Introduction

• Customization of survey instruments (i.e., adapting the layout or the content of a questionnaire to the respondent) can prove beneficial for multiple reasons, such as reducing interview duration or improving data quality (Buskirk et al. 2018; Chun, Hearings and Schouten 2018).

• We expect that more elaborated forms of customization, based on the use of new technologies, can impact the burden imposed on the interviewer and the respondent.

• In the project “New Methods for Occupation Coding” (further information in Schierholz et al. 2018b), a survey instrument was developed that uses supervised learning algorithms to predict candidate job categories from official job classification, e.g., the national German Classification of Occupations (GCO).

• These suggestions are presented to the respondent who, ideally, selects the most appropriate occupation. Therefore, the content of the question is changing depending on the verbatim input.

Does customization impose additional burden on the interviewer in the survey interaction? Does this lead to interviewer errors?

→ Preliminary results based on data from Schierholz et al. (2018)

Does the burden perceived by respondents and interviewers as well as the usability of the instrument observed by interviewers differ depending on whether interviewers use conversational interviewing (CI) or standardized interviewing (SI)?

→ Proposal for an experimental study using a mixed methods approach

Previous Research

Background

• (Cognitive) burden on the interviewer can lead to misbehavior and is, therefore, a crucial factor that affects data quality (Japec 2007).

• Task difficulty can affect interviewer burden

→ Customization introduced by machine learning increases the task difficulty for the interviewer. Burden on the interviewer is expected to be high because the instrument changes in every interview. Therefore, the interviewer needs to constantly adapt to the changing contents of the instrument.

Data and methods

• Analysis of audio-recordings of 150 standardized telephone interviews in which a prior version of the tool for occupation coding was tested

• Behavior coding was used to investigate (a) how often and (b) why interviewers and respondents deviated from paradigmatic answer sequences

1. Development of a coding scheme by using full coding at the exchange level for a subsample of the selected interviews (n=50)

2. Application of this coding scheme on the full sample

Main Results

Interviewer satisfying as a sign for interviewer burden

• Behaviors include: Selecting a response without asking the respondent (4%), reading only one response option to the respondent (14%), skipping (seemingly inappropriate response options (36%) Possible effect on data quality: Even if a response option matches the verbatim answer of the respondent, skipping response options can bias the results, because another (more concrete) job title might be more appropriate

Troubles when reading the response options to the respondent

• In 22.6% of the interviews, interviewers fail to make appropriate pauses between response options, in 12% of the interviews, interviewers read response options incorrectly, leading to a change of meaning

• This can be interpreted as a sign of interviewer burden because it shows that interviewers lack the familiarity with the tool

Other signs for increased burden: interviewer has to contact a supervisor (3%), problems caused by the computer as a third agent in the conversation (14.7%)
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Planned Research

Background

Interviewing technique is likely to influence interviewers’ as well as respondents’ general perceptions of the survey situation as well as perceptions of task difficulty and burden.

Planned Research

Background

Intervening technique is likely to influence interviewers’ as well as respondents’ general perceptions of the survey situation as well as perceptions of task difficulty and burden.

Conversational Interviewing

Staggered burden/low usability (more cognitive resources required)

No burden/low usability (establishment of conversational grounding facilitates interaction)

RESP. Lower burden (interviewers’ behavior facilitates interaction)

Abstract of 1st Interviewing with 1st version: 1) Briefing: embedded tool in the system displays both the text and the options; the text in grey font were suggested to the interviewers and only added to illustrate underlying categories from the GCO

Abstract of 2nd Interviewing with 1st version: 1) Briefing: embedded tool in the system displays both the text and the options; the text in grey font was not shown during the interview and only added to illustrate underlying categories from the GCO

Abstract of 2nd Interviewing with 1st version: 1) Briefing: embedded tool in the system displays both the text and the options; the text in grey font was not shown during the interview and only added to illustrate underlying categories from the GCO

Research design and analysis strategy

A new version of the tool for occupation coding has been developed (Figure 2). To improve data quality, we do not use job titles as response options but occupation-specific task descriptions (e.g. not “school principal” but “management duties in schools of general education”) which is likely to increase task difficulty for interviewers as argued before but also for the respondent (Schierholz et al 2018b).

• We propose a mixed-methods study that will be conducted in cooperation with the German Institute for Angewandte Sozialwissenschaft (IaSS). The tool for occupation coding will be implemented in a telephone survey. Experimental study in which we randomly assign a subsample of 60 interviewers to two experimental groups that will conduct the interviews using SI or CI.

We will rely on different data sources to compare the two interviewing techniques:

1) Interviewers will rate the usability of the tool (1) before and (2) after the field stage to study whether CI- and SI-interviewers rate the usability of the tool differently before and after the field stage.

2) In the CATI-interviews, (a) interviewers and (b) respondents will rate the difficulty of the (a) administration of tool and (b) difficulty of choosing a response option

3) Audio-recordings of the interaction that will be analysed using behavior coding to detect indications of problems by interviewers and respondents.

4) Results from focus groups that will complement the quantitative data collected in the survey and will inform an extended interviewer survey after the field stage.
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