FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN DEVELOPING A REINTERVIEW PROGRAM AND INTERVIEWER DEBRIEFINGS AT SCB

AV DAWN D. NELSON

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN DEVELOPING A REINTERVIEW PROGRAM AND INTERVIEWER DEBRIEFINGS AT SCB

AV DAWN D. NELSON

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN DEVELOPING A REINTERVIEW PROGRAM AT SCB

Purpose: The assumption here is that the main purpose of the SCB re-interview program will be to control the quality of the work of the SCB interviewers. Different factors should be considered if the main purpose is to measure response variance or bias. The U.S. Census Bureau is frequently criticized because it has tried to combine both purposes in one program which reduces the efficiency and effectiveness for either purpose.

Two types of interviewer errors can be detected by a quality control reinterview program:

1)   Uninformed (or unintentional) errors which are the result of interviewer misconceptions, bad interviewing habits, ignorance of correct procedures, etc.

2)   Dishonest errors due to interviewers: a) fabricating responses on the entire questionnaire (called curbstoning); b) knowingly misclassifying units or individuals as noninterviews to avoid work; or c) deliberately disregarding correct interviewing procedures for any reasons.

It is assumed that the quality control program is not necessary for the detection of coverage errors, (i.e., improper exclusion or inclusion of housing units) due to the use of the Total Population Register by SCB as a sampling frame. However, within household coverge errors,(eg., errors in listing the persons residing within a unit) could be detected if desired.

Sample: Usually a separate reinterview program is designed for each recurring survey with a minimum of one reinterview and a maximum of four scheduled per interviewer each year. Only a subsample (usually 1/3 in CPS, the Census Bureau's labor force survey) of the interviewer's current workload at the time of selection is reinterviewed. The size of the subsample in CPS is about 5 per cent of all the sample units assigned for interviewing in one month. Most interviewers only work on two surveys at the same time so they are only subjected to 2-8 reinterviews a year. Such a system would result in far too many reinterviews per interviewer at SCB where all interviewers work on all surveys. Therefore you need to decide in advance how to limit the number of surveys that use reinterviews (probably to a maximum of four surveys). The

basis for this decision could be survey cost, sample size, importance, degree of difficulty, etc. At least two reinterviews should be scheduled in each survey, but they should not be scheduled in a fixed pattern that would be apparent to the interviewers. If only one reinterview was done in each survey (and the interviewers were aware of this), the quality of their work could diminish after the reinterview. The same problem exists if reinterviews are scheduled at fixed intervals - the quality between the reinterview periods may be poorer. The interviewers should know that their work will be checked, which will make them more careful, but they should not know when or which cases will be reinterviewed. An alternative is to design a program where each interviewer is reinterviewed 2-8 times per year with all or at least most of the major surveys having an equal possibility of being the target for reinterview. This would be very complicated to set up initially but it would have some advantages: 1) it would be difficult for the interviewers to know which survey will be selected at what time, therefore, high quality would be required at all times 2) all surveys would have a quality control program which could be a "selling point" for commission surveys.

Households/persons reported as a noninterview in the original interview should be included in the reinterview sample and the noninterview reason given should be verified in the reinterview. Interviews that are observed (by a field supervisor for control reasons) just prior to the reinterview should be eliminated from that reinterview. You will need to decide whether it is cost effective to attempt to locate persons who move between the original and reinterview; usually they are not followed. You should allow for the probability of noninterviews among the cases scheduled for reinterview.

General Method: The reinterview should be conducted approximately one week after the original interview to avoid errors that might be caused by the difference in time between the two interviews. Reinterviews should be conducted by telephone as much as possible to reduce costs, even if the original interview was conducted by personal visit. Obviously, you will not be able to use the telephone if the sample person does not have one or if the interview will take a long time (e.g. over ½ hour). The reinterviewer should have a copy of the original responses, but should be told not look at them before conducting the reinterview. After the reinterview, the reinterviewer should compare the new responses with the original reponses and ask the respondent to explain any differences. Some of the apparent differences usually end up not really being differences. However, any remaining true differences after the reconciliation process should be discussed with the interviewer.

To test the extent to which accessibility of the original responses affects the reinterview results, you could withhold the original responses from the reinterviewer in 20 per cent of the cases. After the reinterview, another person would examine the differences between the original and reinterview responses and contact the respondent for explanations, if necessary. Of course, this will cost more. (The Census Bureau only does this occasionally - not on a regular basis.)

The Questionnaire: The reinterview questionnaire should be identical to the original questionnaire or be a subset of those questions. Using the same questionnaire saves on printing costs and training time. However, some questions may refer to certain time periods such as last week and the interviewer must remember to change this reference to the appropriate time period based on the date of the reinterview. This is a source of potential error. This problem can be avoided easily in SCB's Labour Force Survey (AKU) because the questionnaires are individually printed. A subset of questions from the original questionnaire should only be considered if the interview is very long (over 1/2 hour) and you anticipate problems in getting respondents to cooperate. If a subset is used, extra work will be required to decide which questions (e.g. the easiest ones, or the hardest ones) and to ensure that the new question sequencing makes sense and will not create artificial inconsistencies. See the attached criteria for selecting reinterview items.

The Reinterviewer: The reinterviewer should be an experienced interviewer whose performance is considered to be above average. At SCB, reinterviewing could probably be done best by the central staff in Örebro, however, the staff size may have to be increased. The reinterviewers should receive training on the plans and procedures.

The Respondent: The reinterview should be conducted with the same person who supplied the information in the original interview. You will need to decide if you will accept a proxy respondent if the original respondent is not available. (In CPS, if the original respondent was a proxy, the reinterviewer is supposed to try to get the person about whom the information is being collected to respond for himself/herself because the results are used to measure response bias also. I cannot see a reason for this in a quality control reinterview program.)

Explanation to the respondent: The reinterview must be carefully ex-
plained to the respondent. Two examples used in the CPS follow:

1. First   You could say "Good Morning, I am _____ from
   Introduction   the United States Bureau of the Census. One of our
   interviewers called recently to obtain data for the
   survey of employment and unemployment. In accordan-
   ce with Census Bureau practice we reinterview a few
   of the people who were in the original survey to
   evaluate the quality of our work."

2. Second   Or, you may explain the reinterview in the follow-
   Introduction   ing manner: "Good Morning, I am _____ from the
   United States Bureau of the Census. One of our
   interviewers called recently to obtain data for the
   survey of employment and unemployment. Like any
   business, we're interested in maintaining the qua-
   lity of our product. I have some questions to ask
   in order to insure the quality of our data."

   You could use a different approach but try to use
   language which the respondent will understand.

Reconciliation: A specially designed reconciliation form is usually
necessary to facilitate the comparison of the original and reinterview
responses (see example of CPS form). Someone other than the interviewer
or reinterviewer would transcribe the original responses to the form
before the reinterview. Immediately following the reinterview, the
reinterviewer would compare the new responses to the ones on the form.
Responses that are different would be transcribed to the form also. If
differences are noted, the reinterviewer would ask the respondent to
explain the differences. Questioning about the difference has to be
done very diplomatically. The reinterviewer should be instructed on
ways to do this. Some differences can be resolved, but for the others,
the reinterviewer will have to note and explain the reason for the
difference on the form. Possible reasons for the differences are:
1) Different respondent used each time, 2) Interviewer error, 3) Re-
spondent error. The explanation of the difference should be very de-
tailed; the reinterviewers should receive considerable instruction on
this topic. In some cases, responses may not have to be identical, it
may be acceptable if they are equivalent. For example, in the CPS,
labor force status is determined by a series of questions, if one an-
swer in the series is different, it may not affect the final status.
This would not be counted as an error.

Reporting the results: A summary report form that tallies the errors of all the reinterviews performed at one time should be completed for each interviewer (see CPS example). Criteria needs to be established in advance that will be used to judge the acceptability of an interviewer's work. Tolerance limits are usually set for a group of items rather than each individual item. For example, in the Survey of Living Conditions (ULF) all of the employment questions might be considered together, all of the health questions together, etc. The number of acceptable differences is usually set so that a difference rate at a 5 per cent level will be accepted 95 per cent of the time. (See Attachment 1 for an example of a simple model for the evaluation of interviewer performance.) The tolerance limits should allow for the fact that all errors may not be due to the interviewer. Errors judged by the reinterviewer to be the fault of the respondent should not be excluded because the interviewer may have caused the respondent to make the error.

Using the results: The results of the reinterview should be discussed with the interviewer, in person if possible, by the reinterviewer or a supervisor. The interviewer should have the opportunity to explain differences also and these explanations should be recorded on the reconciliation form. If the interviewer fails to meet the standards set for any portion of the questionnaire, he/she should be retrained on that part of the questionnaire. Following retraining, the interviewer should be selected for reinterviewing again and, in addition, be observed by a supervisor. If the interviewer's performance does not improve, consider removing him/her from the interviewing staff. Keep a continuous record of all summary reports, consultations with the interviewer, and actions taken.

Costs: Information on the cost of reinterviewing should be collected and analyzed for use in modifying the program to reduce costs.

Attachment 1

From Operational Control of Sample Surveys, Walt R. Simmons. Laboratories for Population Statistics, Manual Series No. 2. Aug. 1972.

"For operational purposes, a simple model provides an adequate key instrument for evaluating performance, and suggesting appropriate action - whether the focus of attention is on a single interviewer, the group of interviewers under a common supervisor, or on a particular question or set of questions in the survey. Let n_c be the number of observations of the item or category c under study; d_c be the number of errors observed for that item (i.e., the number of instances in which the reinterviewer's finding differs from that of the interviewer). Then $P'_c = d_c / n_c$ may be treated as an estimate of the probability of error for that item for the category of n_c observations being considered. The estimate P'_c can be assumed to have a simple binomial distribution with variance $o'^2 P'_c (1 - P'_c)/n_c$. Consider, now, some of the uses of this tool.

It will be convenient to assemble data from the control subsample in tables which have a standard format, similar to that illustrated in Table 7-1. Table 7-1 is a generalized table, illustrated for evaluation of the reporting of numbers of persons with one or more chronic conditions. It can be easily adapted to the coverage check, or to proper reporting on any specified topic, group of questions, classes, types of repondents, or subject persons. Tables like 7-1 can be consolidated, and summed over interviewers, reinterviewers, question categories, or time intervals.

The symbols appearing in the column heads correspond to those in the simple model just described. Note that the table allows for two counts by the reinterviewer, y'_c and y_c, the first his initial determination, and the second his final determination after 'reconciliation'. While there are acceptable variation, the table presumes a procedure in which the reinterviewer first records his finding without knowing what the original interviewer reported; then consults the report of the interviewer; compares the two, and reaches a final conclusion, y_c, perhaps consulting further with the respondent, and perhaps amending his own initial finding. This procedure is recommended for these reasons: (1) Although fully independent verification procedures are preferred for most operations, in the reinterview situation, the presence of the reinterviewer at the location of the respondent at the time of reinterview offers an opportunity for reducing misunderstandings through the reconciliation process. (2) The reinterviewer, although a presumed

'expert' may be little if any more skillful than the better interviewer, and may properly be influenced in making his final judgment by taking account of the opinion of the interviewer. (This does put some strain on the integrity of the reinterviewer who is the interviewer's supervisor, but higher level supervision is likely to detect misbehavior in this respect should observed differences over an extended time range be much smaller than expected.) (3) The reconciliation steps are a valuable training device for the reinterviewer, in making him more intimately aware of the difficulties which interviewers are having.

The table includes both the algebraic difference, d_c, and the absolute value $|d_c|$. This permits summation to reflect either gross or net differences, and, of course, points the direction in which retraining or other corrective actions should move.

As noted earlier, when the focus of attention is on an individual interviewer, a single cycle of reinterview (in the illustration), offers only crude evidence of performance. When the statistic of interest is a person characteristic, the single cycle provides only 20 observations. An estimated error rate of 30 per cent, for example, has a sampling error of 10 percentage points. A 30 per cent error rate is intolerable, and 10 percentage points in sampling error leaves too much doubt. But consolidation of evidence can improve the picture markedly. The interviewer who makes anything like 30 per cent error on one item probably has errors of similar scale on, say, 10 other items. In that event, the sampling error for the group of items is cut to about three percentage points, and it becomes pretty clear that the interviewer is performing in a inadequate manner. Combining observations for the interviewer over several cycles of reinterview has a similar utility. Comparison of the estimated error rates among interviewers may well isolate the poor performer. Use of this rather subjective pattern of evaluation in conjunction with the simple binomial model described above, is the approach recommended in this manual. When an interviewer shows unsatisfactory performance, he must be retrained - and that is preferable, if feasible - or replaced.

Some may prefer more structured guidance for interpretation of reinterview data. Such is offered below, with the caution that it still has arbitrary and subjective features. It is a product of standards which could be set at different levels and is an adaptation of an 'acceptance sampling plan'.

Table 7-1.

Reinterview Data on Number of Persons with One or More Chronic Health
Conditions for District A. West Dakota Survey, Cycle 7

Stub	For Subject Persons Reinterviewed					
		Number Persons with One or More Chronic Conditions				
	Number Persons	Reported by Interviewer	Reported by Reinterview		Difference	
			Initially	After Reconciliation	x_c-y_c	$\lvert x_c-y_c \rvert$
c	n_c	x_c	y_c'	y_c	d_c	$\lvert d_c \rvert$
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Interviewer 1 Interviewer 2 Interviewer 3 Interviewer 4 Interviewer 5						
or Question 1 Question 2 Question 3						
or Respondent Type 1 Respondent Type 2 Respondent Type 3						

Step One. Identify Sections I, II III,...of the questionnaire, for which separate surveillance is desired. For example, some of the sections might be:

Section I   Coverage of households.
Section II   Coverage of persons.
Section III   Questions on demographic characteristics of individual persons
Section IV   Health or Labor Force attributes of persons.

Step Two. For each section identify and count the units of observation, i.e., the effective sample size - usually number of households, number of persons or number of person-questions. (This is n_c for a category.)

Step Three. For each section select an approximate level of acceptable error rate, i.e., a target value of P_c.

Step Four. Define as acceptance number the maximum number of permissible differences, d_c, for a given range of observations, n_c, for each section.

Step Five. Build a table like Table 7.2, 'Acceptable Difference Limits' for each section.

Step Six. A decision is made to 'accept' or 'reject' the work of each interviewer for each reinterviewed assignment. If the work is accepted, no further action is taken. If rejected, the interviewer must be retrained on the rejected section(s), or replaced.

Table 7.2 was built around a target acceptable quality level (AQL) of 5 per cent error rate. This means that if the true average error rate is 5 per cent or less, the performance will be accepted at least 95 per cent of the time. The figures in the right-hand column are approximations to what is sometimes called 'the consumer's risk'. They are interpreted in the following way: If, for example, there are 60 observations, and the acceptance number 6 is used, an actual underlying error rate of 18 per cent or greater will not be accepted on more than 10 per cent of inspections. It may appear that the acceptance numbers in the table seem to reflect error tolerances which are nearly double the target specifications. The explanation lies in the fact that the acceptance numbers are maximum values. Observations with fewer errors will also be accepted, and so the average error rate will be smaller.

Those who might wish to set different standards in constructing a table similar to Table 7.2, may consult quality control textbooks."

Table 7.2 Acceptable Difference Limits for Section IV

(For example, number of persons with specified health attributes)

Number of Observations n_c	Acceptable Number of Differences d_c	Approximate $P_{0.10}(100)$
10- 29	2	26 %
30- 49	4	20 %
50- 69	6	18 %
70- 99	7	14 %
100-129	9	13 %

Reinterview Criteria for Selecting Reinterview Items

1) are the items factual (where the same answers would be expected in the interview and reinterview)?

2) are the items ones the interviewer must ask and not ones whose answers can be correctly "assumed"?

3) are the items asked of all or most respondents and not skipped for a sizeable portion?

4) are the items scattered throughout the questionnaire to verify that the interviewer is completing all parts?

FORM **CPS-241**
(3-26-79)

RECONCILIATION RECORD
CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY

a. Control No.			**b.** Segment type	**c.** Date of interview	**d.** Line No. of orig. hhld resp.	**e.** Interviewer code	**f.** Date of reinterview	**g.** Reinterviewer code
PSU	Segment	Serial						

h. Original interview

☐ Personal   ☐ Noninterview A

☐ Telephone   ☐ Noninterview B

☐ Noninterview C

i. If noninterview originally, what is the correct type of noninterview at time of original interview?

☐ A

☐ B

☐ C

j. Reinterview

☐ Personal   ☐ Noninterview A

☐ Telephone   ☐ Noninterview B

☐ Noninterview C

Explain noninterview reason _____

▶ Section I – **COVERAGE OF UNITS**

☐ Housing unit added   ☐ Entire structure   ☐ Occupied

☐ Housing unit deleted   ☐ Part of structure   ☐ Vacant

Listed by { ☐ Present interviewer ☐ Different interviewer

EXPLANATION

(Explain as fully as possible why the original error in listing or classification occurred)

▶ Section II – **COVERAGE OF PERSONS** *(Added or deleted)*

Line No.	**EXPLANATION** *(Explain why error occurred)*

Notes

Section III – CONTENT	Line No. of Individual		Sex		Line No. of individual		Sex	
	Line No. of original resp.	Line No. of reinterview resp.	Line No. of reconciliation respondent		Line No. of original resp.	Line No. of reinterview resp.	Line recor resp.	
			What is correct? (3)	Who is account-able? (4)			What corre (3	
	Original	Reinterview	O	R	Original	Reinterview	O	
Item No.	(1)	(2)			(1)	(2)		
19. Major activity								
20. Any work								
20A. Hours worked								
20C. Usually fulltime and reason								
21. With a job								
21A. Reason absent								
21B. Paid for time off								
22. Looking								
22A. Doing to find work								
22B. Why looking for work								
22C. Weeks looking								
22D. Looking for full or part-time								
22E. Reason could not take job								
23B. Industry								
23C. Occupation								
23 D. Activities								
23E. Class of worker								
24A. Last regular work								
24C. Want job now								
25A. Hours USUALLY work per week								
25B. Paid by hour								
25C. How much earn per hour								
25D. How much USUALLY earn per week								

F	Line No. of individual		Sex			Line No. of individual		Sex		
				M	F				M	F
ne No. of conciliation spondent	Line No. of original resp.	Line No. of reinterview resp.	Line No. of reconciliation respondent			Line No. of original resp.	Line No. of reinterview resp.	Line No. of reconciliation respondent		
at is rect? (3)	Who is account- able? (4)	Original	Reinterview	What is correct? (3)	Who is account- able? (4)	Original	Reinterview	What is correct? (3)	Who is account- able? (4)	
R		(1)	(2)	O	R	(1)	(2)	O	R	

Section IV — EXPLANATION

(Explain as fully as possible why the original and reinterview information differed)

Number		Reinterview respondent	Interviewer
Line	Item		

FORM CPS-242 (5-30-78)	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS	1. Interviewer's name	Code	Telephone No.	2. Regional Office

SUMMARY REPORT OF REINTERVIEW
CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY

3. Reinterviewer's name	Code	Job Title ☐ Program Supervisor ☐ Alternate ☐ Supervisory Field Representative ☐ Other_____	4. PSU
5. Reinterview date			6. Report for (Mo./yr.)

Section I – COVERAGE CHECK OF HOUSING AND OTHER UNITS

Segment number (1)	Segment type ● Area ● Address ● Permit ● Special place ● Cen-Sup (2)	Sample type A, B, C, or D (3)	Part A Listing Check — Listed before reinterview (4)	Part A — Added (5)	Part A — Deleted (6)	Part B Sample Units — Number of sample units before reinterview (7)	Part B — Discrepancies[1] (8)
Total this reinterview ⟶							

[1] Wrong households visited, noninterview misclassifications and EXTRA units missed.

Explanations of differences in Sections I and II. *(Give reference to section and segment number. Explain changes in classification of YEAR BUILT.)*

Section II – HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION CHECK

Segment number (1)	Serial number (2)	Number of persons before reinterview — 14 and over (3)	Number of persons before reinterview — Under 14 (4)	Number of Persons Added — 14 and over (5)	Added — Under 14 (6)	Deleted — 14 and over (7)	Deleted — Under 14 (8)
Total this reinterview ⟶							

Section III – DISCREPANCIES IN LABOR FORCE ITEMS 19–23 AFTER RECONCILIATION

Segment and Serial No. (1)	Line No. (2)	(3)	Labor force 19, 20, 21, 22 (4)	Hours worked 20A, 20C (5)	Reason absent 21A, 21B (6)	Looking 22A, 22B, 22C, 22D, 22E (7)	Job description 23B, 23C, 23D, 23E (8)	Total check marks (9)
		I						
		R						
		I						
		R						
		I						
		R						
		I						
		R						

WASHINGTON USE ONLY	Section I-A	Section I-B	Section II	Section III	Total ⟶

Section IV – DISCREPANCIES IN OTHER ITEMS

Segment and Serial No. (1)	Item No. (2)	Description of discrepancy (3)

Section V – REPORT ON CONSULTATION WITH INTERVIEWER

Report was – *Mark one*
☐ In person   ☐ By telephone
☐ By memo *(If interviewer unavailable)*

Section VI – PERFORMANCE

Section (1)	Number of units (2)	Number of differences (3)	Accept or not accept (4)
I-A			
I-B			
II			
III			

FORM CPS-242 (5-30-78)	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS	1. Interviewer's name	Code	Telephone No.	2. Regional Office

SUMMARY REPORT OF REINTERVIEW CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY

3. Reinterviewer's name	Code	Job Title ☐ Program Supervisor ☐ Alternate ☐ Supervisory Field Representative ☐ Other_____	4. PSU
5. Reinterview date			6. Report for (Mo./yr.)

Section I – COVERAGE CHECK OF HOUSING AND OTHER UNITS

Segment number (1)	Segment type ● Area ● Address ● Permit ● Special place ● Cen-Sup (2)	Sample type A, B, C, or D (3)	Part A Listing Check — Number of units — Listed before reinter-view (4)	Added (5)	Deleted (6)	Part B Sample Units — Number of sample units before reinter-view (7)	Discrep-ancies[1] (8)
Total this reinterview ——→							

[1] Wrong households visited, noninterview misclassifications and EXTRA units missed.

Explanations of differences in Sections I and II. *(Give reference to section and segment number. Explain changes in classification of YEAR BUILT.)*

Section II – HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION CHECK

Segment number	Serial number (2)	Number of persons before reinterview — 14 and over (3)	Under 14 (4)	Number of Persons Added — 14 and over (5)	Under 14 (6)	Deleted — 14 and over (7)	Under 14 (8)
Total this reinterview —→							

Section III – DISCREPANCIES IN LABOR FORCE ITEMS 19–23 AFTER RECONCILIATION

Segment and Serial No. (1)	Line No. (2)	(3)	Labor force 19, 20, 21, 22 (4)	Hours worked 20A, 20C (5)	Reason absent 21A, 21B (6)	Looking 22A, 22B, 22C, 22D, 22E (7)	Job description 23B, 23C, 23D, 23E (8)	Total check marks (9)
		I						
		R						
		I						
		R						
		I						
		R						
		I						
		R						

WASHINGTON USE ONLY	Section I-A	Section I-B	Section II	Section III	Total ——→	

Section IV – DISCREPANCIES IN OTHER ITEMS			Section V – REPORT ON CONSULTATION WITH INTERVIEWER	Section VI – PERFORMANCE			

Segment and Serial No. (1)	Item No. (2)	Description of discrepancy (3)

Report was — *Mark one*
☐ In person   ☐ By telephone
☐ By memo *(If interviewer unavailable)*

Section (1)	Number of units (2)	Number of differ-ences (3)	Accept or not accept (4)
I-A			
I-B			
II			
III			

FORM CPS-242 (8-30-78)	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS	1. Interviewer's name	Code	Telephone No.	2. Regional Office

SUMMARY REPORT OF REINTERVIEW CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY

3. Reinterviewer's name	Code	Job Title ☐ Program Supervisor ☐ Alternate ☐ Supervisory Field Representative ☐ Other_____	4. PSU
5. Reinterview date			6. Report for (Mo./yr.)

Section I – COVERAGE CHECK OF HOUSING AND OTHER UNITS

Segment number	Segment type • Area • Address • Permit • Special place • Cen-Sup	Sample type A, B, C, or D	Part A Listing Check — Number of units — Listed before reinterview	Part A — Added	Part A — Deleted	Part B Sample Units — Number of sample units before reinterview	Part B — Discrepancies[1]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Total this reinterview ➝							

[1] Wrong households visited, noninterview misclassifications and EXTRA units missed.

Explanations of differences in Sections I and II. *(Give reference to section and segment number. Explain changes in classification of YEAR BUILT.)*

Section II – HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION CHECK

Segment number (1)	Serial number (2)	Number of persons before reinterview — 14 and over (3)	Number of persons before reinterview — Under 14 (4)	Selection of the 20% sub-sample for independent reconciliation *(Enter "X" on selected lines)* (5)
Total this reinterview ➝				

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Draw a line in red across columns (1) through (5) under the last unit listed in Section II.

2. Assemble all pink copies of the Summary Report for the current month.

3. Sort them into PSU order and interviewer alphanumeric code order within PSU (except for multi-PSU interviewer assignments where the sort should be by PSU within that interviewer's code).

4. Apply the START WITH shown for your office in the current month's office memorandum on reinterview.

5. Apply a TAKE EVERY of 5 and carry the count over from one Summary Report to the next through all Summary Reports.

6. INCLUDE in your count units that are marked "OBS," "ERSS," "ICR," "NIAO," "NIBO," and "NICO" in columns (3) and (4) in Section II.

7. Enter an "X" in column (5) on the START WITH line and on each TAKE EVERY line.

8. Enter below the red line EXTRA units and other units added to the current sample during the current month's interview week. Starting with the last unit selected above the red line carry over the TAKE EVERY count of 5 to the units listed below the red line, and enter an "X" in column (5) on each TAKE EVERY line.

9. DO NOT record any changes on the pink copy due to the reassignment of units from one interviewer to another.

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN DEVELOPING INTERVIEWER DEBRIEFINGS AT SCB

This section summarizes information contained in the report <u>Approaches</u> <u>to Developing Questionnaires</u> (Statistical Policy Working Paper 10, November 1983), Chapter 9, "Learning From Interviewers" written by Theresa J. DeMaio.

. <u>Definition of interviewer debriefing</u>:
Exchange of verbal information between the interviewing staff and the operations or research staff. Groups sessions or one-on-one exchanges are possible; groups are more common.

. <u>Purpose</u>: To obtain interviewer feedback concerning problems in the structure or wording of a questionnaire. Debriefings done during testing can be useful in revising the questionnaire. Debriefings during or at the end a survey can be used in evaluating the questionnaire or analyzing the results.

. <u>Methods for Groups</u>:
  - <u>Discussion leader</u>: The choice of the leader is critical. If possible, the leader should be very familiar with the development of the questionnaire, known to the interviewers, and skilled at getting everyone in the group to provide useful information The leader should not be defensive when negative comments are made, should not express his/her opinions about the questionnaire, and should not be the interviewer's supervisor. One of the questionnaire designers would be a logical choice.

  - <u>Size and location</u>: The group should be limited to a maximum of 15 interviewers who administered the questionnaire. If the questionnaire was used in more than one geographic area, interviewers from each area should participate in the group. Two or more sessions conducted simultaneously in different locations may be necessary. If the budget permits, and there are enough interviewers, it is advantageous to form two or more groups.

  - <u>Timing</u>: During testing, debriefings may be held as often as daily to allow changes to be made in the questionnaire for the next day's interviewing. If time and money permit only one debriefing session, it should be conducted shortly after the end of testing/interviewing so problems will not be forgotten. The length of the debriefing session should be determined based on the length of the questionnaire and the number of problems expected. They usually last 2-3 hours, but may continue all day; breaks should be scheduled approximately every 2 hours.

- <u>Agenda</u>: An agenda should be prepared in advance of the debriefing to guide the discussion. Topics proposed for discussion might include: 1) question wording that caused problems, 2) question order that should be changed, 3) questions that respondents were unwilling or unable to answer, 4) problems with instructions on the questionnaire, 5) problems with procedures for completing the questionnaire, etc. It helps to give the interviewers a copy of the agenda before the session so they have time to think about the answers and write answers that can be collected after the debriefing.

- <u>The discussion</u>: All interviewers at the session should be encouraged to participate. Normally, some time is "wasted" because the interviewers want to talk about topics such as pay, or working conditions that are unrelated to the questionnaire. This should be permitted for a short time.

. <u>Results</u>: The interviewers comments should be recorded during the debriefing session. This may be done by tape recording or note-taking. A drawback to taping is the time it takes to review and/or transcribe the tape. Tape recording is often used as a back-up for note-taking in case the notes are not clear about a particular topic. The tape/notes supplemented by interviewers written comments, if any, should be used to prepare a summary of the main results as quickly as possible after the session. Revisions to the questionnaire that were suggested by the debriefing should be specified in detail. The results of a debriefing are qualitative rather than quantitative. Although problems in the questionnaire can be detected, the extent of these problems cannot be specified. Changes that are actually made in the questionnaire after a debriefing should be documented.

. <u>Individual Debriefings</u>: This kind of debriefing is more likely to occur in the final survey than during the testing. It is more useful as a means of quality control than questionnaire development. The meeting can take place over the telephone, in the interviewer's home, or the office. An agenda similar to the one used for groups can be helpful.

. Attachment: A copy of a debriefing guide (agenda) that was used in a pretest for the Survey of Income and Program Participation is attached. Another example of a guide from the Consumer Expenditure Survey is available in <u>Approaches to Developing Questionnaires</u> (page 128).

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Bureau of the Census
Washington, D.C. 20233

March 3, 1983

SIPP PRETEST INTERVIEWERS MEMORANDUM NO. 83-4

MEMORANDUM FOR   SIPP Pretest Interviewers

From: Lawrence T. Love
                 Chief, Field Division

Subject: Pretest II Debriefing Guide

The SIPP pretest will be used to evaluate the data collection materials
and procedures to be used for the 1984 SIPP. Your comments and sugges-
tions will be useful in preparing final materials and procedures. The
debriefing session you attend will give you an opportunity to evaluate
both your participation in the pretest and respondents' reaction to the
survey.

Attached to this memorandum is a set of questions which will be discussed
during the debriefing session. Before the session, review the questions
and jot down any notes or points you wish to make. We are counting on you
to help us prepare the best possible materials and procedures, so wherever
possible, suggest ideas for improving any problem areas. The set of ques-
tions with your responses and comments will be collected at the end of the
debriefing session.

Charge one hour to project 1465, code 20 for completing the Debriefing Guide.

Attachment

Survey of Income and Program Participation
Second Interview Pretest
·Interviewer Debriefing Guide

Note: Some of the following questions refer to the Wave 1 questionnaire with
the revised labor force questions. If your assignment did not contain
any of these, then write "NA" for the questions refering to Wave 1.

A. The Control Card

1. Did you encounter any difficulties in updating the control card? If so,
what were they?

2. In general, how much time did the control card take for the second
interview?

3. If you were able to make any changes to the control card, that is reword
questions, change the location of items, or change item numbers, what
types of changes would you make? Please try to give a brief explanation
for changes you suggest. Also, please note any other current surveys
on which you have worked.

B. **The Questionnaire: Labor Force and Recipiency Section**

la. If you administered a Wave 1 questionnaire with the revised labor force questions (items 1 through 7h), did you feel these questions worked better/worse than the original labor force questions which were part of the Wave 1 questionnaire used in February, and which are also a part of the Wave 2 questionnaire?

lb. What in particular do you feel worked better/worse?

2a. How did the pretranscription work in the actual interview?

2b. Are there any other items which should have been transcribed prior to interview?

2c. Do you have any suggestions for improvement of the pretranscription procedure?

2d. Did you have any problems using the Income and Asset Rosters? If so, what kinds of problems?

3. Were there any problems updating Medicare or Medicaid information?

4. In the Wave 2 questionnaire, how well did the skips work in sending persons, who were not interviewed in Wave 1, through the original sequence of questions?

C. The Questionnaire: Earnings and Employment Section

1. Were there problems with any specific questions in this section?

2. How often did respondents find their pay records so they could give accurate answers?

3. Is there any technique that you found was particularly good in getting respondents to refer to records?

4. How often did you enter new employer ID numbers in Check Item E3 (or E6)?

D. **The Questionnaire: Amounts Section**

1. Did you have any trouble remembering <u>not</u> to administer this section to second interview households who had participated in the first interview? Did you remember to ask it for <u>new households?</u>

2. Was there any reaction on the part of the respondents for whom you did <u>not</u> ask any questions on the Amounts Section?

E. **The Questionnaire: General**

1. Were your assignments <u>clear</u> as to which questionnaire to administer to each household that <u>is,</u> either the Wave 2 or the Wave 1 with the revised labor force questions?

2. Did you find that the one month reference period in the Wave 2 questionnaire caused any confusion or awkwardness in the interview?

3. Did you find that you remembered to record travel information on the "Interviewer's Personal Record of Hours and Mileage Claimed"? Do you have any suggestions/comments for this form?

F. Training
   1. Do you feel you received sufficient training for the second interview?

   2. Were the pretranscription instructions/procedures clear to you?
      If not, what additional information or instruction would have been useful?

   3. Were the pretraining instructions adequate (useful) to prepare you
      for the training session and your interviewing assignment?

G. General Comments/Suggestions

Tidigare nummer av Promemorior från U/STM:

NR

1 Bayesianska idéer vid planeringen av sample surveys. Lars Lyberg (1978-11-01)

2 Litteraturförteckning över artiklar om kontingenstabeller. Anders Andersson (1978-11-07)

3 En presentation av Box-Jenkins metod för analys och prognos av tidsserier. Åke Holmén (1979-12-20)

4 Handledning i AID-analys. Anders Norberg (1980-10-22)

5 Utredning angående statistisk analysverksamhet vid SCB: Slutrapport. P/STM, Analysprojektet (1980-10-31)

6 Metoder för evalvering av noggrannheten i SCBs statistik. En översikt. Jörgen Dalén (1981-03-02)

7 Effektiva strategier för estimation av förändringar och nivåer vid föränderlig population. Gösta Forsman och Tomas Garås (1982-11-01)

8 How large must the sample size be? Nominal confidence levels versus actual coverage probabilities in simple random sampling. Jörgen Dalén (1983-02-14)

9 Regression analysis and ratio analysis for domains. A randomization theory approach. Eva Elvers, Carl Erik Särndal, Jan Wretman och Göran Örnberg (1983-06-20)

10 Current survey research at Statistics Sweden. Lars Lyberg, Bengt Swensson och Jan Håkan Wretman (1983-09-01)

11 Utjämningsmetoder vid nivåkorrigering av tidsserier med tillämpning på nationalräkenskapsdata. Lars-Otto Sjöberg (1984-01-11)

12 Regressionsanalys för f d statistikstuderande. Harry Lütjohann (1984-02-01)

13 Estimating Gini and Entropy inequality parameters. Fredrik Nygård och Arne Sandström (1985-01-09)

14 Income inequality measures based on sample surveys. Fredrik Nygård och Arne Sandström (1985-05-20)

15 Granskning och evalvering av surveymodeller, tiden före 1960. Gösta Forsman (1985-05-30)

16 Variance estimators of the Gini coefficient - simple random sampling. Arne Sandström, Jan Wretman och Bertil Waldén (Memo, Februari 1985)

17 Variance estimators of the Gini coefficient - probability sampling. Arne Sandström, Jan Wretman och Bertil Waldén (1985-07-05)

18 Reconciling tables and margins using least-squares. Harry Lütjohann (1985-08-01)

19 Ersättningens och uppgiftslämnarbördans betydelse för kvaliteten i
    undersökningarna om hushååållens utgifter. Håkan L. Lindström
    (1985-11-29)

20 A general view of estimation for two phases of selection. Carl-Erik
    Särndal och Bengt Swensson (1985-12-05)

21 On the use of automated coding at Statistics Sweden. Lars Lyberg
    (1986-01-16)

22 Quality Control of Coding Operations at Statistics Sweden. Lars
    Lyberg (1986-03-20)

23 A General View of Nonresponse Bias in Some Sample Surveys of the
    Swedish Population. Håkan L Lindström (1986-05-16)

24 Nonresponse rates in 1970 - 1985 in surveys of Individuals and
    Households. Håkan L. Lindström och Pat Dean (1986-06-06)

25 Two Evaluation Studies of Small Area Estimation Methods: The Case
    of Estimating Population Characteristics in Swedish Municipalities
    for the Intercensal Period. Sixten Lundström (1986-10-14)

26 A Survey Practitioner's Notion of Nonresponse. Richard Platek
    (1986-10-20)

Kvarvarande exemplar av ovanstående promemorior kan rekvireras från
Elseliv Lindfors, U/STM, SCB, 115 81 Stockholm, eller per telefon
08 7834178