched by FunctioningTable 21
Problems Encountered While Implementing the SurveyTable 22

IV. Validation SurveyTables 23 and 24

Report Outline

The remainder of this report will be divided into sections in the same manner the survey was divided into sections. Figure 1 provides an outline of the data tables presented in this report. “Resources used to design and conduct survey” include the following topics: what groups participated in the design, implementation and analysis of the survey (Table 1); rankings for the overall performance in design (Table 1a), administration (Table 1b), and analyses (Table 1c); sources of financial support for the survey (Tables 2-3), and target populations surveyed in state (Table 4).

“Implementation of the consumer pilot survey” includes the following topics: percent who conducted a pilot study and full survey (Table 5), type of sample frame used (Table 6) if the sample was random (Table 7), sample size (Table 8), and what mode of survey (i.e., mail, face-to-face, telephone, self-administered) was used (Table 9). “Implementation of full survey” also includes Tables 5-9 so that the types of sample frame used, sample size, and mode of survey could be easily compared to those of the pilot study. In addition, “implementation of full survey” includes the following topics: consumer/family members used as interviewers (Table 10), rating of consumer/family member interviewers (Table 11), anonymity of questions (Table 12), importance of open-ended questions (Table 13), number of questions on survey (Table 14), length of questionnaire (Table 15), recovery questions (Tables 16-17), reliability of surveys (Tables 18-19), type of validity measure employed (Table 20), tracking of questions by demographics and level of functioning (Table 21), and problems with survey implementation (Table 22).

Finally, the “validation study” includes Tables 23 and 24. Table 23 asks whether or not consumers were involved in the design, implementation, and analysis of the survey. Table 24 includes responses where respondents ranked state administrators involvement in the design, implementation, and analysis of the survey.

RESULTS

Resources and Funding

Participation by Constituent Groups

Table 1 shows the percentage of respondents who said that a particular group participated in some aspect of the consumer survey.

Table 1

State Report on Participation by Constituent Groups

	Participation % Yes (N = 52) (s.d.*)	Participation % No (N = 52)	Participation % Missing (N = 52)
Consumer Groups/ Organizations	76.9% (s.d. = 0.34)	11.5%	11.5%
Family Member Groups	65.4% (s.d. = 0.44)	23.1%	11.5%
Mental Health Providers	80.8% (s.d. = 0.28)	7.7%	11.5%
State Administrators	84.6% (s.d. = 0.21)	3.8%	11.5%
Protection and Advocacy Groups	38.5% (s.d. = 0.50)	48.1%	13.5%
MHSIP staff	44.2% (s.d. = 0.51)	44.2%	11.5%
Others	40.4% (s.d. = 0.50)	48.1%	11.5%

*s.d. = standard deviation

More than 80% of the state respondents stated that Mental Health Providers (80.8%) and State Administrators (84.6%) were involved in the design implementation, and analysis of the survey. Although Protection and Advocacy groups were involved in less than half of the surveys (38.5%), Consumer Groups/Organizations (76.9%) and Family Member Groups (65.4%) were reported as being involved in some aspect of the survey processes.

State Ratings of Constituent Groups¹

Tables 1a, 1b, and 1c report on respondents' ratings of the various participant groups as to their involvement in different aspects of the survey (design/content, administration, analysis). Table

¹ These series of questions were controversial among consumer experts who reviewed the original survey. Several reviewers of the initial survey instrument suggested that such ratings were potentially demeaning to consumer organizations because they implied that there was reason to question the competence of consumer groups to advise states on the design, administration and analysis of consumer surveys. KCMHS staff decided to include these services of questions in order to obtain some information about states' views on the quality of constituent group participation. Note that a set of constituent groups were rated, including family groups, administration, providers, protection and advocacy, MHSIP staff and others as well as consumer groups.

1a describes respondents' ratings of various participant groups as to their involvement in the design/content of the survey. Table 1b describes respondents' ratings of various participant groups as to their involvement in the administration of the survey. Finally, Table 1c describes respondents' ratings of various participant groups as to their involvement in the analyses of the survey. Respondents were asked to rate the performance of constituent groups who participated in state consumer surveys. Ratings on a scale of 1-6, where 1=very poor, 6 excellent were provided. For each constituent group the state reported on participating in the design, administration and analysis of consumer surveys.

Table 1a

State Ratings of Participation by

Constituent Groups, Survey Design/Content

Constituent Group	Design/Content Mean (s.d.*) (scale: 1 = very poor; 6 = excellent)
Consumer Groups/ Organizations	5.10 (s.d. = 0.98, skewness = -0.89, range = 3-6)
Family Member Groups	5.00 (s.d. = 0.95, skewness = -0.78, range = 3-6)
Mental Health Providers	4.83 (s.d. = 0.91, skewness = -0.23, range = 3-6)
State Administrators	5.03 (s.d. = 0.94, skewness = -0.93, range = 2-6)
Protection and Advocacy Groups	5.14 (s.d. = 0.95, skewness = -0.95, range = 3-6)
MHSIP staff	5.42 (s.d. = 0.69, skewness = -0.81, range = 4-6)
Others	5.20 (s.d. = 0.68, skewness = -0.26, range = 4-6)

*s.d = standard deviation

Table 1a shows each group's rating (on a 6 point Likert scale) for the design/content portion of the survey process. A score of 1 = "very poor" and a score of 6 = "excellent." Average scores were high with little variation across groups. Mental health providers had the lowest average score with a value of 4.83. MHSIP staff had the highest average with a value of 5.42. Consumer groups were rated as 5.10 (very good) in participation.

Table 1b
State Ratings of Participation by Constituent Groups, Survey Administration

	Administration Mean (s.d.*) (scale: 1 = very poor; 6 = excellent)
Consumer Groups/ Organizations	5.06 (s.d. = 1.16, skewness = -1.39, range = 2-6)
Family Member Groups	4.83 (s.d. = 0.83, skewness = 0.35, range = 4-6)
Mental Health Providers	4.76 (s.d. = 0.83, skewness = -0.24, range = 3-6)
State Administrators	5.15 (s.d. = 0.69, skewness = -0.20, range = 4-6)
Protection and Advocacy Groups	5.33 (s.d. = 1.15, skewness = -1.73, range = 4-6)
MHSIP staff	5.29 (s.d. = 0.76, skewness = -0.60, range = 4-6)
Others	5.17 (s.d. = 0.75, skewness = -0.31, range = 4-6)

*s.d. = standard deviation

Table 1b shows each group's rating (on a 1 to 6 Likert scale). A score of 1 = "very poor" and a score of 6 = "excellent." Average scores varied between 4.76 (mental health providers) and 5.33 (protection and advocacy groups). Again, there was little variation across groups.

Table 1c
State Ratings of Participation by Constituent Groups, Data Analysis

	Analysis Mean (s.d.*) (scale: 1 = very poor; 6 = excellent)
Consumer Groups/ Organizations	5.20 (s.d. = 0.84, skewness = -0.51, range = 4-6)
Family Member Groups	5.00 (s.d. = 0.82, skewness = 0, range = 4-6)
Mental Health Providers	5.17 (s.d. = 0.41, skewness = 2.45, range = 5-6)
State Administrators	4.93 (s.d. = 1.03, skewness = -0.75, range = 3-6)
Protection and Advocacy Groups	6.00 (s.d. = 0, skewness = 0, no range)
MHSIP staff	5.50 (s.d. = 0.53, skewness = 0, range = 5-6)
Others	5.29 (s.d. = 0.76, skewness = -0.60, range = 4-6)

*s.d. = standard deviation

Table 1c shows each group’s rating (on a 1 to 6 point scale). A score of 1 = “very poor” and a score of 6 = “excellent.” Average scores ranged between 4.93 (state administrators) and 6.00 (protection and advocacy groups).

Sources of Survey Support

Tables 2 and 3 describe the survey funding. Table 2 describes whether or not states received funding from the MHSIP grant and if they had funds to support the survey on a regular basis in the future. Table 3 describes the amount of money states received from MHSIP or Other sources for the survey.

Table 2

Current MHSIP Grant Funding and Funding for the Future

	% Yes (N = 52) (s.d.*)	% No (N = 52)	% Missing (N = 52)
MHSIP Grant supports the survey	50.0% (s.d. = 0.50)	34.6%	15.4%
We have funds to support the consumer survey on a regular basis in the future	51.9% (s.d. = 0.49)	30.8%	17.3%

*s.d. = standard deviation

Half (50.0%) of the respondents said that the MHSIP Grant supported the survey. Also, 51.9% of respondents said that they had funds to support the future consumer surveys.

Table 3

Survey Support from MHSIP and Other Sources

	Mean (s.d.*)	Range
Survey support from sources OTHER than MHSIP	\$79,050 (s.d. = \$95,360, skewness = 1.60)	\$3,500 - \$300,000
Survey support from MHSIP	\$51,750 (s.d. = \$63,480, skewness = 1.84)	\$0 - \$200,000

*s.d. = standard deviation

Survey support from sources other than the MHSIP varied between three thousand five hundred dollars and three hundred thousand dollars, with an average of seventy nine thousand fifty dollars. Survey support from MHSIP varied between zero dollars and two hundred thousand dollars, with a mean of fifty one thousand seven hundred fifty dollars.

Administration

Samples for Survey and Response Rate

This section describes the sampling frames used in the pilot and full surveys. It also describes sample sizes and response rates for the pilot and full survey.

Table 4

Percent Using Particular Sample Frame and Average Size of Sample

	% Yes (N=52)	Mean (s.d.*)	Range
All adult consumers	25.0%**	2,653.3 (s.d. = 3,548.7, skewness = 1.74)	140-10,800
Adults with severe Mental Illness	32.7%	2,145.8 (s.d. = 2,651.8, skewness = 1.67).	100-9,000
Adults with SA & Mental Illness	9.6%	2,206.5 (s.d. = 2,647.7, skewness = 1.51)	126-6,000
Adults with DD & Mental Illness	1.9%	2,400.0	2,400
Other	13.5%	4,627.8 (s.d. = 8,250.1, skewness = 2.00)	356-17,000
Missing	17.3%		

*s.d. = standard deviation **column total exceeds 100% because some respondents chose more than one category

Table 4 shows that 32.7% of the respondents used “adults with severe mental illness” as their survey sample. The second most frequently used population was “all adult consumers” (25%). Table 4 also shows the range of sample sizes and the mean sample size for each sample population. One survey of “other” used a sample size as high as 17,000, while the mean sample size for “other” was 4,627.8.

Table 5

Characteristics of Pilot and Full Survey

(n = 52)

Pilot Study Only	Full Survey With no pilot	Both Pilot and Full Surveys	Neither Pilot nor Full Survey*	Missing
13.5% (n = 7) (s.d. = 0.34)	25.0% (n = 13) (s.d. = 0.44)	36.5% (n = 19) (s.d. = 0.49)	21.2% (n = 11) (s.d. = 0.41)	3.8% (n = 2)

s.d. = standard deviation

* includes 4 cases where respondents did not answer

Table 6

Type of Sample Used

	Pilot	Full Survey
	51.9% (27) = Unknown/not reported 48.1% (25) = valid percentage*	46.2% (24) = Unknown/not reported 53.8% (28) = valid percentage*
State-wide sample	Not applicable	64.3% (18)
Regional sample	36% (9)	3.6% (1)
CMHC sample	32% (8)	14.3% (4)
Inpatient sample	8% (2)	3.6% (1)
Consumer group sample	4% (1)	0% (0)
Other sample	20% (5)	14.3% (4)

* percentages in table are based on valid responses only

Table 7

Randomness of Sample

	Pilot	Full Survey
	51.9% (27) = Unknown/Not reported 48.1% (25) = valid response*	40.4% (21) = Unknown/Not reported 59.6% (31) = valid response*
% Yes, random	32% (8)	48.4% (15)
% No, random	68% (17)	51.6% (16)

*percentages in table are based on valid responses only

At the time of the data collection for this report, 13.5% of the states conducted only pilot studies. Interestingly enough, 25.0% conducted a full survey without ever conducting a pilot study. A pilot study and full survey were conducted by 36.5% of the sample and 13.5% of the sample neither piloted a study nor a full survey (see Table 5).

Table 6 shows that for the pilot a regional sample or a community mental health center sample was used in 68% of the cases. For the full survey, the state-wide sample was the most typically employed sample population (64.3%). Finally, Table 7 reveals that approximately 32% of the pilot samples used a random sample and 48.4% of the full survey did. It is not known how exactly respondents defined “random.” It is probably the case that true random samples were involved in fewer of the cases than these figures reflect.

Table 8

Range of Sample Sizes and Average Sample Size

	Pilot (s.d.*)	Full Survey
Mean	851 (s.d. = 1,830.9, skewness = 3.93)	3,787 (s.d. = 4,094.4, skewness = 1.70)
Sample Size Range	20-8,800	90-17,000

*s.d. = standard deviation

The sample size in the pilot survey ranged from 20 to 8,800 with a mean of 851. The full survey sample size ranged from 90 to 17,000 with a mean of 3,787.

Table 9

Response Rates for Pilot Study and Full Survey, by Category

	Pilot (s.d.*)	Full Survey
Mail	26.34% (s.d. = 6.14, skewness = 0.47, range = 20%-35%)	30.78% (s.d. = 13.80, skewness = 0.04, range = 10%-50%)
Face-to-face	84.09% (s.d. = 20.56, skewness = -1.04, range = 4 2%-100%)	72.83% (s.d. = 23.16, skewness = -0.90, range = 38%-95%)
Telephone	N/A**	59.67% (s.d. = 0.58, skewness = -1.73, range = 59%-60%)
Self-administered	73.17% (s.d. = 27.86, skewness = -0.81, range = 30%-100%)	49.00% (s.d. = 27.62, skewness = 1.31, range = 27%-80%)

*s.d. = standard deviation **not applicable

Table 9 shows the average response rates for the pilot and full surveys from the 49 states/territories that provided data. Face-to-face interviews had the highest response rate for both the pilot and full survey (84.09% and 72.83% respectively). Mail surveys showed the lowest response rates in both the pilot (26.34%) and full survey (30.78%).

Consumers/Family Members as Interviewers

Tables 10 and 11 show reports of states' use of consumers and family members used as interviewers during the survey process. Table 10 describes the percentage of state respondents who stated that consumers/family members were used as interviewers in the survey.

Table 10

Consumers and/or Family Members used as Interviewers

	% Yes (s.d.*)	% No	% Missing
Are consumers and/or family members used as interviewers in the survey?	38.5% (s.d. = 0.50)	44.2%	17.3%

*s.d. = standard deviation

States were also asked to rate their perceptions of the quality of consumers and family members as interviewers in the surveys. Of those states who reported using consumers and/or family members as interviewers, ratings were in the good to very good range (6 = point scale: 1 = very poor; 6 = excellent). Results are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11
Overall Rating of Consumers and Family Member Interviewers

	Overall rating (s.d.*) (scale: 1 = very poor; 6 = excellent)
Consumers	4.64 (s.d. = 1.01, skewness = 0.33, range = 3-6)
Family Members	4.71 (s.d. = 0.95, skewness = 0.76, range = 4-6)

*s.d. = standard deviation

Consumers and/or family members were used as interviewers in 38.5% of the cases. Consumers received a mean overall rating of 4.64 and family members received a mean overall rating of 4.71 on a 6 point scale. In other words respondents rated consumers and family members between a “good” and “very good” when they employed their services as interviewers.

Survey Questions: Anonymity, and Format and Length

Respondents were asked whether consumer’s responses were anonymous. We assumed that respondents would understand “anonymous” to mean that all questions or other modes for collecting information from consumers would not carry and personally identifying information. However, state respondents reported that responses were confidential and did not distinguish between confidentiality and anonymity. These results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12
Anonymity/Confidentiality of Survey Respondents*

	% Yes (s.d.**)	% No	% Missing
Consumer responses are anonymous/ confidential	51.9% (s.d. = 0.49)	30.8%	17.3%

* state respondents did not tend to distinguish between anonymity and confidentiality

**s.d. = standard deviation

Survey questions were anonymous in 51.9% of the cases. In order to provide some information on the structure of survey questions, we asked respondents to rate the importance of open-ended questions. Importance was rated on a 5-point scale (1 = not important; 5 = extremely important). Results are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Importance of Open-Ended Questions to the Consumer Survey

	Overall rating (s.d.*) (scale: 1 = not important; 5 = extremely important)
If open-ended questions are used, how important are they to the consumer survey?	3.78 (s.d. = 0.98, skewness = -0.42, range = 2-5)

*s.d. = standard deviation

Open-ended questions received a mean rating of 3.78 on a 5 point scale. Survey questions were considered “important” to “very important” to the consumer survey.

Table 14 shows mean number of items across surveys. Survey questionnaires ranged in length from a low of 12 to a high of 125 items. On average, the mean number of items was 40 (rounded to nearest whole numbers).

Table 14

Number of Questions on Survey

	Average number of questions (s.d.*)
How many questions are on the survey?	39.63 (s.d. = 23.75, skewness = 1.86, range = 12-125)

*s.d. = standard deviation

States were asked to judge the length of their survey instrument (“too long, too short, or about right”). Results are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

Length of Questionnaire

(N = 52)

	Too Long	Too Short	About Right	Missing
Length of questionnaire	23.1% (N = 12) Mean length = 48.8; Range = 25-100	1.9% (N = 1) Mean length = 12; Range = 12	51.9% (N = 27) Mean length = 37.4; Range = 15-125	23.1% (N = 12)

Over half of all states reported that the length of their survey instrument was “about right.” For those states that reported the length to be just right the mean length of the survey was 37.4 questions and the range was 15-125 questions. For the 23.1% of the states that reported the questionnaire was too long, the mean length was 48.8 questions and the range was 25-100 questions. For the 1.9% (1 case) of the states that reported that the survey was too short the length of the survey was 12 questions.

Questions About Recovery

The concept of “recovery” for people with mental illnesses is a focus of interest to providers and consumers throughout the U.S. With the endorsement of the CMHS and members of the Recovery Advisory Group (RAG) who reviewed earlier drafts of our data collection instruments, we included two items regarding the inclusion of questions about recovery in the state consumer surveys. As shown in Table 16, most states include some questions about recovery in their surveys (67%). Of those including recovery questions, 46% use the MHSIP Consumer Survey as a measure of recovery. The remaining respondents either do not define recovery (23%) or don’t know how to define it (31%).

Table 16

Questions Asked About Recovery

	% Yes (s.d.*)	% No	% Missing
Do you ask any questions about recovery?	67.3% (n = 35)	11.5% (n = 6)	21.2% (n = 11)

*s.d. = standard deviation

Table 17

Defining Recovery			
	% Yes	% No	% Missing/Don't Know
Recovery defined the same as MHSIP (regular or short form)	46.1% (n = 24)	23.1% (n = 12)	30.8% (n = 16)

Reliability and Validity of Survey

Table 18 reports the percentage of respondents who reported the reliability of their survey.

Table 18

Reliability of Surveys

Reliability Test	% Yes (N=52)	% No	% Missing
Test-retest	0%	80.8%	19.2%
Split-half	1.9%	78.8%	19.2%
Inter-item	11.5%	67.3%	21.1%
Inter-rater	0%	80.8%	19.2%
Other	0%	82.7%	17.3%

Table 18 reveals that few surveys included a measure of reliability. Inter-item reliability was used in 11.5% of the cases and split-half was used in 1.9% of the cases. Respondents were also asked to respond to an open-ended questions that asked what form of validity test, if any, was used.

Table 19

Reliability Mean

Reliability	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Skewness
Split-half	0.80	-	None	-
Inter-item	0.92	.006	0.80-0.97	-1.98

Table 19 shows the relevant data for reliability measures employed. One survey used the split-half reliability measure and returned a score of 0.80. Six surveys used the inter-item measure of reliability and produced a mean score of 0.92.

Table 20

Type of Validity Measure Employed

Type of Validity Measure	% Yes
Factor analysis	5.7%
Focus groups	1.9%
Data samples	1.9%
Nothing	69.2%
Missing/Don't know	21.2%

Most respondents did not use a validity measure for their survey. Factor analysis was the most common validity measure used, but it was only used in 5.7% of the cases. Focus groups and data samples were also used each by 1.9% of the sample.

Findings

Responses Tracked by Demographics and Level of Functioning

Table 21 reports the percentage of responses that can be traced by demographics or level of functioning.

Table 21

Responses Tracked by Demographics and Level of Functioning

	% Yes (s.d.*)	% No	% Missing
Tracked by demographics	38.5% (s.d. = 0.45)	13.5%	48.1%
Tracked by level of functioning	21.2% (s.d. = 0.50)	30.8%	48.1%

*s.d. = standard deviation

In the consumer survey, responses can be tracked or matched by consumer demographics in 38.5% of the cases and can be tracked by level of functioning in 21.2% of the cases.

Problems Encountered during Interview

Table 22 describes the problems encountered by state respondents during the interview process.

Table 22

Types of Problems Encountered During Interview

	% Yes
Poor Response Rate	43.2%
Lack of financial resources	37.7%
Time constraints	32.4%
Interdepartmental/inter-agency problems	29.7%
Other	56.7%
Missing	28.8%

Respondents in Table 22 were asked if they had at least one significant problem or issue that they faced in implementing the consumer survey. Those responding “yes” at least once responded that in 43.2% of those cases they had a “poor response rate,” in 37.7% of the cases they had a “lack of financial resources,” and in 32.4% of the cases they had “time constraint” problems. In more than half of the cases (56.7%) the respondent had some time of “other” problem. “Other” problems included problems with technical aspects of the survey process such as dealing with software, hardware, and return envelopes. “Other” problems also included lack of analytical staff and resistance of provider organizations to being surveyed.

Validation Survey

The validation survey was designed to ask consumers/family members to speak to what states had done to include consumers in the survey process. Whereas one state may claim that consumers were heavily involved in the survey process, the validation study may reveal that consumers/family members don’t believe that to be the case. For the validation study we selected 5 states/territories and contacted members of consumer organizations.

Table 23

Consumers/Family Members Comment on State
Administrators' Involvement of Consumers in Survey

	Yes (N=5) (s.d.*)	No (N=5)	Missing
Consumers participated in the design, implementation and analysis of the survey	80% (s.d. = 0.45, skewness = -2.23)	20%	0%
State administrators involved consumers in <i>design/content</i> of survey	80% (s.d. = 0, skewness = n/a)	0%	20%
State administrators involved consumers in the <i>administration</i> of the survey	40% (s.d. = 0.58, skewness = 0)	40%	20%
State administrators involved consumers in the <i>analysis</i> of the survey	40% (s.d. = 0.58, skewness = 0)	40%	20%
Consumers were able to play a significant role in the survey process	40% (s.d. = 0.55, skewness = 0.61)	60%	0%

*s.d. = standard deviation

From this information it appears that consumers were more involved in the design/content portion of the survey rather than the administration and analysis of the survey. Only 40% of respondents believed that “consumers were able to play a significant role in the survey process.”

Table 24
Consumers/Family Members Rate State Administrators' Efforts

	Rating (s.d.*) (scale: 1 = very poor; 6 = excellent)
Rating of state administrator's efforts to include consumers in survey design/content	3.25 (s.d. = 1.89, skewness = 1.66, range = 2-6)
Rating of state administrator's efforts to include consumers in survey administration	6.00 (no s.d., skewness = n/a, no range)
Rating of state administrator's efforts to include consumers in survey analysis	6.00 (no s.d., skewness = n/a, no range)

*s.d. = standard deviation

The efforts of state administrators to include consumers in survey design/content was ranked fair (3.25 on a 6 point scale). However, the efforts of state administrators to include consumers in survey administration and analysis were ranked excellent (6 on a 6 point scale).

CONCLUSIONS

Resources Used to Design and Conduct Survey

State administrators reported that mental health providers (80.8%) and state administrators (84.6%) participated heavily in the survey process. Consumer groups (76.9%) and family member groups (65.4%) were involved to a high degree also. Respondents ranked groups (e.g., consumer, family members) participation in specific survey areas (e.g., content/design, administration) as generally high, varying between a 4.76 and a 6.00 on a 6-point Likert scale. Half received financial support from a MHSIP grant, with the average amount being \$51,750. Adults with severe mental illness and all adult consumers were the groups most likely to be surveyed.

Implementation of the Consumer Pilot Survey

Pilot studies were conducted by 50.0% of the respondents. A regional sample or a community mental health center sample was used in 32.7% of the cases. 15.4% of pilot surveys reported that they used a random sample. The average pilot study had a sample size of 851. Face-to-face (84.09%) and self-administered (73.17%) were the survey modes with the highest response rates.

One of every four states reported that they initiated a full survey without conducting a pilot study.

Implementation of Full Survey

Respondents reported implementing a full survey in 61.5% of the cases. A statewide sample was most commonly used (34.6%). A random sample was reportedly used by 29% of the states. The average sample size was 3,787. Face-to-face (72.83%) and telephone (59.67%) had the highest response rates. 67.3% of respondents asked questions about recovery and 46.1% of all respondents used the MHSIP outcomes section to define recovery. Respondents were candid about problems with the implementation of the survey. Poor response rate was the most often cited problem (43.2%).

Validation Survey

The validation study revealed that only 40% of respondents felt that “consumers were able to play a significant role in the survey process.” While participation in the design/content phase of the survey process was high it decreased in the administration and analysis. For the design/content phase, state administrators received a fair rating (3.25 on a 6-point Likert scale). Validation survey respondents rated state administrators’ efforts to include consumers in survey administration and survey analysis as high.

Appendix I
Survey Instrument and Script

Phone Script for the Survey of Surveys

Hello, may I please speak to _____ . _____, this is Dan Phillips from the Kentucky Center for Mental Health Studies. I am calling concerning a survey we are conducting for the Center for Mental Health Services in Washington: the State Survey of Surveys on Adult Mental Health Consumers.

_____, are you the person who conducts mental health consumer surveys in your state? Do you have enough information to answer questions about the survey? (*If not: Do you know who that person is? Do you have his/her phone number?*) We are interviewing an administrator from each state to determine what type of consumer survey they are conducting or have conducted recently. Could I set up a day and time to interview you over the phone? The interview should last approximately one half hour.

Prior to the phone interview we would like to send you a list of topics that we will be covering. May I have your mailing address? (*Write down the mailing address*). Thank you. I look forward to talking with you on (*Date, Time*). Let me give you my phone number in case an emergency comes up. My phone number is (606) 226-9096.

Contact: _____

Referred by: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Fax: _____

Interview: _____

Date _____

Interview: _____

Time [record time zone] _____ [record time zone]

1. Does your state survey or plan to survey adult mental health consumers?
 (PROBE: Are you doing a needs, use, or satisfaction survey?)

(1) State is not planning to implement a survey of adult _____ V1 _____
 Consumers. We are finished!
 Thank you for talking with me.

If yes (2), then go to 1.1 V1.1 _____

1.1 Which of the following statements best applies to you?
 (a) State (or a subcontractor) has conducted one or more surveys.
 If more than one cycle has been completed, please
 0.11 How many cycles have you completed so far? _____ V1.11 _____

(b) State is piloting its first consumer survey.
 (c) State has developed a survey and plans to implement it.
 1.12 When do you think the survey will be implemented? _____ V1.12 _____

(d) State is planning a survey that is not yet developed.

These next questions concern resources used to design and conduct the consumer survey.

1 What groups are participating in the design, implementation and analysis of the survey?

<u>Group Type</u>	<u>Name of Organization</u>
(a0) Consumer Groups/Organizations	_____ V2a.1 _____ V2a _____
(b0) Family Member Groups	_____ V2b.1 _____ V2b _____
(c0) Mental Health Providers	_____ V2c.1 _____ V2c _____
(d) State Administrators	_____ V2d.1 _____ V2d _____
(e) Protection & Advocacy Groups	_____ V2e.1 _____ V2e _____
(f) MHSIP* staff	_____ V2f.1 _____ V2f _____
(g) Others (please list them)	_____ V2g.1 _____ V2g _____
<i>Total number of groups</i>	_____ V2h _____

*Mental Health Statistics Improvement Program

3. Specifically, was (were) (name of organization) involved in designing the questionnaire?
 administration? analyses?
 3.1 How would you rate their overall performance in (design/administration/analyses)?

(Rating Scale: 1.Very Poor 2.Poor 3.Fair 4.Good 5.Very Good 6. Excellent)

Constituent	Design/ Content	Administration	Analyses	
(a) Consumers	_____	_____	_____	V3a.1 _____ V3a.2 _____ V3a.3 _____
(b) Family Members	_____	_____	_____	V3b.1 _____ V3b.2 _____ V3b.3 _____
(c) Providers	_____	_____	_____	V3c.1 _____ V3c.2 _____ V3c.3 _____
(d) State Administrators	_____	_____	_____	V3d.1 _____ V3d.2 _____ V3d.3 _____
(e) Protection & Advocacy Groups	_____	_____	_____	V3e.1 _____ V3e.2 _____ V3e.3 _____
(f) MHSIP* Staff	_____	_____	_____	V3f.1 _____ V3f.2 _____ V3f.3 _____
(g) Others	_____	_____	_____	V3g.1 _____ V3g.2 _____ V3g.3 _____

*Mental Health Statistics Improvement Program

4. Has the MHSIP State Reform Grant supported the consumer survey?

(1) No. We are using these other sources: Source: (\$ or in-kind)

(estimate)

V4 _____

(3.1) (a) _____

(4.2) (b) _____

V4.1 _____

V4.11 _____

V4.2 _____

V4.21 _____

(2)Yes.

3.3 About how much of the MHSIP Grant supports the survey.

\$_____

V4.3_____

4.4 Do you have funds to support the consumer survey on a regular basis in the future? (1) No. (2) Yes.

V4.4_____

5. What target populations have been surveyed in your State? *Abbreviations: mental illness (MI), substance abuse (SA), developmental disability (DD)*

Target Group	Number Surveyed	
All adult consumers	_____	V5a _____
Adults with severe MI	_____	V5b _____
Adults with SA&MI	_____	V5c _____
Adults with DD&MI	_____	V5d _____
Other : _____	_____	V5e _____
		V5e.1 _____

The next set of questions concerns implementation of the consumer pilot survey in your state.

PILOT SURVEY

6. Did you conduct a pilot study for the consumer survey in your state? V6 _____
- (1) No. Please go to Question # 7.
- (2) Yes. If yes, these next few questions concern the pilot study.
- 6.1 What kind of sample was used for the pilot survey? V6.1 _____
- (a) Region/Area of State
 - (b) CMHCs. How many? _____
 - (c) Inpatients
 - (d) Consumer Groups/Organizations
 - (e) Others: _____
- V6.1b _____
- 6.2 How large was the pilot sample? N= _____ V6.1e _____
- V6.2 _____
- 6.2a Was this a random sample? 1) No 2) Yes V6.2a _____
- 5.3 What was the response rate?
- (a) Mail _____% V6.3a _____
 - (b) Face-to-face _____% V6.3b _____
 - (c) Telephone _____% V6.3c _____
 - (d) Self-Administered _____% V6.3d _____
- 4.1 Did you change the full survey based on the pilot?
Please explain.
- V6.4 _____

FULL SURVEY

7. Is the consumer survey implemented (or in the process of being) in your State? V7 _____

(1) No. Please go to Questions # 8.

(2) Yes. If yes, please answer the following questions:

7.1 What kind of sample is used for the full survey? V7.1 _____

(a) State-wide

(b) Region/Area of State

(c) CMHCs. How many? _____ V7.1c _____

(d) Inpatients

(e) Consumer Groups/Organizations

(f) Others: _____ V7.1f _____

7.11 Is/was this a random sample? 1) No 2) Yes V7.11 _____

V7.12 _____

7.12 If you are not implementing a statewide survey now, do you plan to do so? If so, when?

(1) No (2) Yes _____ (date).

V7.121 _____

7.2 How large is the sample in the full survey? N=_____

V7.2 _____

How is the survey administered? Please give response rate(s) for each type of survey.

Response Rate

(a) Mail _____% V7.3a _____

(b) Face-to-face _____% V7.3b _____

(c) Telephone _____% V7.3c _____

(d) Self-administered _____% V7.3d _____

(check all applicable)

8. Are consumers and/or family members used as interviewers in the survey? V8 _____
- (1) No. Please go to Question #9.
- (2) Yes. If yes, please answer the following questions:
- 7.1 How would you rate the overall quality of the consumers as interviewers?
 1.Very poor 2.Poor 3.Fair 4.Good 5.Very Good 6.Excellent
 V8.1 _____
- 8.2 How would you rate the overall quality of the family-members as interviewers?
 1. Very poor 2.Poor 3.Fair 4.Good 5.Very Good 6.Excellent
 V8.2 _____
- 7.3 Please comment on your experience using consumers or family members as interviewers.
 V8.3 _____
9. Are responses to the survey anonymous? V9 _____
- (2) Yes
 (1) No. If no, how do you handle issues of confidentiality?
10. What (are you doing/did you do) to address issues of cultural competence? V10 _____
11. If open-ended questions are used, how important are they to the consumer survey?
 V11 _____
1. Not important 2. Somewhat important 3. Important 4. Very Important
 5. Extremely Important
- 11.1 Please give your opinion on the value of the open-ended questions.
 V11.1 _____
12. About how many questions are on your survey? _____ V12 _____
- 12.1 About how long does it take your interviewers to complete one (1) interview for the consumer survey? _____
 (Record approx. time in whole minutes.)
 V12.1 _____
13. Is the length of your questionnaire too long, too short, or about right?
 (1) Too Long (2) Too Short (3) About Right
 V13 _____
- 12.1 Please mail us a copy of the questionnaire.

14. Do you ask any questions concerning Recovery? V14 _____
(1) No
(2) Yes

14.1 How do you define Recovery? V14.1 _____

14.2 How do you measure Recovery? V14.2 _____

The next few questions concern the findings obtained from the consumer survey.

15. Do you have any findings from the consumer survey? V15 _____
(1) No. (Go to *Question #16*).

(2) Yes. Please answer the following questions:

15.1 What was the reliability of the survey? V15.1 _____

(a) Test-retest _____

(b) Split-half _____

(c) Inter-item _____

(d) Inter-rater _____

(e) Other _____ V15.1e _____

15.2 How was/is the validity of the survey assessed? V15.2 _____
Please describe.

15.3 In the consumer survey, can responses be tracked
or matched by:

15.3.1 Consumer demographics? (1) No. (2) Yes.
(i.e., age, gender) V15.31 _____

15.3.2 Level of Functioning? (1) No. (2) Yes. V15.32 _____

15.4 If a report is available, please mail it to us.
(*Record name, address, and phone number of person promising to mail report*).

16. Based on your current experience, what approaches have been most successful in conducting the consumer survey? V16_____
(Probe: Is there any approach you would recommend to other states?)
17. What approaches have you found to be least successful in conducting the survey? V17_____
(Probe: Is there anything you have tried in your State that you would not do again?)
18. What are **three** significant problems or issues you faced in implementing the consumer survey in your State.
- | | |
|---|---------------|
| (a) lack of financial resources | V18a _____ |
| (b) poor response rate | V18ae.1 _____ |
| (c) time constraints | V18b _____ |
| (d) interdepartmental/inter-agency problems | V18be.1 _____ |
| (e) Other _____ | V18c _____ |
| | V18ce.1 _____ |
19. What are your future plans for the consumer survey? V19_____
(Probe: Do you have any plans to survey consumers again within the next year?)
20. How are the results of the consumer survey used in state policy (1), planning (2), and funding (3) decisions? V20_____
(Probe: How does the survey effect the State's decisions regarding mental health _____ (policy/planning/funding)?)
21. Is there any additional information that would be of interest to other states that are involved in consumer surveys? V21_____

Remember to send us copies of the questionnaire and any available reports on findings.

Our Mailing Address:
Caroline L. Kaufmann, Ph.D.
Kentucky Center for Mental Health Studies
1510 Newtown Pike, Suite M
Lexington, KY 40511
Thank you for answering these questions.

Appendix II

Data Codebook

CODEBOOK

STATENUM = 1-52; unique code for each state/territory

STATENAM = names for each state/territory

CONTACT = name and contact number for each contact person (1 per state/territory)

V1. Does your state survey or plan to survey mental health consumers concerning satisfaction with or usage of mental health services?

1= No, state is not planning to implement a survey (FINISHED).

2=Yes, state is planning to implement a survey

V1.1 Which of the following statements best applies to you?

a= State (or a subcontractor) has conducted one or more.

b= State is piloting its first consumer survey.

c= State has developed a survey and plans to implement it.

d= State is planning a survey that is not yet developed.

V1.11. Indicate the number of cycles completed so far.

1 – 80 = Valid code

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V1.12 When do you think the survey will be implemented?

Mm/dd/yy

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V2 Which sponsoring and/or participating organizations are taking part in content design, administration, and or analysis of the survey?

V2a. Consumer Groups/Organizations

1 = no

2 = yes

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V2a.1 (NAME of V2a)

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V2b. Family Member Groups

1 = no

2 = yes

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V2b.1 (NAME of V2b).

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V2c. Mental Health Providers

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v2c.1 (NAME of v2c)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V2d. State Administrators

1 = no (SKIP to v2e)
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v2d.1 (NAME of V2d)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V2e. Protection & Advocacy Groups

1 = no (SKIP to v2f)
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V2e.1 (NAME of V2e)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V2f. MHSIP staff

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V2f.1. (NAME of V2f)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V2g. Others

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V2g.1 (NAME of V2g)

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V2h. Total number of groups (V2a-V2g)

v3 Specifically, was (were) _____ involved in designing the questionnaire? administration? analysis of the survey?

How would you rate their overall performance in (design/administration/analysis)?

V3a.1 Consumers constituent area of involvement = content

1 = very poor

2 = poor

3 = fair

4 = good

5 = very good

6 = excellent

88 = DK

99 = NA/User missing

V3a.2 Consumers constituent area of involvement = administration

1 = very poor

2 = poor

3 = fair

4 = good

5 = very good

6 = excellent

88 = DK

99 = NA/User missing

V3a.3 Consumers constituent area of involvement = analyses

1 = very poor

2 = poor

3 = fair

4 = good

5 = very good

6 = excellent

88 = DK

99 = NA/User missing

V3b.1 Family Members constituent area of involvement = content

1 = very poor

2 = poor

3 = fair

4 = good

5 = very good

6 = excellent

88 = DK

99 = NA/User missing

V3b.2 Family Members constituent area of involvement = administration

- 1 = very poor
- 2 = poor
- 3 = fair
- 4 = good
- 5 = very good
- 6 = excellent
- 88 = DK
- 99 = NA/User missing

V3b.3 Family Members constituent area of involvement = analyses

- 1 = very poor
- 2 = poor
- 3 = fair
- 4 = good
- 5 = very good
- 6 = excellent
- 88 = DK
- 99 = NA/User missing

V3c.1 Providers constituent area of involvement = content

- 1 = very poor
- 2 = poor
- 3 = fair
- 4 = good
- 5 = very good
- 6 = excellent
- 88 = DK
- 99 = NA/User missing

V3c.2 Providers constituent area of involvement = administration

- 1 = very poor
- 2 = poor
- 3 = fair
- 4 = good
- 5 = very good
- 6 = excellent
- 88 = DK
- 99 = NA/User missing

V3c.3 Providers constituent area of involvement = analyses

- 1 = very poor
- 2 = poor
- 3 = fair
- 4 = good

5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User missing

V3d.1 State Administrators constituent area of involvement = content

1 = very poor
2 = poor
3 = fair
4 = good
5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User missing

V3d.2 State Administrators constituent area of involvement = administration

1 = very poor
2 = poor
3 = fair
4 = good
5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User missing

V3d.3 State Administrators constituent area of involvement = analyses

1 = very poor
2 = poor
3 = fair
4 = good
5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User missing

V3e.1 Protection and Advocacy Groups constituent area of involvement = content

1 = very poor
2 = poor
3 = fair
4 = good
5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User missing

V3e.2 Protection and Advocacy Groups constituent area of involvement = administration

1 = very poor

2 = poor
3 = fair
4 = good
5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User missing

V3e.3 Protection and Advocacy Groups area of involvement = analyses

1 = very poor
2 = poor
3 = fair
4 = good
5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User missing

V3f.1 MHSIP Staff constituent area of involvement = content

1 = very poor
2 = poor
3 = fair
4 = good
5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User missing

V3f.2 MHSIP Staff constituent area of involvement = administration

1 = very poor
2 = poor
3 = fair
4 = good
5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User missing

V3f.3 MHSIP Staff constituent area of involvement = analyses

1 = very poor
2 = poor
3 = fair
4 = good
5 = very good
6 = excellent
88 = DK

99 = NA/User missing

V3g.1 Others constituent area of involvement = content

1 = very poor

2 = poor

3 = fair

4 = good

5 = very good

6 = excellent

88 = DK

99 = NA/User missing

V3g.2 Others constituent area of involvement = administration

1 = very poor

2 = poor

3 = fair

4 = good

5 = very good

6 = excellent

88 = DK

99 = NA/User missing

V3g.3 Others constituent area of involvement = analyses

1 = very poor

2 = poor

3 = fair

4 = good

5 = very good

6 = excellent

88 = DK

99 = NA/User missing

v4 Has the MHSIP State Reform Grant supported the consumer survey?

1 =No

2 = Yes

88 = DK

99 = NA/User missing

V4.1 (NAME of SOURCE1)

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V4.11 Amount of Source 1

1-9999999 = Valid code

88888888 = DK

99999999 = NA/User Missing

v4.2 (NAME of SOURCE2)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v4.21 Amount of Source 2

1-9999999 = Valid code
88888888 = DK
99999999 = NA/User Missing

v4.3 About how much of the Grant supports the survey?

1-9999999 = Valid code
88888888 = DK
99999999 = NA/User Missing

v4.4 Do you have funds to support the adult consumer survey on a regular basis in the future.

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v5 What target populations have been surveyed in your State?

V5a All adult consumers

0-9999999 = # surveyed
88888888 = DK
99999999 = NA/User Missing

V5b Adults with severe MI

0-9999999 = # surveyed
88888888 = DK
99999999 = NA/User Missing

V5c Adults with SA&MI

0-9999999 = # surveyed
88888888 = DK
99999999 = NA/User Missing

V5d Adults with DD&MI

0-9999999 = # surveyed
88888888 = DK
99999999 = NA/User Missing

V5e Other

0-9999999 = # surveyed

88888888 = DK
99999999 = NA/User Missing

V5e.1 (NAME of V5e)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V6 Did you conduct a pilot study for the consumers survey in your state?

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v6.1 What kind of sample was used for the pilot survey?

a = Region/Area of State
b = CMHC
c = Inpatients
d = Consumer Groups/Organizations
e = Other
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v6.1b 0-87 = # of CMHCs
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v6.1e (NAME of Other)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v6.2 How large was the pilot sample?

1 – 9999999 = Valid code
88888888 = DK
99999999 = NA/User Missing

v6.2a 1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v6.3 What was the response rate?

V6.3a Mail

0-100 = Valid code
888 = DK
999 = NA/User Missing

- v6.3b Face-to-face
- 0-100 = Valid code
888 = DK
999 = NA/User Missing
- v6.3c Telephone
- 0-100 = Valid code
888 = DK
999 = NA/User Missing
- v6.3d Self-administered
- 0-100 = Valid code
888 = DK
999 = NA/User Missing
- v6.4 Did you change the full survey based on the pilot? Please explain.
- 1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing
- 5.41 How?
- (Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing
- v7 Is the consumer survey implemented (or in the process of being) in your State?
- 1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing
- v7.1 What kind of sample is used for the full survey?
- a = State-wide
b = Region/Area of State
c = CMHCs
d = Inpatients
e = Consumer Groups/Organizations
f = Others
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing
- v7.1c 0-87 = #of CMHCs
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v7.1f (NAME of OTHERS)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

6.11 Is/was this a random sample?

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v7.12 If you are not implementing a statewide survey now, do you plan to do so?

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v7.121 If so, when?

Mm/dd/yy
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V7.2 How large is the sample in the full survey?

1 – 9999999 = Valid code
88888888 = DK
99999999 = NA/User Missing

v7.3 How is the survey administered?

V7.3a Mail

0-100 = Valid code
888 = DK
999 = NA/User Missing

7.3b Face-to-face

0-100 = Valid code
888 = DK
999 = NA/User Missing

7.3c Telephone

0-100 = Valid code
888 = DK
999 = NA/User Missing

7.3d Self-administered

0-100 = Valid code
888 = DK
999 = NA/User Missing

v8 Are consumers and /or family members used as interviewers in the survey?

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v8.1 How would you rate the overall quality of the consumer interviewers?

1= Very poor
2= Poor
3= Fair
4= Good
5= Very good
6= Excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V8.2 How would you rate the overall quality of the family-member interviewers?

1= Very poor
2= Poor
3= Fair
4= Good
5= Very good
6= Excellent
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V8.3 Please comment on your experience using consumers or family members in the survey.

(Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v9 Are responses to the survey anonymous?

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v9.1 If no, how do you handle issues of confidentiality?

(Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v10 What (are you doing/did you do) to address issues of cultural competence?

(Comments – Text)

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

v11 If open-ended questions are used, how important are they to the consumer survey?

1= Not important

2= Somewhat important

3= Important

4= Very Important

5= Extremely Important

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V11.1 Please give your opinion on the value of the open-ended questions.

(Comments – Text)

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

v12 About how many questions are on the survey?

1-800 = # of questions

888 = DK

999 = NA/User Missing

v12.1 About how long does it take your interviewers to complete one (1) interview for the consumer survey?

1-800 = # of minutes

888 = DK

999 = NA/User Missing

v13 Is the length of your questionnaire too long, too short, or about right?

1= Too long

2= Too short

3=About right

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V14 Do you ask any questions concerning recovery?

1 = no

2 = yes

88 = DK

99 = NA/User Missing

V14.1 How do you define recovery?

(Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V14.2 How do you measure recovery?

(Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V15 Do you have any findings from the consumer survey?

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v15.1a What was the reliability of the survey?

1 = Test-retest
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v15.1b

1 = Split-half
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v15.1c

1 = Inter-item
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v15.1d

1 = Inter-rater
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v15.1e1

1 = Other
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v15.1e2 (NAME of other)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v15.2 How was the validity of the survey assessed? Please describe

(Comments – Text) 88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v15.31 In the consumer survey, can responses be tracked or matched by consumer demographics?

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v15.32 In the consumer survey, can responses be tracked or matched by level of functioning?

1 = no
2 = yes
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v16 Based on your current experience, what approaches have been most successful in conducting the consumer survey?

(Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v17 What approaches have you found to be the least successful in conducting the survey?

(Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v18a What are the three most significant problems or issues you faced in implementing the consumer survey in your State?

a = lack of financial resources
b = poor response rate
c = time constraints
d = interdepartmental/inter-agency problems
e = Other
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v18ae.1 (Comments – Text)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v18b What are three significant problems or issues you faced in implementing the consumer survey in your State?

b = poor response rate
c = time constraints

d = interdepartmental/inter-agency problems
e = Other
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v18be.1 (Comments – Text)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v18c What are three significant problems or issues you faced in implementing the consumer survey in your State?

c = time constraints
d = interdepartmental/inter-agency problems
e = Other
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v18ce.1 (Comments – Text)

88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

v19 What are your future plans for the consumer survey?

(Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V20 How are the results of the consumer survey used in state policy (1), planning (2), and funding (3) decisions?

(Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing

V21 Is there any additional information that would be of interest to other States that are involved in consumer surveys?

(Comments – Text)
88 = DK
99 = NA/User Missing