
Appendix G: Data Usage

G.1 Instructions for Using Weights

For the purposes of design-based (variance) estimation, the data file includes the following design variables:

- WT_A, WT_C, adjusted survey weights for adult-level and child-level estimates and analyses
- STRATA, a stratum indicator for generating design-based variance estimators

Sampling variances for the weighted estimates that account for the complex sample design can be computed with statistical software such as SUDAAN, STATA, or SAS.

An example SUDAAN statement would necessitate a Nest statement where STRATUM is specified, and a Design statement with a “WR” specification for a with-replacement sampling design (approximation).

An example follows for a health insurance variable (INSRD_A) that is tabulated by region.

```
Proc Descript Data="OMAS.ssd" Filetype=sas Design=WR;
Weight WT_A;
Nest STRATA;
Var INSRD_A_IMP;
Tables REGION;
Class REGION;
Title "OMAS, Percent of adults insured by region";
Print Percent SEPercent;
```

The example SAS code below shows how to compute the weighted percentage of adults insured statewide.

```
Proc Surveymeans Data= OMAS mean;
Stratum STRATA;
Weight WT_A;
Var INSRD_A_IMP;
Class INSRD_A_IMP;
Domain REGION;
run;
```

The example STATA code below shows how to compute the weighted percentage of adults uninsured statewide.

```
svyset _n [pweight=wt_a], strata(strata) vce(linearized) singleunit(certainty)
xi, noomit: svy: tabulate INSRD_A_IMP, level(95) ci deff
```

G.2 Limitations and Cautions When Using the Data

The 2015 OMAS carries with it the following limitations and cautions regarding use of the data:

- The data were collected via telephone only. A telephone-only approach precluded the ability to:
 - Collect information from consumers of the sampled population without valid telephone numbers.
 - Maximize the number of attempts to reach nonrespondents; a mail and telephone survey method would increase the number of attempts.
 - Reach respondents in a manner that is most suitable for themselves; for example, respondents with limited speaking abilities may be more likely to conduct the survey via mail because they would not be required to talk to an interviewer.
 - Minimize bias that may result from only one mode of data collection; a study conducted in 1998 with the SF-36 questionnaire found that younger adults were more likely to refuse to participate when the study was administered via mail, while older adults were more likely to refuse telephone interviews (Perkins & Sanson-Fisher, 1998).
- Interviews were only conducted with households that could speak English or Spanish well enough to be interviewed. Thus, non-English- and non-Spanish-speaking households were excluded from the survey. As identified by the final dispositions, less than one-tenth of 1% of households contacted were unable to complete the survey because of a language barrier situation.
- The literature indicates that the use of proxies can introduce bias to the survey results. A number of studies have shown consistent differences between self- and proxy reporting (Bassett et al., 1990; Ellis et al., 2003; Epstein et al., 1989; Kovar & Wright, 1973; Mathiowetz & Groves, 1985; Todorov, 2003). The research has shown that proxies have difficulty measuring another person's behaviors or disabilities because they have a different perception of the behavior or disability when it is not their own. The availability of the information also can be an issue when using proxies because they may not have the direct knowledge to accurately respond about another person's behavior or opinions. Proxies were limited to cases where the selected household member had a long-term or permanent physical or mental impairment. Of the more than 42,000 cases in the final data file, fewer than 1% were completed by proxy. Unrelated to the adult section, the child section was always by proxy.
- The inability to verify the information collected—and the reliance on self-reported insurance status and health behaviors—is another limitation of the study. Although both live and recorded interviewer monitoring verified the information as recorded by the interviewers, this survey's protocols did not allow for the verification of respondent's insurance status—by obtaining a copy of their insurance card. Research has shown that differences occur when comparing claims data and medical records to self-reported information provided in a telephone survey (Fowles et al., 1999).

The above limitations as they relate to the ability to use the 2015 OMAS data are standard to any RDD telephone survey in that:

- The data can only be generalized to the population surveyed (i.e., the information cannot be generalized to households without telephones).
- Comparisons made to other data sources for Ohio must be done with the understanding that differences in the data could result from differences in the how the survey was designed and conducted—not necessarily because of actual differences in the population of interest.
- To maximize coverage when conducting a telephone study, using a dual frame of landline and cell phone numbers is necessary. The 2015 OMAS used an overlapping dual frame design. This design included respondents who could have been captured from either frame. This poses several methodological challenges related to a person with both a landline and cell phone having multiple chances of being selected. As discussed in the section on weighting, the 2015 OMAS used a single-frame estimation technique to account for this overlap and to ensure proper weights for inference to the target population.
- When considering subpopulations sizes with OMAS data analysis, the OMAS OMAS EC recommends using the National Center for Health Statistics guidelines for health surveillance suppression of cell sizes of 10 or less to protect against the likelihood of a breach of potential identification (<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/misc/staffmanual2004.pdf>).

G.3 Survey Dispositions

The following presents the final dispositions for the entire study overall, and by region stratum, and county. For details, see *Tables G-1 through G-4*.

- 1.1 Interview
- 1.2 Partial Interview
- 1.3 Refusals
- 2.2 Noncontact
- 3.1 Unknown, No Answer
- 3.2 Unknown Household
- 3.9 Unknown Other
- 4.2 Fax/Data Line
- 4.3 Nonworking, Disconnected Number
- 4.4 Tech Circumstance (incl. Changed Number, Cellular Phones, Pagers)
- 4.5 Nonresidence (incl. Businesses, Dorms)
- 4.7 No Eligible Respondent (incl. No Adults, Not Qualified for Oversample)

Table G-1. Final Dispositions Overall

Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
Landline	15,279	1,372	24,163	596	37	21,471	76,809	7,346	14,049	494	38,250	74,441
Cell	24,453	2,264	32,536	9,047	3,745	46,260	92,552	170	25,843	279	9,990	96,705
Overall	39,732	3,636	56,699	9,643	3,782	67,731	169,361	7,516	39,892	773	48,240	171,146

Table G-2. Final Dispositions by Medicaid Region

Medicaid Region No.	Sampling Medicaid Region	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
1	North Central	2,541	217	3,610	669	310	4,643	11,172	588	3,054	44	3,343	15,463
2	Northeast	10,845	1,045	16,232	3,221	1,199	21,830	53,923	2,576	13,317	248	16,118	44,649
3	Northeast Central	3,164	265	5,034	845	347	5,610	15,168	651	4,142	70	4,192	11,733
4	Northwest	2,663	223	3,705	551	243	3,899	9,627	250	2,183	32	2,018	8,466
5	South Central	7,554	692	9,881	1,378	492	10,208	28,716	1,323	6,717	145	7,996	28,969
6	Southeast	3,635	329	4,833	803	344	5,559	12,795	358	2,749	61	2,707	12,169
7	Southwest	9,330	865	13,404	2,176	847	15,982	37,960	1,770	7,730	173	11,866	49,697

Table G-3. Final Dispositions by County Type

Region No.	Sampling County Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
1	Rural Appalachian	6,532	603	8,554	1,456	603	10,354	23,395	761	4,702	112	5,110	24,217
2	Metro	20,877	1,962	32,999	5,803	2,179	40,270	102,785	4,982	24,369	469	31,448	102,330
3	Rural Non-Appalachian	5,894	507	8,028	1,247	544	8,830	21,625	727	5,627	95	5,024	22,690
4	Suburban	6,429	564	7,118	1,137	456	8,277	21,556	1,046	5,194	97	6,658	21,909

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
1	Adams County	LL	41	3	64	1	0	37	164	8	42	1	61	379
2	Allen County	LL	64	3	104	1	0	88	362	37	134	3	215	115
3	Ashland County	LL	51	3	71	0	0	48	236	27	30	2	137	411
4	Ashtabula County	LL	111	6	130	0	0	102	391	27	62	2	191	98
5	Athens County	LL	62	7	84	0	0	63	269	27	28	0	131	689
6	Auglaize County	LL	45	3	80	4	0	46	220	18	55	1	84	193
7	Belmont County	LL	103	8	213	0	0	89	376	29	58	3	238	165
8	Brown County	LL	47	2	47	0	0	35	146	18	18	0	71	253
9	Butler County—Hispanic Surname	LL	47	5	77	2	0	95	237	6	39	0	40	158
10	Butler County—Asian Surname	LL	70	8	155	4	0	147	320	21	48	1	32	157
11	Butler County	LL	334	32	580	18	4	520	1,610	178	268	14	1,072	2,808
12	Carroll County	LL	37	2	47	2	0	30	139	7	21	1	80	325
13	Champaign County	LL	46	2	66	2	0	28	133	6	17	3	63	121
14	Clark County	LL	193	13	257	1	0	159	654	61	96	4	324	619
15	Clermont County—Asian Surname	LL	40	2	73	0	1	63	150	4	9	0	20	119
16	Clermont County	LL	195	13	342	7	1	286	814	90	179	6	405	1,602
17	Clinton County	LL	32	6	44	4	0	38	166	20	39	1	110	478
18	Columbiana County	LL	118	9	171	7	0	107	368	45	67	1	205	688
19	Coshocton County	LL	48	2	67	1	0	25	195	16	21	0	72	153
20	Crawford County	LL	52	1	74	1	0	43	253	19	40	1	95	368

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
21	Cuyahoga County—Hispanic Surname	LL	323	43	554	25	1	752	1,570	60	229	11	140	1,225
22	Cuyahoga County—Asian Surname	LL	205	20	424	13	1	546	1,326	48	155	5	68	771
23	Cuyahoga County—AA Low Density	LL	552	46	915	37	4	1,187	4,005	499	556	31	2,663	3,048
24	Cuyahoga County—AA Medium Density	LL	294	33	532	21	0	534	1,982	221	335	23	1,263	1,226
25	Cuyahoga County—AA High Density	LL	296	30	527	9	0	417	1,455	198	323	5	874	652
26	Darke County	LL	39	4	66	0	0	28	153	9	20	1	77	600
27	Defiance County	LL	51	0	85	0	0	54	170	17	28	5	133	180
28	Delaware County—Asian Surname	LL	25	2	43	0	0	36	117	9	13	0	6	108
29	Delaware County	LL	130	13	190	1	1	210	895	85	99	6	489	2,125
30	Erie County	LL	93	14	143	8	0	129	550	50	89	3	271	339
31	Fairfield County	LL	157	9	253	3	0	139	547	54	90	2	322	1,012
32	Fayette County	LL	41	1	61	0	0	37	172	9	25	0	94	39
33	Franklin County—Hispanic Surname	LL	212	24	313	2	0	278	807	47	146	8	78	442
34	Franklin County—Asian Surname	LL	267	23	405	5	2	366	1,010	65	128	1	88	468
35	Franklin County—AA Low Density	LL	578	43	741	10	0	657	3,655	345	461	26	1,917	1,773

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
36	Franklin County—AA Medium Density	LL	402	38	565	3	1	415	1,892	210	363	13	999	2,040
37	Franklin County—AA High Density	LL	450	57	556	2	0	391	1,667	226	356	16	1,032	587
38	Fulton County	LL	45	3	57	1	0	42	153	21	26	0	86	34
39	Gallia County	LL	64	7	54	0	0	30	130	18	34	0	101	62
40	Geauga County	LL	108	14	196	3	0	224	693	94	105	7	337	389
41	Greene County—Asian Surname	LL	47	6	78	2	1	85	182	8	25	1	12	66
42	Greene County	LL	188	13	271	2	0	255	813	85	104	4	473	533
43	Guernsey County	LL	36	3	56	0	0	35	156	18	16	2	89	157
44	Hamilton County—Hispanic Surname	LL	83	12	125	8	0	164	366	20	56	0	45	255
45	Hamilton County—Asian Surname	LL	167	15	274	1	0	295	624	19	60	2	83	322
46	Hamilton County—AA Low Density	LL	293	24	440	7	0	401	1,278	178	186	14	930	2,548
47	Hamilton County—AA Medium Density	LL	279	26	423	3	3	450	1,473	176	208	7	910	3,908
48	Hamilton County—AA High Density	LL	391	39	571	11	1	568	2,104	321	327	32	1,710	7,847
49	Hancock County	LL	64	2	103	8	0	97	346	27	60	2	246	273
50	Hardin County	LL	34	2	43	1	0	32	113	10	23	2	60	248
51	Harrison County	LL	27	1	45	3	1	22	115	9	23	0	64	168
52	Henry County	LL	31	0	44	1	0	28	103	14	18	0	50	55

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
53	Highland County	LL	43	4	70	0	0	36	165	13	26	0	71	140
54	Hocking County	LL	47	5	92	0	0	37	152	12	21	0	76	287
55	Holmes County	LL	22	2	44	3	0	44	180	29	36	2	169	185
56	Huron County	LL	46	3	75	3	0	57	273	19	48	3	128	564
57	Jackson County	LL	51	3	58	0	1	25	151	11	101	2	78	238
58	Jefferson County	LL	89	11	126	2	0	81	295	22	57	2	149	165
59	Knox County	LL	89	12	116	1	0	81	410	26	57	2	219	88
60	Lake County—Hispanic Surname	LL	42	14	103	2	0	112	274	4	49	0	25	80
61	Lake County—Asian Surname	LL	40	5	68	1	0	100	200	5	34	2	13	91
62	Lake County	LL	179	17	307	18	0	389	1,053	112	223	14	711	393
63	Lawrence County	LL	61	2	88	1	0	47	258	20	41	0	69	197
64	Licking County	LL	270	17	420	1	1	226	1,023	94	126	5	487	1,087
65	Logan County	LL	28	1	30	0	0	16	98	9	13	0	40	753
66	Lorain County—Hispanic Surname	LL	106	15	205	3	0	168	655	15	91	3	50	138
67	Lorain County—Asian Surname	LL	49	1	75	0	0	58	191	11	35	2	17	67
68	Lorain County	LL	297	27	531	5	1	450	1,822	181	282	12	943	737
69	Lucas County—Hispanic Surname	LL	130	11	210	4	0	194	526	17	100	3	38	196
70	Lucas County—Asian Surname	LL	86	11	134	0	0	130	312	15	46	0	18	98

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
71	Lucas County—AA Low Density	LL	281	18	466	35	1	494	1,546	196	300	6	1,035	1,163
72	Lucas County—AA Medium Density	LL	48	7	69	4	0	73	252	40	60	4	255	619
73	Lucas County—AA High Density	LL	111	15	175	8	0	302	640	101	207	7	582	4,025
74	Madison County	LL	51	6	73	1	0	33	182	25	46	4	106	185
75	Mahoning County—Hispanic Surname	LL	57	6	118	1	0	103	236	12	100	1	32	92
76	Mahoning County	LL	185	19	342	21	1	295	1,107	117	170	5	707	778
77	Marion County	LL	64	8	84	2	0	56	258	29	23	2	146	308
78	Medina County	LL	133	5	228	11	0	269	883	97	115	2	480	929
79	Meigs County	LL	40	2	70	0	0	33	149	12	22	0	50	356
80	Mercer County	LL	31	1	56	1	0	26	122	3	24	0	70	191
81	Miami County	LL	129	13	211	6	1	190	664	53	116	7	364	736
82	Monroe County	LL	60	3	96	0	1	22	132	10	36	0	45	93
83	Montgomery County—Hispanic Surname	LL	58	6	88	3	1	108	225	9	35	1	22	113
84	Montgomery County	LL	102	6	142	0	0	134	337	8	53	1	30	111
85	Montgomery County—AA Low Density	LL	249	17	360	1	0	343	1,180	98	189	9	698	1,052
86	Montgomery County—AA Medium Density	LL	32	3	29	0	0	32	196	29	24	1	166	186
87	Montgomery County—AA High Density	LL	436	53	660	5	0	425	2,591	150	401	7	702	1,101

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
88	Morgan County	LL	47	3	41	1	0	18	95	12	25	0	23	24
89	Morrow County	LL	14	1	25	2	0	19	102	5	25	0	27	18
90	Muskingum County	LL	98	11	164	6	0	72	332	29	75	1	201	152
91	Noble County	LL	29	0	39	3	0	15	100	10	13	3	33	291
92	Ottawa County	LL	29	2	38	5	0	44	178	19	34	2	84	412
93	Paulding County	LL	44	4	69	3	0	31	134	17	40	0	50	203
94	Perry County	LL	49	1	90	1	0	30	134	12	24	2	58	274
95	Pickaway County	LL	69	7	101	6	0	55	324	16	50	1	138	664
96	Pike County	LL	42	5	50	1	0	28	131	8	27	1	54	172
97	Portage County	LL	201	14	292	11	2	319	1,194	118	208	8	603	541
98	Preble County	LL	32	3	62	1	0	32	158	12	39	0	85	409
99	Putnam County	LL	44	0	58	0	0	21	124	7	23	0	46	19
100	Richland County	LL	151	15	266	1	0	173	809	65	213	4	379	140
101	Ross County	LL	88	4	129	3	0	51	234	23	62	1	104	100
102	Sandusky County	LL	59	7	116	4	1	85	416	39	128	1	210	308
103	Scioto County	LL	115	10	151	0	0	80	454	35	77	4	200	874
104	Seneca County	LL	36	2	55	4	0	41	252	18	30	0	92	211
105	Shelby County	LL	40	6	75	3	0	39	210	19	19	0	90	424
106	Stark County—Hispanic Surname	LL	50	4	102	0	0	87	236	8	44	1	25	36
107	Stark County—Asian Surname	LL	43	6	102	0	0	66	220	3	103	0	19	44
108	Stark County	LL	662	47	1,019	43	1	945	3,566	388	934	26	1,969	940

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
109	Summit County—Hispanic Surname	LL	54	5	121	2	0	121	256	15	102	3	25	112
110	Summit County—Asian Surname	LL	113	12	164	3	0	183	468	19	111	0	32	110
111	Summit County	LL	752	74	1,247	53	0	1,322	5,302	494	1,112	29	2,926	2,293
112	Trumbull County	LL	229	17	375	6	0	281	1,105	110	239	6	534	377
113	Tuscarawas County	LL	80	6	122	7	2	107	420	44	51	1	242	568
114	Union County	LL	51	4	85	1	0	74	341	26	86	2	180	508
115	Van Wert County	LL	41	2	53	0	0	41	147	18	21	0	91	100
116	Vinton County	LL	11	1	23	1	0	13	69	4	55	3	31	199
117	Warren County—Asian Surname	LL	57	3	97	0	0	95	190	13	24	0	18	100
118	Warren County	LL	189	23	425	24	1	454	1,215	146	411	9	665	1,253
119	Washington County	LL	82	8	96	0	0	55	217	13	66	1	135	174
120	Wayne County	LL	94	4	141	2	0	127	411	59	95	1	252	262
121	Williams County	LL	46	6	58	1	0	39	154	14	45	1	114	300
122	Wood County	LL	68	5	157	9	0	136	446	57	124	1	302	715
123	Wyandot County	LL	20	4	37	1	0	30	102	13	49	0	66	173
124	Adams County	CELL	15	1	21	5	2	27	55	0	8	1	2	38
125	Allen County	CELL	532	49	673	130	54	682	1,538	1	408	4	171	1,418
126	Ashland County	CELL	165	10	242	47	34	262	576	1	217	2	31	543
127	Ashtabula County	CELL	278	33	400	119	46	650	1,074	0	308	3	75	1,082
128	Athens County	CELL	413	37	444	143	49	760	1,213	1	279	11	80	1,067

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
129	Auglaize County	CELL	11	1	21	3	3	12	29	0	11	0	0	30
130	Belmont County	CELL	94	7	140	49	42	354	538	1	44	8	37	420
131	Brown County	CELL	71	7	112	14	8	129	232	0	73	1	15	237
132	Butler County	CELL	181	11	256	94	52	461	734	0	206	0	91	635
134	Champaign County	CELL	31	1	35	10	2	73	103	0	45	0	8	107
135	Clark County	CELL	283	37	363	110	39	441	982	0	321	1	89	896
136	Clermont County	CELL	46	2	59	24	13	160	253	1	114	1	38	273
137	Clinton County	CELL	94	7	146	21	12	204	314	0	111	5	32	361
138	Columbiana County	CELL	123	17	181	50	21	256	548	0	85	0	37	590
139	Coshocton County	CELL	99	12	122	27	12	178	363	0	138	2	30	373
140	Crawford County	CELL	28	1	59	14	5	75	162	0	54	0	8	160
141	Cuyahoga County—AA Low Density	CELL	79	10	131	48	21	239	772	3	635	2	46	1,367
142	Cuyahoga County—AA High Density	CELL	1,536	157	1,860	651	240	3,084	5,874	1	2,314	19	816	7,794
143	Darke County	CELL	133	9	236	57	22	265	583	0	137	5	45	627
144	Defiance County	CELL	99	9	130	27	25	244	346	1	100	2	23	304
145	Delaware County	CELL	140	10	177	42	19	229	452	0	170	1	46	496
146	Erie County	CELL	200	15	246	63	32	345	645	4	188	6	74	723
147	Fairfield County	CELL	199	27	258	51	26	264	729	0	235	2	57	650
148	Fayette County	CELL	16	2	32	4	4	42	84	0	21	0	4	43
149	Franklin County—AA Low Density	CELL	50	6	56	21	3	134	288	1	235	3	31	548

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
150	Franklin County—AA High Density	CELL	2,274	188	2,648	641	215	3,021	6,925	15	2,266	17	1,019	7,573
151	Fulton County	CELL	15	1	20	2	4	30	63	0	33	1	5	42
152	Gallia County	CELL	65	6	82	31	8	164	248	0	27	1	17	269
153	Geauga County	CELL	48	4	65	17	6	122	188	0	107	2	28	226
154	Greene County	CELL	11	0	11	3	1	26	57	0	57	0	6	195
155	Guernsey County	CELL	179	17	226	68	18	398	635	1	121	4	55	717
156	Hamilton County	CELL	2,228	192	2,950	896	354	4,625	8,229	8	1,669	17	1,254	9,995
157	Hancock County	CELL	377	34	483	113	43	617	1,141	3	244	4	119	1,073
158	Hardin County	CELL	52	5	78	10	3	85	196	0	53	2	9	157
159	Harrison County	CELL	28	4	46	11	5	84	160	0	35	0	2	164
160	Henry County	CELL	44	3	48	7	5	78	158	0	48	0	16	144
161	Highland County	CELL	127	10	160	40	15	237	394	0	101	0	27	434
162	Hocking County	CELL	92	11	126	35	12	184	329	0	111	0	10	264
163	Holmes County	CELL	102	7	193	26	10	208	393	0	182	0	49	427
164	Huron County	CELL	147	15	250	71	22	323	662	0	200	2	38	630
165	Jackson County	CELL	65	6	107	14	5	165	282	0	33	1	13	245
166	Jefferson County	CELL	117	12	148	66	29	438	609	1	58	1	32	495
167	Knox County	CELL	353	38	510	80	43	477	1,100	0	414	3	127	1,086
168	Lake County	CELL	835	71	1,188	420	176	1,991	3,810	0	851	8	437	4,107
169	Lawrence County	CELL	82	13	130	47	10	249	411	0	76	4	17	396
170	Licking County	CELL	283	24	390	84	23	397	1,033	0	402	2	82	995
171	Logan County	CELL	182	16	280	49	32	290	583	0	165	1	34	638

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
172	Lorain County	CELL	581	56	770	326	98	1,202	2,332	1	751	4	211	2,401
173	Lucas County	CELL	1,360	112	1,736	489	244	2,451	5,116	72	1,462	13	601	5,984
174	Madison County	CELL	41	5	55	13	5	105	180	0	66	0	23	147
175	Mahoning County	CELL	549	70	788	277	107	1,239	2,564	0	406	8	293	2,241
176	Marion County	CELL	268	24	386	93	27	449	896	2	334	2	64	860
177	Medina County	CELL	269	22	371	134	50	587	1,163	3	368	0	133	1,090
178	Meigs County	CELL	34	3	47	16	9	135	198	0	31	1	0	170
179	Mercer County	CELL	393	27	557	91	42	569	1,546	2	225	1	107	1,094
180	Miami County	CELL	148	18	184	37	15	221	483	0	165	1	58	464
181	Monroe County	CELL	44	2	74	18	17	142	267	0	27	2	9	189
182	Montgomery County	CELL	1,907	186	2,639	728	280	3,437	6,929	2	1,540	14	909	7,095
183	Morgan County	CELL	26	1	23	2	6	45	62	0	11	0	2	53
184	Morrow County	CELL	90	4	98	23	5	148	203	0	86	0	17	225
185	Muskingum County	CELL	235	32	389	83	44	452	1,016	3	229	5	67	882
186	Noble County	CELL	32	5	52	10	9	95	140	0	25	0	12	368
187	Ottawa County	CELL	25	0	46	11	4	60	104	0	56	2	10	215
188	Paulding County	CELL	25	3	35	4	3	87	126	0	38	0	4	104
189	Perry County	CELL	37	3	62	9	2	96	149	0	19	0	6	118
190	Pickaway County	CELL	111	10	162	29	19	188	441	0	140	2	27	346
191	Pike County	CELL	53	8	68	17	5	99	208	1	27	1	15	218
192	Portage County	CELL	146	7	170	57	32	267	517	0	235	4	45	637
193	Preble County	CELL	68	5	113	21	14	146	243	0	48	1	15	229

(continued)

Table G-4. Final Disposition by Sampling Stratum (continued)

Stratum	Stratum Description	Phone Type	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.9	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.7
194	Putnam County	CELL	88	11	140	15	12	154	392	4	93	1	22	252
195	Richland County	CELL	425	42	607	107	47	652	1,463	0	429	7	138	1,358
196	Ross County	CELL	383	49	568	124	54	701	1,403	3	222	10	127	1,388
197	Sandusky County	CELL	120	9	177	33	24	246	528	5	160	2	33	568
198	Scioto County	CELL	251	23	370	94	27	577	1,148	3	155	5	69	1,005
199	Seneca County	CELL	92	7	121	27	11	195	510	8	167	3	36	593
200	Shelby County	CELL	238	38	334	62	28	393	923	3	202	1	97	734
201	Stark County	CELL	857	78	1,162	378	154	1,629	3,684	6	1,165	7	333	3,598
202	Summit County	CELL	1,446	123	1,817	643	288	2,937	5,921	6	1,793	17	706	5,822
203	Trumbull County	CELL	166	13	243	78	41	342	826	1	219	1	31	913
204	Tuscarawas County	CELL	231	22	349	86	45	506	1,113	0	195	3	110	907
205	Union County	CELL	86	11	100	15	7	107	228	0	64	2	33	227
206	Van Wert County	CELL	126	6	172	40	13	199	422	1	103	1	26	377
208	Warren County	CELL	21	5	25	3	4	25	54	0	75	0	11	118
209	Washington County	CELL	246	20	295	94	32	524	939	0	117	1	76	791
210	Wayne County	CELL	434	35	487	147	63	747	1,394	0	445	7	169	1,291
211	Williams County	CELL	55	8	60	14	7	91	187	0	41	1	10	151
212	Wood County	CELL	99	5	113	36	25	191	346	1	179	0	47	353
213	Wyandot County	CELL	25	1	32	8	1	45	95	0	20	0	6	75

