



EXAMINING RESPONDENT- INTERVIEWER INTERACTIONS USING BEHAVIOR CODING DATA AND PARADATA

Allyson L. Holbrook, University of Illinois at Chicago

Timothy P. Johnson, University of Illinois at Chicago

Young Ik Cho, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Sharon Shavitt, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Noel Chavez, University of Illinois at Chicago

Saul Weiner, University of Illinois at Chicago

Research Questions

- Can we use respondent characteristics and personality to predict likelihood of demonstrating certain kinds of behaviors?
- Can this information be used to help interviewers identify respondents who are particularly likely to demonstrate problematic behaviors?
- Do personality characteristics predict respondent behaviors comparably across racial and ethnic groups (comparability of behavior coding to identify problems with cognitive process)?

Data

- 405 Respondents recruited via telephone
 - *White: N=103*
 - *Black: N=100*
 - *Mexican American: (N=102; English/Spanish)*
 - *Korean American (N=100; English/Korean)*
- Came into the lab for an interview
 - *PAPI Instruments*
 - ***CAPI interview about social and political issues***
 - *Subjective, Behavioral, and Knowledge*
- More than 100 questions about social and political opinions, beliefs, and knowledge
- Respondents were all asked the same questions (constant)
- 77 minutes on average
- Separated into five sections
 - *Section I: Government and Policy*
 - *Section II: Family demographics, behavioral*
 - *Section III: Economy, taxes and spending, media use*
 - *Section IV: Knowledge*
 - *Section V: Respondent reports on cognitive processes, respondent demographics,*
- Order of sections was rotated: random assignment
 - *Half of respondents: I, II, III, IV, V*
 - *Half of respondents: III, IV, I, II, V*

Measures of interviewer and respondent behavior:

- Interviewers were video and audio recorded
- Audio recordings were used to code the verbal behaviors of both respondents and interviewers
 - *Up to three interviewer and three respondent behaviors were coded for each question*
 - *20% of all behavior codes were validated (n=55,253 unique codes); validation rate was 95.7%*
- Paradata (not analyzed here)
 - *Reading time was assessed for each question (excluding demographics)*
 - *Response latencies were also assessed (excluding demographics)*

Behaviors

- Behavior categories:
 - **Comprehension Problems** (e.g., ask for clarification of a term; asked question to be repeated)
 - **Memory Retrieval Problems** (e.g., respondent explicitly says they're having difficulty remembering relevant information)
 - **Mapping Problems** (e.g., respondent gives an answer that doesn't meet the question objectives)
 - **Social Desirability Concerns** (e.g., respondent refuses to answer due to privacy concerns; respondent answers but expresses concerns about anonymity or privacy)
- Other behaviors:
 - Verbal reasoning (respondent articulates the logic they used to reach an answer)
 - Qualified response (respondent gives answer, but expresses uncertainty about it)
 - Seeking approval (respondent seeks approval: e.g., asking "Is that right?")
 - Respondent laughs
- Summed across 100+ items for each respondent

Respondent characteristics:

- Gender
- Race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Mexican-American, Korean-American)
- Language of Interview (English, Spanish, Korean)
- Education (years of education)
- Income
- Age

Personality Measures

- Need for cognition
 - *The tendency for an individual to engage in and enjoy thinking*
- Need to evaluate
 - *The tendency for an individual to form evaluative responses about situations and objects*
- BIDR (Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding)
 - *Impression management*
 - *Self-deception*
- Need for cognitive closure
 - *An individual's desire for a firm answer to a question and an aversion toward ambiguity.*

Analyses

- OLS Regressions predicting the following dependent variables
 - *Number of comprehension problems*
 - *Number of memory retrieval problems*
 - *Number of mapping problems*
 - *Number of respondent concerns about social desirability expressed*
 - *Number of times respondent articulated their reasoning while answering*
 - *Number of qualified responses (uncertainty)*
 - *Number of times respondent seeks interviewer approval for their response*
 - *Number of times respondent laughs*

Analyses (cont.)

- Independent variables
 - *Respondent characteristics*
 - *Personality characteristics*
 - *Interactions between race/ethnicity and personality characteristics (comparability)*

Findings: Descriptive Statistics

| Sum of Behaviors Across Questions | Mean | Standard Deviation | Minimum | Maximum | N |
|-----------------------------------|------|--------------------|---------|---------|-----|
| Comprehension Problems | 25.4 | 16.5 | 0 | 103 | 405 |
| Memory Problems | 0.3 | .7 | 0 | 6 | 405 |
| Mapping Problems | 19.2 | 9.6 | 0 | 61 | 405 |
| Social Desirability Concerns | .11 | 0.5 | 0 | 5 | 405 |
| Verbal Reasoning | 11.9 | 13.8 | 0 | 97 | 405 |
| Laughter | 8.7 | 8.7 | 0 | 47 | 405 |
| Qualified Responses | 11.7 | 9.3 | 0 | 57 | 405 |
| Seeks Confirmation | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0 | 12 | 405 |

Findings: Respondent characteristics (standardized)

| Predictor | Comprehension | Memory | Mapping | SD | Verbal Reasoning | Laughter | Qualified Response | Seeks Confirmation |
|---------------------|---------------|--------|---------|------|------------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Race/ ethnicity* | | | | | | | | |
| Black | .07 | .21** | .02 | -.03 | -.09 | -.13* | -.13* | -.11 |
| Mexican-American | -.03 | .13 | -.15* | .09 | -.24** | -.37** | -.24** | -.13 |
| Korean-American | .47** | .10 | .40** | -.09 | .07 | -.11 | .02 | .02 |
| Language* | | | | | | | | |
| Spanish | .08 | .22** | .22** | .04 | -.10 | -.06 | -.05 | .17** |
| Korean | -.17* | -.14 | -.21** | -.02 | -.20** | -.11 | -.40** | .12 |
| Age | .27** | .12* | .31** | .02 | .23** | .006 | .11* | .09 |
| Income | -.01 | .10 | -.05 | -.03 | -.06 | .05 | .07 | -.06 |
| Education | .13* | .08 | -.27** | -.01 | -.03 | -.06 | -.04 | -.12 |
| Male | .06 | .02 | -.04 | -.03 | .05 | -.20** | -.08 | -.07 |

Findings: Respondent personality

| Predictor | Comprehension | Memory | Mapping | SD | Verbal Reasoning | Laughter | Qualified Response | Seeks Confirmation |
|----------------------------|---------------|--------|---------|------|------------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Need to Evaluate | .09+ | .05 | .10* | .12* | .22** | .11* | .08 | .01 |
| Need for Cognition | -.05 | .06 | -.06 | .02 | .07 | -.05 | -.05 | -.03 |
| BIDR | | | | | | | | |
| Self-Deceptive Behavior | -.08 | -.05 | .04 | -.04 | -.11* | -.09 | -.11 | -.04 |
| Impression Management | .11* | -.03 | .09 | -.05 | .14* | .05 | .05 | -.01 |
| Need for Cognitive Closure | -.06 | -.07 | -.09 | -.08 | -.03 | -.07 | -.003 | .07 |

Findings: Race/ethnicity and respondent personality

| Statistic | Comprehension | Memory | Mapping | SD | Verbal Reasoning | Laughter | Qualified Response | Seeks Confirmation |
|--------------------------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Change in R ² | .03 | .06 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .04 | .07 |
| Degrees of freedom | (15,347) | (15,347) | (15,347) | (15,347) | (15,347) | (15,347) | (15,347) | (15,347) |
| F-test | .87 | 1.56 | .91 | .74 | .83 | .76 | 1.27 | 2.04 |
| p-value | .60 | .08 | .55 | .74 | .65 | .72 | .22 | .01** |

Seeking Confirmation Interaction:

- Self-deceptive enhancement
 - *Self-deceptive enhancement was positively associated with confirmation seeking behavior among Whites, but negatively associated for all three other groups*
- Impression management
 - *Impression management was positively associated with confirmation seeking behavior among Korean-Americans, but not among the other three groups*

Conclusions

- Some characteristics consistently predicted potentially problematic behaviors
 - *Age*
 - *Race/ethnicity*
 - Korean-Americans and Mexican-Americans –
 - *More problems*
 - *Particularly when interviewed in English*
- Most personality factors didn't consistently predict behaviors
 - *Need to evaluate – consistently positively associated*
 - *Impression management – associated with behaviors like clarifying the meaning or the task and verbalizing reasoning*
- Also very little evidence that personality predicted behaviors differently across racial or ethnic groups
- May be useful for helping interviewers identify respondents who **may** be more likely to demonstrate behaviors that interviewers will need to address

Limitations/Future directions

- Limitations
 - *Not a probability sample*
- Future directions
 - *Examine along with question characteristics and question-level data (multi-level analyses)*
 - *Also examine interviewer behaviors (small numbers of interviewers and matched on race)*