

Interviewer Privacy in a Nationally-Representative Survey of Women in Qatar

M. Nizam Khan
SESRI
Qatar University

Jill Wittrock
Center for Political Studies
University of Michigan

**2014 International Workshop
on Comparative Survey
Design and Implementation**

March 27, 2014
Bethesda, MD

Overview

- Motivation
- Qatar Women Study 2011
 - Expectations
 - Data analysis & Results
- Implications for data collection
- Summary

Motivation

QWS 2011: bystanders during pretesting

- Who are they?
- How does this impact survey quality?
- How should we modify training protocols?

RQs: What contextual factors increase the likelihood of a bystander present at the interview? How does this impact responses to sensitive questions?

Why is this important?

Social norm of privacy varies cross-nationally:

Region/Country	Natl Rep Survey	Bystander	Source
United States	ANES	41-57%	Silver, Abramson & Anderson '86
	GSS	37%	Smith '97
Europe	W. Germany	24-35%	Harman '95
	Belgium	48-52%	Bulck '99; Welkenhuysen-Gybels & Billiet '01
UN members	14 countries	13-70%	Mneimneh, et. al., N.D.
GCC, incl. Qatar	?	?	

Qatar Women Study 2011

Topics: fertility & family planning, marriage(s), health awareness, women's empowerment

- Why so many bystanders?
 - Women only
 - Qatari households
 - Advance letter sent to head of household
 - Male supervisor obtained consent from male HH

Survey Design

- Sample of ever-married Qatari women, 18+
- $n = 1,493$
- Sampling frame from Kahramaa, complete listing of all households in Qatar as of late 2010.
- Respondent selected random via 2-stage sampling

Survey Administration

- CAPI (Blaise)
- All female interviewers (non-Qatari)
- All supervisors male
- No self-administration options for sensitive Qs
- Interviews conducted in Arabic
- Average length ~ 30 minutes

Bystander rates

Table 1. Was a bystander present during the interview?*

Bystander	%
No	69.35%
Yes	30.65%

*Note: Weighted proportions using svyset in Stata 13.

Bystander effects expectations

Bystander as a DV: Household demographics and contextual factors will increase the likelihood of a bystander present at the interview.

Bystander as an IV: If a bystander is present, respondents will be more likely to edit responses to what the bystander knows to be true or what the respondent believes the bystander would want to hear.

Model 1: Bystander as a DV

DV: Was a bystander present at some point during the interview?

IVs:

- Age
- Respondent's education
- Household size
- Income
- Children age 13 or under
- Respondent's occupation
- Husband's education
- Mother's education
- Consanguineous marriage

Model 1 Results

Age (50-64) -	0.51	(0.30-0.85)
High school -	0.44	(0.30-0.66)
HH size 10 +	3.08	(1.84-5.15)
4+ children -	0.64	(0.38-1.07)
Income	n.s.	n.s.
Spouse H.S. -	0.71	(0.50-1.03)
Consanguineous marriage	n.s.	n.s.
Mother's education	n.s.	n.s.
Occupation	n.s.	n.s.

Model 2: Bystander as IV

DV: How does your husband feel about women working in general?

IV: Bystander present?

Controls:

- Age
- Respondent's education
- Income
- Children age 13 or under
- Respondent's occupation

Model 2 Results

Bystander present +	1.35	(1.02-1.8)
Age (30-39) +	1.41	(1.01-2.12)
University -	n.S	n.s.
Children under 13	n.s.	n.s.
Income	n.s.	n.s.
Medium skilled occupation -	0.39	(0.14-1.08)

Model 3: Bystander as IV

DV: In the past 30 days have you had a problem with feeling worried or anxious?

IV: Bystander present?

Controls:

- Age
- Respondent's education
- Income
- Children age 13 or under
- Respondent's occupation

Model 3: Results

Table 4. Odds ratio from ordered logit predicting feeling anxious/worried.

Bystander present	n.s.	n.s.
Age (30-39)	n.s.	n.s.
University	n.s.	n.s.
Children under 13	n.s.	n.s.
Income	n.s.	n.s.
Medium skilled occupation	n.s.	n.s.

Implications for data collection

- Need to make collection of bystanders information a standard observation variable in all face-to-face surveys in the GCC.
- Need to collect other interviewer characteristics to see if particular traits increase likelihood of a bystander.
- Revise training materials for both supervisors & interviewers on how to increase likelihood of privacy.

Summary

- A bystander can have a non-trivial influence on responses.
- Although unlikely to eliminate completely, we can reduce impact on survey quality and data analysis through combination of field staff training and collection of interviewer observations.



Comments most welcome!

Jill Wittrock

jillwitt@umich.edu

M. Nizam Khan

nizamkhan@qu.edu.qa