**Description of Sampling Procedures for 1997, 2000, 2007 Waves of NC1030 Data**

**Description of the Sampling Procedures for the 1997 Data**

1. The 1997 NFBS used a household sampling frame. The sample was limited to families (defined as a group of people related by blood, marriage, or adoption who shared a common dwelling unit) in which at least one person owned or managed a family business. Another criterion of the sample was work intensity in the business as assessed by length of time in business and number of hours per week of involvement. To qualify for this study, the owner-manager had to have been in business for a least 1 year, worked at least 6 hours per week year-round or a minimum of 312 hours a year in the business, be involved in its day-to-day management and reside with another family member.
2. Data collection involved four instruments. The first, the screening instrument, was piloted and developed to ascertain whether the household contained a family business (Heck & Scannell, 1997). Three interview schedules formed the core data collection instruments---one schedule for the household manager, one for the business manager, and one combined interview if the household manager and the business manager were the same individual. After verifying eligibility, the respondent was asked to identify the household manager, the business manager, and the family financial manager. The household manager was defined as “the person who actually manages the household, that is, the one who takes care of most of the meal preparation, laundry, cleaning, scheduling of family activities, and overseeing child care.” The business manager had to be an “owner-manager in business for at least a year, worked at least six hours per week year-round or a minimum of 312 hours a year in the business, been involved in its day-to-day management, and resided with another family member.” [From Winter et al. (1998) Revisiting the study of family business: Methodological challenges, dilemmas, and alternative approaches. Family Business Review, 11 (3), 239-252.] The instruments were administered to household members that met the study criteria.
3. The national sample was purchased from Survey Sampling in Fairfield, Connecticut, a commercial firm that provides samples based on specified sampling frames. Because the interviews were administered by telephone, the sample frame consisted of all households with a listed telephone.
4. During 1997, the Iowa State University Statistical Laboratory screened 14,115 U.S. households, resulting in 1,116 eligible family households. At the completion of interviewing, the 1997 NFBS consisted of 794 families with a family business, a 71% response rate. The response rate for the 708 completed business interviews was 63.4%. Households with a family business that completed both the business and household interviews numbered 673, a 60.3 response rate. Missing data were imputed. For further details concerning methods of the 1997 NFBS, see Winter et al. (1998). [This is a direct quote from Heck R.K.Z., & Scannell Trent, E. (1999) The prevalence of family business from a household sample*. Family Business Review*, XII, 209-224.]
5. **Description of the Sampling Procedures for the 2000 Data**
   1. To provide data about family businesses over time, researchers decided to reinterview the 1997 NSFB sample three years later (Winter et al, 2004). This second interview focused on changes in these businesses over time. This second wave supplemented the earlier survey by examining what changes had happened and why those changes had occurred. In addition, questions were asked about the owner's involvement in the community, contributions to the community and their opinions about the impact of policies and programs designed to stimulate economic development. In households in which two different people were interviewed, an attempt was made to interview each individual again. When only one individual in a household was interviewed in 1997, only that individual would be re-interviewed in 2000. Because of the interest in tracking the family business over time, the 86 households in which the business manager was not interviewed in 1997 were omitted from the sample in 2000, making the initial sample size 708 instead of 794.
   2. To enhance the possibility that the 1997 individuals could be located in 2000, every six months between the surveys, the research group mailed a one-page summary of research results to each household interviewed in 1997. Address correction by the U.S. Postal Service was requested, and addresses in the data base were updated. Only 61 of the 708 households could not be located; 93 households were contacted, but refused to be interviewed. Data were gathered in 2000 from 553 households, more than three-fourths of the 708 households surveyed in 1997.

**Description of the Sampling Procedures for the 2007 Data**

**Survey Procedures:** The NFBS panel data are longitudinal over ten years with the third wave containing experiences with natural disasters. Such data allows us to distinguish between business failures due to a natural disaster and those failures that are “routine” business failures. Only a small body of disaster research exists on individual responses that estimate disaster prevalence, nature of losses, and predictors of recovery. These studies have been conducted either in urban disaster locations or with small convenience samples. All samples have been cross sectional. Studying businesses at one point in time potentially has presented a distorted picture, since businesses may fail at a later date; economic cycles and increased indebtedness after the disaster can influence success and failure over the long-term (Tierney, 1997). The NFBS panel data can begin to provide some insight into the distinction in failure rates.

In the mid-1990’s, a group of academic scholars from seventeen universities combined their resources to form the Family Business Research Group and conduct research on the impact and interplay between owning/managing a business and managing a family. Research began with national household screening to locate people with a family in the home who owned and managed a business, and interviews were conducted with both business managers and household managers in 1997 (Winter, Fitzgerald, Heck, Haynes & Danes, 1009). Follow-up interviews were conducted with 1997 respondents three years later, in 2000 (Winter, Danes, Koh, Fredericks & Paul, 2004), and ten years later in 2007. The 2007 study was designed to obtain updated information about the status of the businesses and families and also to learn about the impact of natural disasters and disaster relief on business viability. Data collection for each segment of the research was conducted by Iowa State University’s Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology (CSSM), formerly known as the Statistical Laboratory.

The sample for the 2007 survey consisted of the 708 cases that were attempted for the 2000 study. One of the 1997 Combination Managers had died prior to the 2000 study. Efforts were made to locate and interview all of the remaining 707 cases, including those that were unlocatable, refusals, or closed out after a maximum number of attempts in 2000. Cases interviewed in 2000 with businesses open or closed, sold or owned, would be contacted again and efforts would be made to interview the same respondents who were interviewed in 2000.

Participants in the 1997 and 2000 surveys had received project newsletters from the Family Business Research Group periodically to maintain participant interest and accurate contact information. However, no newsletters had been sent for several years. Because of this, efforts were made to verify the address and telephone number of the sample, and a newsletter was sent to the sample prior to any interviewing attempts in order to make use of postal address updates.

The earlier surveys did not include a monetary incentive for respondents. This time, however, it was decided to incorporate an incentive into the study design. If it was known in advance that a business was closed or sold, the interview was comparatively brief and those cases were sent $10 after survey completion to thank them for their time. If, however, the business status was unknown in advance and the potential interview length was possibly as long as 40 minutes, those cases were sent $20 after survey completion.

Possible contact information was available for 679 of the 707 cases in the sample. After the newsletter distribution and various tracking efforts, reliable addresses were available for 574 of the 707 cases. Data collection took place from May 9 to August 6, 2007. Initial telephone screening was conducted using paper documents. Interviews were conducted using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) Blaise software. Phone numbers with no personal contact were rotated through a minimum of 15 call attempts at various times (e.g., days and evenings, weekdays and weekends).

Of the 708 cases, 29.4% could not be located, and 22.2% resulted in either refusals or maximum calls classifications with no screening completed. Most cases that completed the initial screening (verifying the business status) also completed interviews. Of the 334 cases screened in 2007, 290 completed short or long interviews for a Cooperation Rate of 86.8%. Response rates can be viewed in several ways. The 290 cases with completed short or long are 86.8% of the 334 cases that completed initial screening, 58.6% of the 495 eligible cases that could be located, and 41.0% of the 708 total cases.