OBSERVATION OF NHS-HIS INTERVIEWS

MAY 1965

SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This study was possible only through the cooperation of many people. Although it is not possible to mention all of them, we would like to particularly thank Hobert Yerkey, Director of the Detroit Regional Office of the Bureau of the Census, and Irene Monti, the field supervisor in Detroit, who helped us so much in the pretesting phase of the study and in the development of training materials for observers. George Kearns and Curtis Hill of the Bureau of the Census gave suggestions and did a great deal of the work required to organize and carry out the complex scheduling for this study. Leon Pritzger of the Bureau of the Census helped with his suggestions and support for the design of the study. Robert Fuchsberg of the United States Public Health Service was the contract officer and helped to coordinate the efforts of the three organizations involved in this project. Finally, the Census interviewers who came to Ann Arbor for training and served as observers in this study were Hilda Walker, Ruby Ver Strate, Kathleen Hartwell, Doris Riddick, Gladys Bell, and Jeanne Johnson.

This report presents one part of the analyses made by the Survey

Research Center of The University of Michigan to the National Health

Survey, United States Public Health Service, as fulfillment of contract

No. PH.86-64-37. The research reported here was a cooperative undertaking

of the National Health Survey, the Bureau of the Census, and the Survey

Research Center. The analysis presented was carried out by Charles F.

Cannell, Floyd J. Fowler, Jr., and Kent H. Marquis, assisted by Sandra

F. Myers, of the Survey Research Center. The statement below is a general

overview of the research project which was the source of the data discussed

in this report.

The objectives of this study were:

1. To identify major variables which are related to accuracy of

   reporting of health information in the National Health Survey,

   household interview.

2. To gain sufficient insight into the dynamics underlying those

   variables that they can be manipulated.

There were four steps in the data collection procedure. First, thirty-

five interviewers from six Bureau of the Census Regional offices were

observed while carrying out their usual NHS-HIS interview assignments. The

observers, using an observation form specifically designed for this study,

were Census interviewers who had been specially trained to use the form.

Second, after each interview, the health interviewer was asked to fill out

a brief report on the respondent and the interview. Third, on the day

following the health interview, an interviewer who had been sworn in as

a Special Agent of the United States Public Health Service, returned to the home and interviewed the principal respondent about the health interview: the information and attitudes he had about it. Fourth, when all observations of a given health interviewer had been completed, this special interviewer interviewed her about various aspects of her job and her reactions to various procedures and types of interviewing situations.

FIGURE 1

Chronology of data collection in a typical week

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday
Health Interview	Group A	Group B	Group C	Rest of Group C if necessary
Observation	Group A	Group B	None	None
Self-enumerative form on respondent	Group A	Group B	None	None
Special Interview	None	Group A	Group B	None
Interview with interviewer	Any time after observation of health interviewer's work has been completed			

Group A   Those respondents in regular NHS sample who could be contacted on Monday for health interview.

Group B   Those respondents in regular NHS sample not contacted on Monday but contacted and interviewed on Tuesday.

Group C   Those respondents in regular NHS sample who could not be reached on either Monday or Tuesday.

Figure 1 presents the standard data collection procedure in a given week. Occasionally an observer or special interviewer worked an extra day if too few interviews were made during the allotted two days. As Figure 2 indicates, the study was carried out in six Regions for six weeks. The study was designed to obtain data on 12 respondents for each interviewer. In one case, however, the health interviewer became ill and no data were collected on her assignment. In several others, some dwelling units were unoccupied resulting in a reduced number of obtained interviews.

FIGURE 2

Number of interviews obtained in final sample by week and region

Week	Region						
	Atlanta	Charlotte	Chicago	Detroit	New York	Phila-delphia	Total
May 4-10	15	12	11	14	13	14	79
May 11-17	12	14	8	12	9	11	66
May 18-24	13	11	14	11	12	12	73
May 25-31	9	9	9	12	15	13	67
June 1- 7	14	10*	10	14	0	15	63
June 8-14	4	14	14	10	11	11	64
Total	67	70	66	73	60	76	412

*Interviewer from Chicago region substituted, no Charlotte interviewer available.

A total of 478 interviews were observed. Thirteen of these
respondents refused to be reinterviewed and 53 could not be reached by
the special interviewer during the two days in which she was to work,
leaving 412 respondents for whom complete information is available.

Population estimates cannot be made from this sample for several
reasons. First, the sample was drawn only from the area east of the
Mississippi, with the extreme Northeast excluded. Second, those
respondents who are most difficult to reach are somewhat underrepresented.
However, the sample is quite comparable to the population in a number
of respects and is representative enough for the two purposes for which
it was designed: to suggest major tendencies in respondents and to
provide data for examining relationships between respondent
characteristics and behavior.

ABSTRACT

A special procedure based on previous literature and extensive pre-
liminary testing was developed to record behavior and observer impres-
sions during an ongoing interview. The procedure emphasized recording
by a third person of easily discriminable behavior acts and sequences
relevant to the NHS-HIS interview.

Data are presented in descriptive form for 412 interviews.

Behaviors directly related to asking and answering questions were
recorded in three selected parts of the interview. In these parts,
respondents were observed to give about 40 answers on the average, about
one-fourth of which were elaborated with additional information. They
seldom took the initiative to seek clarification of questions from
the interviewer, however, or to question the adequacy of their answers,
or to consult other persons, medical records, calendars, or other
sources of information. Large variation between respondents in the
frequency of these behaviors was found.

Interviewers probed about 12 per cent of these answers on the
average. They divided their probes almost equally between directive
and non-directive types. Other interviewer behavior such as clarifying
a question or suggesting a respondent consult other sources of informa-
tion was rare.

Conversation not directly related to the interview questions was
recorded for both interviewer and respondent. In general, such con-
versation was relatively frequent for respondents, but with consider-
able variation between respondents. Interviewers were seldom observed

to initiate unrelated conversation, and the variance between them was small. Respondent initiations were about equally divided between talking about themselves and humor (laughing, joking) with almost no conversation about the interviewer as a person. Interviewers, when they did initiate unrelated conversation, focused on the respondent or introduced humor. Reactions of the respondent to extraneous conversation initiated by the interviewer tended, on the average, to be more positive than interviewer reactions to respondent conversation. Interviewer reactions were more often coded neutral. Almost no instances of negative reactions were recorded for either person.

Some evidence is presented to indicate that each interview may be characterized by a "general activity level" since all types of behaviors of both interviewer and respondent show consistent positive correlations.

Special recording procedures were used for the Chronic and Acute Conditions Lists, the Specialists Card, and the family income question. For Chronic and Acute Conditions List A, respondents paused to consider a list condition infrequently and interviewers probed only occasionally. Ratings made during List B indicate that both interviewer and respondent took an adequate amount of time, on the average, to read and answer to the list.

When filling out the Specialists Card, about one-fourth of the respondents asked the meaning of at least one of the items, and one-third asked other (procedural) questions. Most were rated as giving careful consideration to filling out the card. Interviewers usually gave an adequate explanation of the meaning of a Specialist Card item when asked. They read the whole card to 16 per cent of their respondents,

part of the card to eight per cent.

Almost none of the respondents showed any resistance to being asked about family income but interviewers lent assistance to one-fourth of the respondents in arriving at an income figure.

Several times during the interview, attempts were made to measure respondent attitude. Strong positive or strong negative attitudes were almost never recorded. Attitudes concerning initial receptiveness to being interviewered were generally in the positive direction. During the interview itself, neutral attitudes were recorded for almost all respondents.

Respondent demographic characteristics account for little of the variance in recorded behaviors but a moderate amount of variance in observer ratings. The most consistent relationship is that as the age of the respondent increases, behaviors tend to be more frequent, especially elaborating upon answers and initiating irrelevant conversation. Older respondents are also more likely to be rated as having difficult, strained interviews.

Various respondent competence measures are directly (but slightly) related to family income. High income respondents tend to give more acceptable answers and receive less probing. They consider the Specialists Card more carefully and are rated as understanding questions well. Interviewers also tend to initiate more irrelevant conversation in these interviews.

Respondent education relates to the above variables in much the same way as income, but the relations are not as pronounced. Respondent race and sex show no consistent relations to the observation variables.

The report also includes a description of several other behavioral measures and ratings of less central, but possibly salient, aspects of the interview. Finally, comparisons of overall ratings and behavior items hypothesized to be measuring the same constructs are presented and discussed.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The Survey Research Center (SRC), under contract to the U.S. Public Health Service, is conducting an extensive series of studies to obtain a more detailed understanding of phenomena which influence the two-person interview situation. Current studies are aimed at understanding variables which affect respondent reporting accuracy.

Previous studies which attempt an explanation of important factors in the interview have focused on events or phenomena outside the actual interview situation, such as personality characteristics of interviewers or demographic characteristics of respondents. In order to test the psychological hypotheses underlying this study, more immediate records of actual behavior were needed. These records were obtained by using a specially developed interview observation procedure.

This report will give a general outline of the observation procedure and the results of its application to a series of interviews from the National Health Survey - Health Interview Survey (NHS - HIS).

For specific details on observation technique, forms used, and definitions employed, two other documents are appended to this report:

  Appendix C: Interview Observation Manual (PHS-T274-4/4-64)

  Appendix D: Interview Observation Form (PHS-T274-1/4-64)

Description of the Observation Technique

The SRC observation technique yields a permanent record of what goes on during an interview. This technique differs somewhat from other observation techniques with respect to procedures, nature of items, and what is observed.

Procedure. Observation is accomplished by making use of a third person to record what goes on between the interviewer and respondent. This differs from techniques which require the interviewer to keep track of what is occurring. The total number of interview questions are divided into several selected segments and the observer is instructed to record certain behaviors in specified segments. The SRC technique does not vary the selected segments from interview to interview.*

What is observed. The selected segment procedure permits an observer to observe and record a wide variety of behaviors in the interview. Other observation procedures are limited to using a small set of items for an entire interview or other behavior setting.** The SRC procedure concentrates observation on behaviors rather than on feelings, impressions, motivations, etc. These behaviors, for the majority of items, are verbal interchanges. The advantage of recording conversation is that the observer need not look at the respondent and interviewer at all times. Observation is limited to the behaviors of only two persons: the interviewer and the principal respondent. The behaviors of other persons in the situation, for

---

*The selected segment technique is, of course, a form of drawing a biased sample. Unbiased sampling techniques such as varying question sample segments from interview to interview on some random or "stratified" basis could also be used.

**This is partially due to the fact that individuals are known to work successfully with only about seven distinct categories of ideas at one time. This number can be increased either by extensive training, which is costly, or by increasing the similarity between categories, which can lead to confusion and lack of reliability.

example, a husband or a husband-wife team sharing respondent duties, are recorded only indirectly through "distraction" ratings. This contrasts with observation procedures in which behaviors of more than two persons must be noted.

Nature of the Items. The items of behavior which are recorded differ radically from other techniques. Generally, the SRC technique keeps records of only very specific behaviors. These require minimum inference or judgment on the part of the observer to record them, allowing more time for observing rather than thinking about complex ratings; when such ratings are required, the observer is allocated a relatively large block of time in which to make them. Finally, attention was given to devising a simple recording process for each of the items. In general, all data are recorded by using check marks and tally marks. In a few instances the observer is asked to use a set of codes (A,B,C). The observer is instructed to "write" or "describe" only in "unusual circumstances."

Description of the Observation Form

The observation form, used for recording interview behaviors, is reproduced in Appendix D. It is generally divided into four sections with the following characteristics:

The first section includes what happens during the first minutes of contact between the interviewer and respondent when the respondent agrees to be interviewed and the interview is being set up.

Next, the question and answer exchange receives attention, in addition to other behaviors which occur during this period apart from actual questions or answers.

The third section concentrates on events taking place after the last interview question has been answered.

In the final section, the observer records general impressions of the particular interview.

Each section is further subdivided so that observations of different behaviors may be obtained.

Development of the Observation Form

Criteria - The observation procedure chosen had to meet three general criteria:

a. To describe as much of the important behavior which takes place in the interview as possible.

b. To obtain reliable, valid measures of theoretical constructs.

c. To be usable in the field by people not acquainted with observation technique who could be trained in a relatively short period of time.

Other observation procedures -

Observation techniques have, in the past, been used in connection with studies measuring psychological variables. Results, however, have not always been encouraging, because the above criteria of comprehensiveness, reliability, validity, and economy could not be met simultaneously. Most attempts over the past 30 to 40 years have involved extensive specialized training of observers to record such things as hostility, regression, affiliation, or other psychological concepts. Reliability (or agreement between different observers) tended to be reasonably good, but the validity (or meaning) of the measures was often open to serious question.

Problems of validity were partially resolved in this study by using techniques which record only directly observable behavior, such as speech, not inferred behavior, such as hostility. Inferences about the psychological meaning of the data were made after the objective data were recorded and analyzed.

No measurement procedure, however, can be designed to comprise all the specific behaviors involved in some of the questions, as "How willing was the respondent to be interviewed?" All the indications of respondent willingness to be interviewed cannot be listed on a page for an observer to check as they occur. Individual judgment, therefore, must play a part in an assessment process which has, as one of its goals, the interpretation of objectively recorded behavior. Heyns, et al. (1948), demonstrate an interesting technique for employing observer judgment in the interpretation of objective data. They find that reliability and validity are increased if the observer first records objective behaviors and, then, enters his overall impressions. This procedure was duplicated in this study.

The most widely used, current behavior observation technique is that of Bales (1951). Bales' technique, most frequently used with small groups engaged in solving problems, yields continuous records of behavior. The success of the technique demonstrates that it is possible to construct reliable and valid, minimum-inference obser-vation procedures and that the data can be used successfully to test theories about how people interact. Bales experimented with many different recording systems and techniques. Unfortunately, the Bales system requires too long a period of observer training for it to be feasible in this study. In addition, the actual behaviors

recorded by using this procedure are not wholly comparable to those deemed important in the interview. This study, however, does rely heavily on Bales' experiences in developing his system. SRC specified particular behaviors relevant to a particular theoretical idea and had observers look for and record them. Observers recorded detailed behaviors, however, rather than grouping behaviors together into theoretical categories. Under this procedure, inferences about overall patterns of behavior still had to be made, but they were made during the analysis stage rather than the data recording stage.

Since specific content is ignored in the Bales' system, a set of descriptive categories had to be developed for this study which combined measures of theoretical concepts with purely descriptive records. Content areas included such things as style of introduction used by the interviewer, type of probing, and interviewer-respondent rapport.

Item selection. A set of initial items was developed and subjected to intensive field and laboratory testing. Laboratory testing involved actual and simulated interviews observed simultaneously by three observers (the authors). The field testing consisted of having actual NHS-HIS interviews observed by each of the authors separately.

Items and procedures were eliminated if they were judged very difficult or impossible by any one of the authors. They also were discarded if reliability was consistently low in the staged interviews.

On the basis of these pretests, many items were eliminated. Eliminated items were those for which reliability was low and could not be improved easily or those which took too much time to record or think about. A number of the ratings involving complex judgments

were eliminated or shifted to the last section of the observation form so that the observer could have more time to think about them (e.g. "shows lack of understanding"). Most judgments which required the observer to use visual cues were discarded (e.g. posture, facial expression). Most of the written description also had to be left out (e.g. "describe the physical layout of the room, persons, TV set, etc.").

Other things eliminated were codings of long sequences of interaction, indicating what was said, who said it, what was the reaction of the other person, etc. And finally, most of the time recordings were eliminated: both total times (amount of time spent answering a particular question or explaining the survey) and actual times (when the interviewer entered the house, when the first question was asked). Several efforts were made to get an objective indication of the pace of the interview (e.g. how fast the questions were being asked or answers given), but all proved impossible. Use of a stop watch was found not to be of any great value.

Study Design

The observations were used as part of an overall study design investigating reporting accuracy in the NHS-HIS interview. The overall design is explained in the Foreword to this report.

Observer training. For this study, the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the agency which conducts the NHS-HIS interviews, selected six NHS-HIS interviewers who had participated previously in research projects to be trained as observers.

One week before the field work began, the six observers came to The Survey Research Center for training. Training sessions were

primarily concerned with the goals of the study, a detailed explanation
of the Interview Observation Manual, (Appendix C), and practice in
observing and recording staged interviews. The staged interviews
followed carefully prepared scripts covering all aspects of the form
and stressing difficult items. Furthermore, each simulated interview
was tape-recorded while in progress. Differences among observers
concerning any verbal behavior were resolved by listening to the
tape-recordings.

To supplement the role-played interviews, two training films
were made of staged NHS-HIS interviews. For these films, an experienced
NHS-HIS interviewer interviewed two respondents who had no connection
with the NHS-HIS or SRC. The movies proved valuable in conveying
the subtleties of using the observation form, and could be rerun when
questions arose.

One half day of training was devoted to actual field experience,
so that the trainers would have an opportunity to answer questions
and deal with problems that did not appear in the controlled setting.

Training performance records were kept for each observer on six
staged interviews, including the two movies, and served as a check
upon the amount of inter-observer reliability to be expected.

In order to eliminate one potential source of bias, it was con-
tinually emphasized to the observers that the study was not designed
to "check up" on their colleagues whom they would be observing. It
was stressed that respondent performance was of primary interest.

Data Collection Procedures. The essentials of the study
design are found in the Foreword to this report. An elaboration of
the design of the observation procedures is given here.

The observers were specially trained, experienced NHS-HIS interviewers. They worked on Monday and Tuesday of six consecutive weeks. Each observer was assigned on the basis of proximity to one of six geographic regions, and carried out her assignment within this region for the duration of the study. No observer was assigned to her "home" region.

The trained observers accompanied the regular NHS-HIS interviewer in each region. If it was necessary to introduce the observer to the respondent, the interviewer merely said: "This is Mrs. Smith, she's working with me."

As soon as possible after entering the dwelling unit, the observer identified the "principal respondent," or the person who assumed responsibility for reporting for the greatest number of people in the household, including herself. If two respondents took approximately equal responsibility for reporting, the female most closely related to the head of the family was considered to be the principal respondent.

During the interview, the observer remained in the background as much as possible, never speaking to the interviewer and speaking to the respondent only when it was unavoidable. She recorded certain behaviors and made several ratings on the observation form provided for each interview. This recording commenced before the formal interview began, continued while it was in progress, after the last question had been asked, and after both she and the interviewer had left the house.

Data were sent to SRC weekly for coding and analysis.

References

1. Bales, R. F., (1951) _Interaction Process Analysis_, Addison-
    Wesley, Cambridge, Mass.

2. Heyns, R. W., (1948) "Functional Analysis of Group Problem
    Solving Behavior," Conference Research Project, Department of
    Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to provide an overall description
of what occurs in the NHS-HIS interviews obtained by using the SRC
interview observation procedure. In the following pages two basic
types of behaviors are described: behaviors related to asking and
answering questions, and behaviors not related to the questions.
These results are supplemented by a discussion of some qualitative
aspects of the interview, obtained by specialized recording forms
and ratings made by the observers.

Special problems are raised concerning the interpretation of
the data to follow. The observation procedure was designed for two
purposes: to provide a detailed description of the behaviors taking
place in an interview, and to test certain hypotheses about the
determinants of interview performance and reporting accuracy. The
latter called for several items which have very little purely
descriptive value, but yield interesting results in combination with
other variables. Since the purpose of this report is descriptive
rather than theoretical, however, most of these items have been
omitted from the main body of the report and presented in Appendix A.
The behavioral and rating items discussed in this section were also
derived from theoretical considerations, but, in addition, have
intrinsic descriptive value outside of the theoretical context.
Aside from providing a basic framework within which to present the
data, this theoretical context will not be discussed.

Following each section in which one type of data is presented,
the variables are related to five demographic characteristics of the

principal respondent: age, education, family income, race, and sex. The pattern of these relations is then discussed.

It should be pointed out that certain general problems exist with respect to these demographic comparisons on age, race, and sex. The age variable is broken down into five groups, the last of which (75 or older) contains only 27 respondents. Race and sex are dichotomous variables. Only sixty-one respondents (15% of the respondents) are non-white and only 82 respondents (20% of the respondents) are male.

In general, the criteria for including a table showing the relation of an observed variable to a demographic characteristic are non-statistical. A table is included in the report either because it tends to substantiate a consistent relationship found between a demographic variable and other observation variables, or it is included when demographic groups differ greatly with respect to an observation variable.

The data are based on 412 observed interviews for which a follow-up interview was also obtained with the principal respondent.

Behaviors Related to Asking and Answering Questions

Behavior samples. The major portion of the observation of the NHS-HIS interview is devoted to behaviors connected with asking and answering questionnaire items. Three sections of the interview were selected for observation and recording:

Sample 1: Question 8. Were you sick at any time last week or the week before?
Question 9. Last week or the week before did you take any medicine or treatment for any condition?
Question 10. Last week or the week before did you have any accidents or injuries?
Question 11. Did you ever have an accident or injury that still bothers you or affects you in any way?

This series of questions was repeated for each member of the house-

hold.

Sample Two: A series of questions which elaborates upon the

health conditions reported in sample one.*

Sample Three: Question 20. Last week or the week before did
anyone in the family go to a doctor or to a doctor's office or clinic?
(Probes follow for affirmative response.)
Question 21. About how long has it been since you (your ----)
have seen or talked to a doctor?

Response Behavior. A tally was kept of six types of responses

which the principal respondent might give during the selected portions

of the interview.

a. The number of acceptable answers given. These are answers
which are complete, in that the interviewer is willing to accept them
without probing further than is specified in the NHS-HIS interview
schedule.**

b. The number of unacceptable answers given for which the
interviewer probes for needed additional information. Only when
the interviewer used a probe was an answer placed in this category.

c. The number of elaborated answers. This category reflects
the number of times the respondent offered additional information
after answering a question which was defined by the observer as
pertinent to the question asked. Examples of relevant additional
information would be: attempts to remember the date of a doctor
visit by recalling important events on the day of the visit, explaining
how one health condition is a symptom of another, or describing
symptoms of a reported illness more fully than required.

d. The number of times the respondent asks that a question be
explained, clarified, or repeated.

---

*NHS-HIS Table 1, Accident Table, and Activities Limitation
Card but Not Table 2.
**Other data indicate that interviewers occasionally do probe
after complete answers are given. This implies either that there
were some errors in recording information or that interviewers did
some "superfluous" probing.

e. The number of times the respondent refers to other sources for information rather than relying solely on his own memory. These might be other persons, medical records, hospital or physician's bills, a calendar, etc.

f. The number of times the respondent questions the adequacy of his answer.

g. A seventh category "other, specify" was included in the observation recording form. This category was infrequently used by observers and has not provided any information of value to data analysis.

These six measures were designed to measure three aspects of respondent performance in the selected sections of the interview. The number of acceptable answers is a rough index of the degree of difficulty of the reporting task for each respondent. The difficulty is partly determined by such things as the number of people he reports for and how sick they are as well as how motivated he is to report and the adequacy of his memory for health conditions. The last four measures are indications of how far the respondent goes beyond the minimum reporting requirements; and the second measure shows how often the interviewer decides that the respondent has not completed these requirements.

The data presented below were collected for the three selected portions of the interview only.

The following table gives the average incidence per interview of each of these six respondent behaviors. Since the frequency distributions of most of these behaviors are skewed, means should be interpreted with caution. The obtained frequency distributions for each behavior are given in Tables 87 to 93 in Appendix B.

The table indicates that, on the average, respondents give 39 acceptable answers and two answers requiring probing for further information in the selected parts of the interview. About a fourth

TABLE 1

AVERAGE FREQUENCY IN THE SELECTED PORTIONS OF
THE INTERVIEW OF SIX TYPES OF RESPONSE BEHAVIOR

Respondent Behavior	Average Frequency per Interview
Acceptable answers	39
Answers interviewer probes for additional information	2
Elaborated answers	11
Requests clarification, repetition of question	1
Consults other persons, records, calendar, etc.	0.2
Questions the adequacy of his answer	0.2

N=412

of these answers are elaborated upon by respondents. Behaviors which require independent initiative on the part of the respondent, (requesting clarification, consulting other information sources, and questioning the adequacy of an answer), are infrequently observed.

These data suggest that respondents take some initiative in answering health questions by elaborating their answers, and that interviewers are not especially active since they probe only about 5% of these answers for further information.

The following paragraphs discuss each of the six measures in more detail.

Acceptable Answers:

The mean number of acceptable answers in the selected sections of the interview is 39 (median 35). The range varies greatly from 0^*-98. The distribution is only moderately skewed. The number of acceptable answers is affected by the number of people for whom the principal respondent is reporting since the number of NHS questions asked increases with the size of the reporting unit. The Pearson product-moment correlation between reporting unit size and number of acceptable answer is .45. The number of acceptable answers is also related to the number of conditions reported (Pearson r=.77).

Answers Requiring Further Probing:

Interviewers probed an average of 5% of the answers for additional information (mean = 2; median = 1). The distribution over 412 interviews is heavily skewed with a range from 0 to 28. No probing for additional information was recorded in the selected parts of 37% of the interviews.

---

*In one case, the principal respondent left the interview during the selected parts.

16.

<u>Elaborated Answers</u>:

Respondents elaborated answers an average of 11 times in the selected interview parts (median 7). Again, a very wide range in the number of elaborations given is observed (0-86). The distribution of such answers across interviews is skewed. The number of elaborated answers given is, in part, a function of the total number of answers given. In Table 90 (Appendix B), the distribution of the number of elaborated answers divided by the number of acceptable answers is shown. These data reflect the extent to which respondents elaborate independent of the number of acceptable answers given. The average proportion elaborated is .25 (median .22). The range of the proportion of elaborated answers is extremely large, going from .00 to .95.

<u>Asking Clarification</u>:

The average number of times respondents ask for clarification of meaning of an interview question is one (median 0). The range extends to 27 requests. In the selected portions of 62% of the observed interviews, no clarification was requested.

<u>Consulting Other Sources of Information</u>:

The average number of times the respondent consulted other sources of information in the selected parts of the interview was 0.2 (median 0). 88% of the respondents did not consult other sources of information but relied solely on their memories for the reporting of health data.

<u>Questioning the Adequacy of an Answer</u>:

Respondents were observed to question whether an answer they had just given was what the interviewer wanted an average of 0.2

17.

times in the selected parts of the interview (median 0). This behavior is entirely absent from 86% of the interviews, with an observed range across interviews of 0 to 4.

In general, one gets the picture of a fairly wide variability in response patterns. Some respondents, for example, elaborate little and others a great deal. Interviewers show some differences with respect to probing for additional information in the different interviews, but they tend to be much more homogeneous in their behaviors, staying close to the questions with only occasional probing for additional information. Respondents, as a group, do not engage in many "other" reporting behaviors such as checking with other sources of information or asking what the questions mean.

Response Behavior and Respondent Demographic Characteristics. The following table summarizes the main findings on the relation between respondent behavior in answering questions and respondent demographic characteristics.

Inspection of the tables which follow reveals that response behavior relates very weakly, if at all, to demographic characteristics. The data do suggest certain patterns worthy of further exploration. For example, it appears that interviewers tend to probe more often for further information when the respondent is older, less well educated, has a lower family income, or is non-white. These are respondent groups who might be expected to be more inclined to give incomplete answers. The high income respondents seem to be reporting well as a group. They give more acceptable answers without as much interviewer probing. In addition, they tend to consult outside sources of information somewhat more frequently.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF RELATIONS OF RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS TO RESPONSE BEHAVIOR

Respondent Behavior	Age	Education	Income	Race[1]	Sex[2]
Number of Acceptable Answers	0^3	0	+	0	0
Number of Answers Requiring Probing	+	-	-	+	0
Number of Elaborated Answers	+	-	0	0	0
Number of Requests for Clarification	0	0	0	0	0
Number Consult Other Information Sources	-	-	+	0	0
Number of Questions Adequacy of Answer	0	0	0	0	0

1. + indicates non-whites more

2. + indicates females more

3. Symbols indicate:

    + positive relation
    0 no relation
    - negative relation

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ACCEPTABLE ANSWERS
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

| Income | Number of Acceptable Answers | | | | | | | | |
	0-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60 or More	-Total	N
$0-1999	3	19	19	24	12	10	13	100%	59
2000-3999	9	24	19	16	10	9	13	100%	88
4000-6999	3	16	20	23	10	10	18	100%	103
7000-9999	1	14	24	17	12	10	22	100%	81
10,000 or more	0	9	15	24	15	9	28	100%	58
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	23

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ANSWERS WHICH REQUIRED PROBING BY
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Age	0	1-3	4-9	10 or More	Total %	N
Under 35	43	43	14	0	100	109
35-54	34	48	16	2	100	161
55-74	37	36	20	7	100	115
75 or more	26	48	11	15	100	27
Family Income						
$ 0-1999	25	34	27	14	100	59
2000-3999	34	44	15	7	100	88
4000-6999	43	43	13	1	100	103
7000-9999	43	38	19	0	100	81
10,000 or more	40	47	13	0	100	58
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	---	23
Race						
White	40	41	15	4	100	351
Non-white	20	52	23	5	100	61
Education						
0-8 years grade school	26	43	22	9	100	129
1-3 years high school	39	45	13	3	100	89
4 years high school	36	48	15	1	100	124
1 or more years college	56	32	12	0	100	66
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	---	4

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF ELABORATED ANSWERS BY
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Number of Elaborations

Age	0-9	10-19	20 or More	Total %	N
Under 35	76	18	6	100	109
35-54	59	27	14	100	161
55-74	50	30	20	100	115
75 or more	37	33	30	100	27

Education					
0-8 years grade school	44	33	23	100	129
1-3 years high school	68	22	10	100	89
4 years high school	65	24	11	100	123
1 year or more college	66	21	13	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	--	---	4

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF TIMES RESPONDENT CONSULTED
CALENDAR, RECORDS, OR OTHER SOURCES BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Number of Times Respondent
Consulted Other Sources

Age	0	1 or More	Total %	N
Under 35	84	16	100	109
35-54	83	12	100	161
55-74	90	10	100	115
75 or more	100	0	100	27
Education				
0-8 years grade school	88	12	100	129
1-3 years high school	86	14	100	89
4 years high school	88	12	100	123
1 year or more college	94	6	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	---	4
Family Income				
$ 0-1999	97	3	100	59
2000-3999	91	9	100	88
4000-6999	83	17	100	103
7000-9999	89	11	100	81
10,000 or more	86	14	100	58
Not Ascertained	--	--	---	23

23.

One would expect essentially the same pattern for high versus low education respondents, but the data do not confirm this expectation. Special problems arise with respect to the older respondents. It appears that, although they tend to elaborate more, their answers require more probing for additional information. The expected patterns did not emerge between whites and non-whites. No differences were expected with respect to respondent sex, and none were obtained.

In examining these data it appears there are some differences in respondent behavior within some demographic groups, and that these differences are generally in predictable directions. The most important finding, however, is that differences within a particular demographic level (e.g., age 35-54) are much larger than between levels of the same variable (e.g., age). This suggests that other factors are more important in respondent behavior than the demographic groups to which they belong.

Interviewing Behavior. Most studies concerned with the interview have focused major attention on the interviewer and her performance. Although this study has shifted the emphasis primarily to respondent characteristics and performance, certain interviewer behaviors were recorded, especially those which reflect probing techniques and other ways in which the interviewer helps the respondent report well. These measures of interviewer behavior were taken simultaneously with the response behavior discussed above, for three selected parts of the NHS-HIS interview.

Five interviewer behaviors concerned with eliciting accurate, complete information from the respondent were recorded.[*]

---

[*]Behaviors involved in asking a question from the interview schedule for the first time were not recorded since it was felt that there would be no important differences among interviewers.

1. <u>Non-Directive Probes</u>. Interviewer probes are divided into
two basic categories: non-directive and directive. Whether or not
the interviewer's probe introduces a potential source of bias in a
respondent's answer differentiates the two. Non-directive probes
do not limit the respondent's frame of reference in answering a
question. They do not suggest a specific answer, or weigh one re-
sponse alternative more than another. It is generally felt, therefore,
that non-directive probing is to be preferred over directive probing
in most instances. Two categories of non-directive probes were
recorded:

(a) Number of times the interviewer repeats a question exactly
as worded on the interview schedule. If any rephrasing occurred, the
behavior was coded in the next category.

(b) <u>Other non-directive probes</u>. Examples of other non-directive
probes are: "Could you explain that please?", "Can you tell me the
number of times you went?", "Will you give me an example?", or
"Could you be more specific?"

2. <u>Directive Probes</u>. Directive probes may direct the respondent's
attention to a specific response alternative. Examples of directive
probes are: "Were you in the hospital three times during the past
12 months?", "That was in the past two weeks, Mr. Jones?" Directive
probes, if used skillfully, need not produce biased data. They may
often have the same beneficial effects as non-directive probes.

3. <u>Other Interviewing Behavior</u>. Two other interviewer behaviors
were counted and recorded:

(a) Number of times the interviewer clarified the meaning of a
question.

(b) The number of times she suggested the respondent consult
other sources of information (other persons, records, bills, calendar).

<u>Results</u>. The following table gives the average frequency
per interview of each of these five interviewer behaviors.

Table 7 indicates that interviewers probe about five

times during the selected parts of the interview. This indicates

that about five of the average respondent's 41 answers (12%) receive

probes. The table also indicates that non-directive probes are

slightly more frequent than directive probes, and that the other re-

corded interviewer behaviors are seldom used.

Each of these interviewer behaviors is discussed below. More

detailed information on the distribution of these items is given in

Tables 94-97 in Appendix B.

25.

TABLE 7

AVERAGE FREQUENCY IN THE SELECTED PORTIONS OF
THE INTERVIEW OF FIVE INTERVIEWING BEHAVIORS

Interviewer Behavior	Average Frequency per Interview
Repeats question as worded	0.7
Other non-directive probes	2.4
Directive probes	2.2
Clarifies meaning of question	0.8
Suggests other sources be consulted	0.1

N=412

26.

Repeats Question

The interviewer repeats an interview question exactly as worded 0.7 times in the selected portions of the average interview (median 0). A wide range exists for this type of probing, from 0 to 29. Interviewers did not repeat an interview question in 71% of the observed interviews.

Other Non-Directive Probes

Other types of non-directive probing were more frequent, averaging 2.4 occurrences per interview (median 1). The distribution is skewed but with a slightly narrower range, from 0 to 23. These non-directive probes were not observed in 33% of the interviews.

Both Types of Non-Directive Probes

The combined average of the above two types of non-directive probes is 3.1 (combined median is 2). The combined frequency distribution tends to be moderately skewed with a range from 0 to 40. Neither type of non-directive probe was observed in 27% of the interviews.

Directive Probes

The average number of interviewer directive probes observed is 2.2 per interview (median 1). The distribution is skewed with a range from 0 to 37. Directive probes did not occur in the selected parts of 39% of the interviews.

All Types of Probes

The combined average of all types of probes, directive and non-directive, is approximately five per interview (combined median is 3). Fifteen per cent of the observed interviews contained no probing of any type in the three sampled parts of the question and answer process.

<u>Summary of observed probing behavior</u>. Generalizing from the interviewers' behaviors as observed in the selected sections of the interview, one can say that some type of probing occurs in a high proportion of the interviews, but that there is a moderately wide range among interviews as to number and type of probes used. In over 50 per cent of the interviews, fewer than four probes of all kinds were used in the selected sections.

The most frequent type of probe used can be classified as "non-directive" (repeating the question, or other interviewer comment to obtain a fuller report). Directive probes were not, however, at all uncommon.

<u>Other Interviewing Behavior</u>

The interviewer clarified the meaning of an interview question (either at her own initiative or at the request of the respondent) an average of 0.8 times (median 0). Such clarification was absent in 60% of the interviews for the sections sampled. Interviewers ranged in the number of clarifications given from 0 to 24.

Interviewer requests for the respondent to check with other data sources, such as hospital records, a calendar, another person, etc., were totally absent in 96% of the observed interviews, and ranged from 0-3 in individual interviews (mean=0.1; median = 0). It appears that interviewers make this request in only 4% of the interviews, but that respondents consult other sources in 12% of the interviews.[*] It is apparent that clarifying the questions is not very prevalent in NHS interviews, and that interviewers almost

---

[*]For information concerning the relation between the use of records by respondents and characteristics of reporting accuracy, see: J. B. Lansing, <u>et al</u>., <u>An Investigation of Response Error</u>, Urbana, Ill., Bureau of Economic and Business Research, 1961.

never suggest that the respondent consult records. The ranges for the two measured types of other interviewer behavior indicate that there are large differences among interviews in the extent to which non-probing techniques are used, but that, in general, probing for further information is the primary way that interviewers supplement the standardized schedule.

Tables showimg more detailed distribution characteristics appear in Appendix B.

Interviewing Behavior and Respondent Demographic Characteristics

The main findings concerning the relation of interviewing behavior for the selected parts of the interview to respondent demographic characteristics are given in the following table. In general, no strong relations or consistent patterns can be found. The relations obtained (non-directive probes inversely related to education and income, and more frequent for non-whites) were opposite from what was predicted.

The following table shows the relation between respondent demographic characteristics and interviewer non-directive probing in greater detail.

Conversation Not Directly Related to The Questions

Introduction

The preceding section has dealt with behaviors of the respondent and interviewer which are more or less programmed by the questionnaire schedule and anticipated by those who designed the interview. Regardless of how well designed and engineered an interview schedule and procedure may be, behaviors which are not relevant to questions and answers, which are not explicitly planned for, do occur. Studying these behaviors may prove valuable in understanding many other aspects of the interview.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF RELATIONS OF RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS TO INTERVIEWING BEHAVIOR

Interviewing Behavior	Age	Education	Income	Race[1]	Sex[2]
Total Non-directive Probes [4]	0^3	-	-	+	0
Directive Probes	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Clarifications Given	0	0	0	0	0
Number Suggests Respondent Consult Other Information Sources	0	0	0	0	0

1. + indicates non-whites more

2. + indicates females more

3. Symbols indicate:

    + positive relation
    0 no relation
    - negative relation

4. Includes "repeats question as worded" and all other non-directive probes.

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ALL TYPES OF NON-DIRECTIVE
PROBES BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Number of Non-Directive Probes				Total %	N
	0	1-2	3-9	10 or more		
Race						
white	31	35	28	6	100	351
non-white	7	19	59	15	100	61
Education						
0-8 years of grade school	18	24	44	14	100	129
1-3 years of high school	25	30	38	7	100	89
4 years of high school	29	35	33	3	100	123
College	40	35	22	3	100	67
Not ascertained	—	--	—	-	——	4
Income						
0 - 1999	27	24	35	14	100	59
2000 - 3999	26	27	36	11	100	88
4000 - 6999	26	33	37	4	100	103
7000-9999	28	35	31	6	100	81
10,000 +	33	34	31	2	100	58
Not ascertained	—	—	—	-	——	23

One explanation for the occurrence of these behaviors is
human nature itself. There is extensive literature in the field of
social psychology which suggests that people, working together, do
not strive to accomplish tasks by the most direct means. They must
pay attention to the whole spectrum of each other's needs, abilities,
problems, and frustrations.

Interviewers often find it is necessary to build or maintain
a particular kind of relationship with their respondents. To this
end, they frequently depart from their interviewing task as it is
spelled out in the interview schedule.

Furthermore, the nature of a household interview, as opposed
to, for example, a business conference, encourages a lot of extraneous
conversation about the respondents and their family members. Such
talk may be unrelated to the specific questions being asked.

In this case, instead of selecting particular parts of the
interview to observe, observers attempted to record every instance
of behavior which was not directly related to the task as it is
outlined in the questionnaire. In addition, each instance of "ir-
relevant" behavior was categorized; first, by who initiated it (the
interviewer or the respondent); then, by its content (the general
description of the type of irrelevant conversation). Finally, the
observers were instructed to record the reaction of the other person
to the initiated, irrelevant act.

The Categories

The content categories used for coding irrelevant conversation
were similar to those used by the Bales system of interaction analysis
(1951). Modifications were made to conform to this special kind of

interaction, the interview.

Each time the respondent or interviewer said something unrelated to the interview question being asked, it was classified into one of four content categories: talks about the other person, talks about himself, talks about the interview, and "humor," which are described below.

a. Talks about other person

1) Flatters or praises. This category refers to conversation content which seems friendly, approving, supportive, encouraging, etc.

2) Questions about other person. This includes indications of curiousity about the other person (asking personal questions not included in the interview schedule).

3) Gives suggestion to other. This covers suggestions, demands, orders, attempts at structuring the situation, beyond those contained in the interview schedule.

b. Talks about himself

1) Talks about self, family, friends. This category includes all conversation about oneself or one's personal experiences, which in the case of the respondent, is neither a direct answer to a question from the interview schedule, nor an elaboration of such an answer (discussed in the preceding section).

2) Two other content categories were included in the observation recording form under the general heading talks about self. They were:

Talks about things she would rather be doing now.
Talks about things she is avoiding now.

Neither category was recorded often enough to warrant its inclusion in the data analysis.

c. Talks about the interview

1) Asks purpose of study or of question. This encompassed both questions and comments about the general aims of the NHS-HIS, or about specific questions and the reasons for asking them. If an interviewer offered special explanations about the purpose of her questions, it was also recorded here.

2) Two other sub-divisions appear on the recording form. Instances of these subdivisions were combined with the preceding category for analysis purposes.

<u>Asks about Public Health Service, Census</u>.

<u>Other Questions about the interview, sponsorship</u>. (e.g. sampling, use of results).

d. <u>"Humor"</u>

Behaviors recorded in this category range from a nervous chuckle, possibly lasting no longer than a half-second, to an elaborate attempt to tell a funny story on the part of either of the participants.

There are different theories about what "humor," as it is used here, means. Generally, such behavior has been viewed either as an attempt to reduce tension or as an attempt to establish a friendly relationship with another person.

e. <u>"Other unrelated conversation</u>," was included on the recording form. Because of its infrequent use, these data are excluded from the analysis.

<u>Respondent Initiation of Conversation Unrelated to the Interview Questions</u>

The following table lists the average frequency of respondent initiations of each of the above content categories. Data represent records over the entire interview:

The frequency table indicates that, on the average, respondents depart from straight question-answer behavior about 16 times during the entire interview. These departures (in terms of numbers, not necessarily total time taken up by them) are about evenly divided between "talking about self" and "humor," with only about 6% of the departures distributed among the remaining categories. The percentage distributions for all of these categories are skewed. These distributions are reproduced in Tables 98-100 in Appendix B and are discussed below.

<u>Talking about the interviewer</u>

The average respondent talks about the interviewer only 0.3 times over the entire interview. This includes an average of 0.06 instances of giving praise or flattery (range 0-3, not recorded in 96% of the interviews); 0.19 instances of showing curiosity (range

TABLE 10

AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENT UNRELATED CONVERSATION
INITIATIONS OBSERVED OVER ENTIRE INTERVIEW*

Content of Initiations	Average Number of Initiations
Talking about other person	
Giving praise or flattery	.06
Showing curiosity about the other person	.19
Giving direct suggestions to the other person	.09
Total Talking about other person	.34
Talking about self	
Talking about own experience or those of family, friends, etc.	7.58
Talking about the interview	
Asks purpose of a question or of the study in general. Asks about sponsorship, etc.	.69
Humor	
Laughs, jokes, or otherwise shows or tries to relieve tension	7.26
Average number of total initiations	15.87

N = 412 interviews

---

*There are a very few cases in which the number of initiations of a specific type of unrelated conversation exceeded the maximum allowed for in the coding system. Averages were computed, therefore, by assigning the maximum coded value.

35.

0-8, not recorded in 89% of the interviews); and 0.09 instances

of giving direct suggestions to the interviewer (range 0-3, not

recorded in 92% of the interviews).

Talking about self, family, friends

The most frequent type of unrelated conversation on the part

of the respondent is talking about herself, family, friends, etc.

An average of 7.6 instances of this type of unrelated conversation

was recorded per interview (median 3, range 0-over 98, not recorded

in 25% of the interviews).

Talking about the interview

Questions and comments about the goals of the NHS-HIS, sponsor-

ship of the survey, or about the purpose of specific questionnaire

items were observed an average of 0.69 times per interview (range 0-8,

not recorded in 63% of the interviews).

Humor

The average number of times the respondent laughed, joked, etc.,

is 7.26 per interview (median 5, range 0-59, not observed in only 11%

of the interviews). This behavior occurs frequently in the observed

interviews, but it should be pointed out that every instance of

nervous laughter or chuckling was recorded. Hence, the time spent

in such behavior could be quite small.

Interviewer initiation of conversation unrelated to the interview
   questions.

Records also were kept of interviewer initiations of unrelated

conversation. Such initiations are expected to be relatively rare,

since the interviewer for various reasons is often reluctant to

initiate unrelated conversation. The major reason for introducing

extraneous talk is probably a desire to establish or maintain a certain type of relationship with the respondent. The following table shows the average frequency of each category of unrelated conversation.

As was expected, interviewer initiations of unrelated conversation are relatively infrequent. On the average, interviewers depart from the question-answer process only 1.68 times over the entire interview. The "humor" or tension category has the highest average frequency of occurrence. Talking about the respondent (praise, curiosity, suggestions) is more frequent, on the average, than talking about herself.

Percentage distributions of each of these categories are presented in Tables 101-103 in Appendix B.

Talking about the respondent

The interviewer initiates talk about the principal respondent an average of 0.68 times in each interview. This average may be further subdivided as follows:

The average number of times the interviewer praised or flattered the respondent is 0.29 (not observed in 85% of the interviews). The interviewer showed curiosity about the respondent 0.18 times on the average (not observed in 89% of the interviews). The interviewer gave direct suggestions to the respondent an average of 0.21 times per interview (not recorded in 88% of the interviews). Ranges for these three types of behavior cannot be determined because of certain restrictions placed on the coding of the data. In all three cases, the ranges are assumed to be approximately 0-8.

TABLE 11

AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF INTERVIEWER UNRELATED CONVERSATION
INITIATIONS OBSERVED OVER THE ENTIRE INTERVIEW*

Content of Initiation	Average Number of Initiations
Talking about other person	
Giving praise or flattery	.29
Showing curiosity about the other person	.18
Giving direct suggestions to the other person	.21
Total talking about other person	.68
Talking about self	
Talking about own experiences or those of family, friends, etc.	.19
Humor	
Laughs, jokes, or otherwise shows or tries to relieve tension	.81
Average number of total initiations	1.68

*There are a very few cases in which the number of initiations
of a specific type of unrelated conversation exceeded the
maximum allowed for in the coding system. Averages were computed,
therefore, by assigning the maximum coded value.

Talking about herself

The interviewer did not often talk about herself to the respondent. An average of 0.19 instances of this type of conversation was recorded per interview (range 0-8, not recorded in 87% of the interviews).

Talking about the interview

The number of instances in which the interviewer initiated an explanation of the purpose of a question or of the study or sponsors was too infrequent to warrant further analysis.

Humor

The interviewer laughed, joked, chuckled, etc., an average of 0.81 times during the entire interview (range 0-15, not observed in 64% of the interviews).

Comparison of Interviewer and Respondent Initiations of Conversation Unrelated to the Interview Questions

The most apparent difference between interviewer and respondent initiations of unrelated conversation is in the average number of total initiations observed for each. Interviewers average 1.7 initiations per interview, respondents average 15.9 or almost ten times more. Such findings seem to suggest that the interviewer and respondent have different orientations to the interview situation in general.

It is also interesting to note the differences in content of the initiations. Respondents' unrelated conversation tends to center about equally on talking about themselves and signs of tension (laughter, joking). Very few instances of interest in the interviewer as a person were recorded. On the other hand, when interviewers initiate irrelevant conversation, they tend to concentrate

on comments about the respondent rather than themselves. About half of the interviewer unrelated conversation is also coded into the "humor" category.

Finally, the data suggest that there are wide differences between respondents in the frequency and type of conversation content initiated. Interviewer behavior, on the other hand, seems much more homogeneous. Most types of interviewer unrelated conversation were absent from 85 per cent or more of the interviews. When these initiations were made, they were usually limited to one or two occurrences per interview.

Generalizing from the conversation data, it may be suggested that respondents seem somewhat more active than interviewers, possibly under more tension, and more preoccupied with themselves. Large differences are to be expected among respondents, however, with respect to these variables.

Interviewers appear to be somewhat less active, more task-oriented, more preoccupied with the respondent, possibly under less pressure, and more stereotyped, as a group, in initiating unrelated conversation. The special emphasis which interviewers place on comments about the respondent may be interpreted as behavior designed to gain or keep rapport with the respondent.

Information on the reactions of interviewer and respondent to unrelated conversation may be found in section D of Appendix A.

Relations of initiations of irrelevant conversation to respondent demographic characteristics

Respondent

Table 12 provides a summary of demographic relations to various types of conversation initiated by the respondent, and Tables 13-15 show these relationships individually. Since respondents

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF RELATIONS OF RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
TO INITIATIONS OF UNRELATED CONVERSATION BY RESPONDENT

Type of Initiation	Age	Education	Income	Race[1]	Sex[2]
Talks about self, etc.	+[3]	0	0	0	0
Laughs, jokes, show tension	+	0	0	0	+
Total initiations	+	0	0	-	+

1. + indicates non-whites more

2. + indicates females more

3. Symbols indicate:

   + positive relation
   0 no relation
   - negative relation

41.

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENT TALKS ABOUT
SELF BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Age	Number of Times Respondent Talks about Self					Total %	N
	0	1-3	4-9	10-19	20 or more		
0-34	31	37	20	9	3	100	109
35-54	21	30	25	13	11	100	161
55-74	22	22	28	13	15	100	115
75+	11	18	15	22	34	100	27

TABLE 14

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENT LAUGHS, JOKES,
ETC. BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

| | Number of Times Respondent Laughs, Etc. | | | | | | |
	0	1-3	4-10	11-19	20 or more	Total %	N
Sex							
male	26	33	24	13	4	100	82
female	12	23	37	20	8	100	330
Age							
Under 35	15	25	41	16	3	100	109
35-54	9	33	31	21	6	100	161
55-74	12	27	32	27	2	100	115
75 or over	7	26	37	15	15	100	27

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL RESPONDENT
INITIATIONS OF UNRELATED CONVERSATION BY
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS.

	Number of Respondent Initiations of Unrelated Conversation						
	0	1-3	4-9	10-19	20 or more	Total %	N
Age							
0-34	6	20	34	25	15	100	109
35-40	4	15	32	23	26	100	161
55-74	3	15	22	25	35	100	115
75 +	0	11	22	19	48	100	27
							412
Race							
white	4	15	28	25	28	100	351
non-white	5	20	31	18	26	100	61
							412
Sex							
male	6	22	28	18	26	100	82
female	3	15	29	25	28	100	330
							412

initiate few comments in certain content categories, these categories have been left out of the analysis.

The main finding from these tables is that the total number of respondent initiations of unrelated conversation tends to increase with the age of the respondent. This relationship holds with each of the two major respondent categories: "Talks about self, family, friends, etc.," and "Laughs, jokes, other signs of tension or tension release." The other demographic variables show very weak relations to the content categories. Initiating conversation relates negatively to race (white respondents initiate more), and positively to sex (female respondents initiate more). Race correlates with no specific content category, but women respondents initiate slightly more conversation in the "humor" category than do men.

Interviewer

Table 16 summarizes the obtained relations between respondents' demographic characteristics and the frequency with which interviewers initiated conversation.

It appears that there are many relations between respondent demographic characteristics and interviewer initiations of unrelated conversation. The most consistent relations appear to be with education and income: the higher the education or the income of the respondent, the more conversation the interviewer initiates.

Relations between age, race, and sex of respondent, and specific types of unrelated conversation are also found, but do not exhibit any readily understandable patterns.

Tables are presented on the following pages which give more detail on the obtained relationships. It should be noticed that many of the tables show big differences only in the extreme categories.

45.

TABLE 16

SUMMARY OF RELATIONS OF RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
TO INTERVIEWER INITIATIONS OF UNRELATED CONVERSATION

Type of Initiation	Age	Education	Income	Race[1]	Sex[2]
Gives praise or flattery	+[3]	+	+	+	+
Asks questions about respondent	0	0	0	0	0
Gives suggestions	0	+	+	+	+
Talks about herself	0	0	+	0	0
Laughs, jokes, shows tension	+	+	0	0	0
Total initiations	0	+	+	0	0

1. + indicates non-whites more

2. + indicates females more

3. Symbols indicate:

   + positive relation
   0 no relation
   - negative relation

46.

TABLE 17

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWER INITIATIONS OF PRAISE,
FLATTERY, ETC. BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Frequency of Giving Praise, Flattery to Respondent				
	0	1-2	3 or more	Total %	N
Age					
0-34	87	10	3	100	109
35-54	84	13	3	100	161
55-74	87	10	3	100	115
75 or over	70	22	8	100	27
Education					
0-8 years of grade school	87	10	3	100	129
1-3 years of high school	87	11	2	100	89
4 years of high school	84	14	2	100	123
College	81	15	4	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	-	---	4
Income					
0-1999	86	12	2	100	59
2000-3999	89	8	3	100	88
4000-6999	83	12	5	100	103
7000-9999	88	10	2	100	81
10,000 +	79	19	2	100	58
Not ascertained	--	--	-	---	23
Race					
white	86	12	2	100	351
non-white	79	14	7	100	61
Sex					
male	92	5	3	100	82
female	83	14	3	100	330

TABLE 18

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF INTERVIEWER
SUGGESTIONS BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Number of Interviewer Suggestions				
	0	1-2	3 or more	Total %	N
Race					
white	89	8	3	100	351
non-white	84	13	3	100	61
Education					
0-8 years of grade school	91	6	3	100	130
1-3 years of high school	91	7	2	100	89
4 years of high school	87	9	4	100	123
1 or more years college	84	16	0	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	-	---	4
Income					
0-1999	95	3	2	100	59
2000-3999	89	9	2	100	88
4000-6999	87	9	4	100	103
7000-9999	91	6	3	100	81
10,000 or more	79	19	2	100	58
Not ascertained	--	--	-	---	?23
Sex					
male	94	4	2	100	82
female	87	10	3	100	330

TABLE 19

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWER TALKS ABOUT
SELF, ETC. BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Number of Times Interviewer Talks About Self				
	0	1-2	3 or more	Total %	N
Family Income					
0-1999	90	10	0	100	59
2000-3999	88	12	0	100	88
4000-6999	93	6	1	100	103
7000-9999	87	12	1	100	81
10,000 +	72	24	4	100	58
Not ascertained	-	-	-	---	23

TABLE 20

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF
TIMES INTERVIEWER LAUGHS, JOKES, BY
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Number of times Interviewer Laughs, etc.				
Age	0	1-2	3 or more	Total %	N
Under 35	68	24	8	100	109
35-54	65	24	11	100	161
55-74	63	31	6	100	115
75 or more	59	22	19	100	27
Education					
0-8 years grade school	67	24	9	100	129
1-3 years high school	67	27	6	100	89
4 years high school	65	24	11	100	123
1 or more years college	55	31	14	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	--	---	4

TABLE 21

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF TOTAL INTERVIEWER
INITIATIONS OF UNRELATED CONVERSATION BY SELECTED
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENT.

	Number of Interviewer Initiations of Unrelated Conversation					
Education	0	1-3	4-9	10 or more	Total %	N
0-8 years of grade school	48	38	10	4	100	129
1-3 years of high school	53	36	7	4	100	89
4 years of high	46	37	13	4	100	123
College	36	43	18	3	100	67
Not ascertained	—	—	—	-	—	4
Family Income						
0-1999	59	24	17	0	100	59
2000-3999	44	41	10	5	100	88
4000-6999	48	38	11	3	100	103
7000-9999	49	38	8	5	100	81
10,000 +	29	50	17	4	100	58
Not ascertained	—	—	—	-	—	23

51.

Comparison of Different Types of Observed Behavior: General
Activity Level

Data have been presented in the above two sections according to

the dichotomy usually found in recent literature on interaction: task-

oriented behavior and interpersonal (unrelated) behavior. One main

finding from this observation study is that these behaviors are not

completely independent. Table 22 presents a small selection of data

to illustrate two points:

1. If the respondent performs a lot of task-related behavior,

he is also likely to engage in more unrelated behavior. This holds

for interviewers as well.

2. There is some correspondence between the amount of behavior

of the interviewer and respondent within the interview. If the inter-

viewer is active during the interview, the respondent is also likely

to be active.

While many studies suggest that these types of behavior are

fairly independent, the data in this study suggest that they coincide

with a general level of activity in the interview situation which

characterizes almost <u>all</u> of the behaviors of <u>both</u> participants.

The following table demonstrates how the frequencies of different

kinds of the behaviors of both interviewer and respondent are correlated

in a given interview. This empirically derived concept of general

activity level is discussed more fully in another report.

TABLE 22

	Acceptable Answers	Elaborated Answers	Unacceptable Answers	Unrelated Conversation	Unrelated Conversation	Non-Directive Probes	Total Directive Probes
Intercorrelations of Respondent Behaviors							
Acceptable Answers-R	---						
Elaborated Answers-R	.05	---					
Unacceptable Answers-R	.45	.49	---				
Total Unrelated Conversation-R	.21	.49	.26	---			

	Intercorrelations of Behaviors of Both				Intercorrelations of Interviewer Behaviors		
Total Unrelated Conversation-I	.26	.36	.12	.45	---		
Total Non-directive Probes-I	.48	.60	.45	.32	.36	---	
Total Directive Probes-I	.50	.58	.64	.27	.33	.40	---

53.

Auxiliary Approaches to Recording Question and Answer Behavior

Introduction

The NHS-HIS interview uses some special procedures for asking about health of respondents. Observation methods to record behaviors in three special parts of the NHS-HIS were developed. These parts are A and B of the chronic and acute conditions list, for which the interviewing pace was particularly observed; the Specialists Utilization List, where respondent performance in a simple, self-paced reporting task was recorded; and the family income question, for which two items were designed to measure difficulty of the question for the respondent and resistance to being asked about income.

Chronic and Acute Conditions Lists

For these lists, the interviewer reads aloud a long list of health conditions, and the respondent indicates whether or not any of these illnesses are present in his family.

List A. List A is NHS-HIS question 12: "Has anyone in the family . . . had any of these conditions during the past 12 months: asthma, . . . cancer, . . . kidney stones or chronic kidney trouble, . . . chronic nervous trouble, . . . speech defect?"

List A contains 23 such conditions, and it would be understandable if some interviewers read through it quickly. The items used to record behavior during the reading and answering of the list are designed to be especially sensitive to the pace:

a. The number of conditions for which the respondent pauses to consider an answer, meaning of the condition. Pauses were defined as hesitating before answering or other observable signs of thought.

b. The number of conditions for which the respondent asks for clarification or definition of the item or for type of response desired.

c. The number of conditions for which the respondent gives additional relevant health information to the interviewer, beyond the simple "yes" or "no" required by the format.

d. The number of conditions for which the interviewer asks additional questions, probes, or suggests an answer.

It should be noted that the first three measures are quite similar to those used on the general question and answer form described in Section B.2 above. Here, however, the number of conditions for which probes were required are recorded, rather than the total number of probes.

List B. This list is NHS-HIS question 13: "Does anyone in the family have any of these conditions . . . Tuberculosis . . . Heart trouble . . . Diabetes . . . Serious trouble seeing with one or both eyes even when wearing glasses . . . Permanent stiffness or any deformity of the foot, let, fingers, arms, or back?"

List B contains 14 conditions, and is also subject to being read or answered in a great hurry. While this list was being read, the observer was instructed to <u>look</u> <u>at</u> the interviewer and respondent and make both of the following ratings:

a. Does the interviewer look up at the respondent after reading each condition? The rating is made on a five-point scale indicating how often the interviewer took her eyes off the questionnaire and focused on the respondent.

b. Does the respondent have enough time to think about each condition before the interviewer asks the next? Observers were asked to base their ratings on the pace at which the interviewer was asking the questions.

List A. The following table summarizes the behavior data obtained while List A was being read.

The data indicate that for this sample of respondents, the average number of conditions reported by the principal respondent for the reporting unit[*] was 1.5. According to the table, respondents are observed to pause to consider their answers an average of 1.2

*Reporting unit refers to members of the household for whom the principal respondent is reporting. Conditions reported by other members of the family are excluded.

TABLE 23

AVERAGE   FREQUENCY OF QUESTION-ANSWERING
BEHAVIORS DURING LIST A

Behavior	Average Frequency Per Interview
Average number of conditions reported	1.5[*]
Average number of conditions respondent paused to consider	1.2
Average number of conditions respondent asked clarification or definition	0.25
Average number of conditions for which respondent elaborated his answer	1.5
Average number of conditions for which the INTERVIEWER had to probe to get an acceptable answer	0.4

[*]From NHS-HIS data (not recorded by observer)

times and to give additional, relevant information beyond that required for 1.5 of the conditions listed. Fifty-three per cent of the respondents never pause and thirty-six per cent never elaborate.

These averages show a close correspondence between the number of conditions reported and both the number of conditions the respondent paused to consider and the number for which he offered extra, relevant information. One may question, therefore, the value of using elaboration and pauses as measures of respondent effort, if the number of conditions reported will yield the same information. Table 24 shows the relationship between pauses and number of conditions reported for List A. Table 25 shows the relationship between elaborations and List A reporting.

It appears that in 41% of the interviews, the number of pauses equals the number of conditions reported, but 39% of the respondents pause fewer times than they report, and 20% pause more often than they report. Two reasons may be advanced for reporting without pausing: The principal respondent did not need to consider whether a particular condition applied to a family member or a health condition reported for several members of the family required only one pause. Pausing more often than reporting may indicate a desire to be accurate and complete, or it may occur when a respondent or family member has a condition mentioned on List A and decides not to report it.

Table 25 illustrates that in 47% of the interviews, the number of conditions reported exactly equals the number of conditions for which the respondent furnished additional, relevant information. In

TABLE 24

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER
OF TIMES RESPONDENT PAUSES TO CONSIDER
A LIST A CONDITION BY THE NUMBER OF
CONDITIONS REPORTED ON LIST A

Number of List A Conditions Respondent Reports	Number of List A Conditions Respondent Pauses						
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	Total %	N
0	26	6	2	1	1	36	147
1	13	6	3	1	2	25	103
2	8	3	4	1	1	17	69
3	3	2	2	1	2	10	42
4 or more	4	1	2	1	4	12	51
TOTAL %	54	18	13	5	10	100	
N	217	77	53	21	44		412

58.

TABLE 25

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER
OF TIMES RESPONDENT ELABORATES UPON
LIST A CONDITIONS BY THE NUMBER OF
CONDITIONS REPORTED ON LIST A

Number of List A Conditions Respondent Reports	Number of List A Conditions Respondent Elaborates						
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	Total %	N
0	25	7	1	2	1	36	147
1	9	10	4	1	1	25	103
2	3	5	5	2	2	17	69
3	*	3	2	2	3	10	42
4 or more	*	2	2	3	5	12	51
TOTAL %	37	27	14	10	12	100	
N	148	112	56	42	54		412

* N less than 1%.

59.

24% of the interviews, fewer conditions are reported than elaborated upon. It is possible that extra elaboration is a sign that the respondent is trying to do a good job of reporting but other interpretations are also possible.

Two other types of behavior were observed and found to be relatively infrequent: respondent requests for clarification or definition, and interviewer probes. Asking for clarification occurred in only 18% of the interviews with a range from zero to seven occurrences. Interviewer probes occurred in 28% of the interviews with a range of zero to five.

Additional information on these distributions is found in Tables 105 and 107 in Appendix B.

List B. During the presentation of List B, two ratings were made. Table 26 shows the distributions of these ratings.

The ratings for List B suggest that the interviewer usually looks up at the respondent after reading each condition and the respondent appears to have plenty of time to answer the questions. In 22% of the interviews, the interviewer seldom or almost never looked up while reading the list, but in only 8% of the interviews did the observer record any serious difficulty for the respondent.

Two pictures of what happens during the administration of both of the chronic and acute conditions appear from these two kinds of observer recordings. When behaviors are counted, the respondent is observed to pause only occasionally to consider an item, request clarification, or elaborate on the answer finally given. Also, only occasional probes on the part of the interviewer are noted. This may indicate a rather hurried situation. When observers make a more

TABLE 26

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TWO RATINGS
OF LIST B BEHAVIORS

Rating	% of Interviews

How often does the interviewer look up at the respondent after reading
each condition?

Almost always	54%
Often	15
Sometimes	9
Seldom	11
Almost never	<u>11</u>
	100% N = 412

How often does the respondent have enough time to think about each
condition before the interviewer asks the next?

All items	74%
Most items	11
Some items	5
A few items	5
No items	3
Not ascertained	<u>2</u>
	100% N = 412

subjective assessment of what transpires, taking into account many other variables, their impressions are that the interviewer usually looks up at the respondent after reading each condition, and that the respondent almost always has sufficient time to consider and answer each item adequately. No way of reconciling these two pictures is immediately apparent.

Specialist Utilization List

A special recording form was devised and used for question 23 of the NHS-HIS interview when the respondent was handed a card and asked to check "yes" or "no" to indicate whether or not any family member had recently used the services of any of 11 listed medical specialists or practitioners, e.g., otolaryngologist. The checking of the Specialist Card comes relatively late in the interview and while it is being used, respondent behavior is largely self-determined, in the sense that the interviewer is no longer asking questions. Recorded behaviors and observer ratings are given in the following tables.

About a quarter of the respondents actually ask for definition or clarification of the meaning of one or more of the specialist labels included on the card. Interviewers are trained to be able to furnish such information if it is needed, and in at least three quarters of the cases, they did so. Occasional instances of giving incomplete information were recorded.

Over one third of the respondents asked some question other than definition or clarification of the meaning of one of the items on the card. These questions, it is assumed, centered on how to proceed to fill out the card.

TABLE 27

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WHETHER RESPONDENT ASKS
CLARIFICATION OR DEFINITION OF A SPECIALIST CARD ITEM

Did Respondent ask Clarification or Definition?	% of Interviews	N
Yes	27%	110
No	71	293
Not ascertained	2	9
	100%	412

TABLE 28

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWER
RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

Interviewer Response to Clarification Request	% of Interviews in which clarification requested	N
Gave complete information	74%	81
Gave partial information	10	11
Other or not ascertained	16	18
	100%	110

TABLE 29

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WHETHER THE RESPONDENT ASKS
OTHER (NON-CLARIFICATION) QUESTION ABOUT SPECIALISTS CARD

Does Respondent Ask Other (Non-clarification) Question?	% of Interviews
Yes	35%
No	62
Not ascertained	3
	100%

N=412

TABLE 30

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RATING "HOW DID
RESPONDENT RESPOND TO THE SPECIALISTS CARD"

How Did Respondent Respond to the Specialists Card?	% of Interviews
Considered Items carefully	84%
Rushed through it	4
Other or not ascertained	12
	100%

N=412

TABLE 31

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE AMOUNT OF THE SPECIALISTS
CARD READ BY THE INTERVIEWER TO THE RESPONDENT

Amount of Specialists Card Read to Respondent	% of Interviews
All	16%
Some	8
None	72
Not ascertained	4
	100%

N=412

64.

If the respondent does not check either a "yes" or "no" box for a given listed specialist or practitioner, the interviewer asks him whether anyone in the family received services from that specialist. In about a quarter of the interviews, this procedure was adhered to. The data also indicate that the interviewers read the entire Specialist Card to 16% of the respondents. There are several possible reasons why the self-administering procedure might not be followed. For example, the interviewer reads the entire card if the respondent is illiterate or blind, or if the respondent has failed to check any of the boxes. Unfortunately, the observation procedure did not provide a means of distinguishing among these alternatives.

As a whole these data suggest some tentative hypotheses about the nature of the NHS-HIS Specialist Card procedure as well as interviewer and respondent performance. There seems to be a good deal of difference among respondents in the way they respond to the card. For example, about a quarter of the respondents asked at least once what one of the specialists or practitioners on the list does. Thirty-five per cent of the respondents asked some other question, presumably concerning instructions for filling out the card. These observations indicate that the Specialist Card and instructions for filling it out are not self explanatory for at least one third of the respondents. In addition, most respondents were rated as considering the items on the card carefully. Altogether, a picture emerges in which the respondent, even at this late stage in the interview, is being reasonably conscientious in considering the items and asking questions about items and procedures which he does not understand.

Interviewer performance is somewhat more difficult to assess. The procedure is designed to be self administrative, so that the interviewer acts more as a source of information than as interrogator. As a source of information, she must repeat procedure instructions in 35% of the interviews and give definitions or clarifications of the items in 27%. For the latter, she gave adequate information in 74% - 90% of the interviews. As an interrogator, the interviewer had to read some of the items on the card to 8% of the respondents and read all of the card to 16% of the respondents.

Family Income Question

Two types of behavior were specially observed while the question on family income was being asked. The first item, "Did the respondent ask the reason for the income question?" was designed to be an objective measure of the amount of expressed resistance respondents in general had to being asked about their income. The second item, "Did the interviewer help the respondent arrive at an answer?" was an attempt to assess the magnitude of lack of information about family income. The following table shows the obtained percentage distributions for each of the two observation items. If one assumes that the items are measuring what they intend to measure, it appears that respondents seldom voice any resistance to the fact that they are being asked to furnish income data but that there is some difficulty for about a fourth of the respondents in actually furnishing this data accurately and completely.

66.

TABLE 32

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME
QUESTION BEHAVIOR OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Did Respondent Ask Reason for Income Question?	% of Respondents	N
Yes	2%	7
No	95	394
Not ascertained	3	11
	100%	412

Did Interviewer Help the Respondent Arrive at Answer?		
Yes	27%	112
No	70	286
Not ascertained	3	14
	100%	412

67.

Demographic Data

This section of the report contains three tables which summarize the relations between demographic characteristics of respondents and chronic and acute conditions list behaviors, Specialist Utilization Card behaviors, and Income question behaviors. Additional tables are provided to give more information on the relationships of interest.

a. Chronic and Acute Conditions Lists

The following summary table illustrates how respondent demographic characteristics relate to interviewer and respondent behaviors and observer ratings with respect to Lists A and B. One consistent pattern emerges in the two lists and for the different type of measures used: all behaviors conducive to good reporting seem to be positively related to age. Occasionally other relations are found, but do not present a consistent pattern.

b. Specialist Utilization Card

The following table summarizes the relations of respondent demographic characteristics to three of the variables used for the Specialist Utilization Card.

In general, higher educated, higher income, and female respondents are rated as considering the Specialist Card more carefully. The interviewer is less likely to read all or some of the items on the card to them. The opposite seems to hold for older respondents and careful consideration of the card. Interviewers are more likely to read all or some of the Specialist Card items to the respondent if he is older. The interviewer also seems to read more items to non-white respondents.

TABLE 33

SUMMARY OF RELATIONS OF RESPONDENT
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS TO RATINGS AND
BEHAVIORS FOR THE CHRONIC AND ACUTE CONDITIONS LISTS

Behavior	Age	Education	Income	Race[1]	Sex[2]
Number of conditions respondent pauses	+[3]	0	0	0	0
Number of conditions respondent pauses more than reports	+	+	*[4]	*[4]	*[4]
Number of conditions respondent elaborates	+	0	0	--	0
Number of conditions interviewer probes	+	0	0	--	0
Number of conditions interviewer looks up	+	0	--	0	0
Number of conditions respondent has adequate response time	+	--	--	+	0

1. + indicates non-whites more

2. + indicates females more

3. Symbols indicate:

      + positive relation
      0 no relation
      -- negative relation

4. Tables not available at this time

69.

TABLE 34

SUMMARY OF RELATIONS BETWEEN RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS AND THREE SPECIALIST CARD VARIABLES

Specialist Card Variable	Age	Education	Income	Race[1]	Sex[2]
Respondent asks some clarification, definition	0[3]	--	0	0	0
Respondent considers card carefully	--	+	+	0	+
Interviewer reads card items	+	--	--	+	--

1. + indicates non-white more

2. + indicates females more

3. Symbols indicate:

    + positive relationship
    0 no relationship
    -- negative relationship

c. Family Income Question

Respondent demographic characteristics are related to the measures of income question difficulty. It is interesting to note that relations were found in all possible places, and are in the expected directions. Respondents who have the most difficulty furnishing income information are older, low income, low education, non-white, or female.

TABLE 35

SUMMARY OF RELATIONS OF RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
TO INTERVIEWER HELPS RESPONDENT WITH INCOME QUESTION

Behavior	Age	Education	Income	Race[1]	Sex[2]
Interviewer helps respondent with income question	$+^3$	--	--	+	+

1. + indicates non-white more

2. + indicates females more

3. Symbols indicate:

    + positive relationship
    0 no relationship
    -- negative relationship

TABLE 36

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF "R PAUSES"
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

| | Number of Times R Pauses to Consider Answer | | | | |
	0	1-2	3+	Total %	N
Age					
0 - 34	67	24	9	100	109
35 - 54	48	34	18	100	161
55 - 74	49	38	13	100	115
75 +	41	26	33	100	27

TABLE 37

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER RESPONDENT PAUSES
COMPARED TO NUMBER OF CONDITIONS REPORTED ON LIST A
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Percentage of respondents for whom number of pauses is greater than number of conditions reported	Percentage of respondents for whom number of pauses is less than or equal to number of conditions reported	Total %	N
Age				
0-34	11	89	100	109
35-54	27	73	100	161
55-74	28	72	100	115
75 or more	30	70	100	27
Education				
0-8 years grade school	23	77	100	129
1-3 years high school	22	78	100	89
4 years high school	20	80	100	123
1 or more years college	28	72	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	---	4

TABLE 38

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENT ELABORATED ANSWERS TO LIST A BY
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Number of Respondent Elaborated Answers

Age	0	1	2	3+	Total %	N
0-34	63	21	8	8	100	109
35-54	33	30	17	20	100	161
55-74	19	31	15	35	100	115
75+	11	19	11	59	100	27
Race						
White	33	28	15	24	100	351
Non White	52	25	4	19	100	61

TABLE 39

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF INTERVIEWER PROBES DURING LIST A
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Number of Interviewer Probes

Race	0	1	2	3+	Total %	N
White	71	20	6	3	100	351
Non White	79	15	3	3	100	61
Age						
0-34	83	11	5	1	100	109
35-54	69	23	6	2	100	161
55-74	70	19	7	4	100	115
75+	52	37	0	11	100	27

TABLE 40

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WHETHER INTERVIEWER LOOKS UP
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Does Interviewer Look Up						
	Almost always	Often	Some-times	Seldom	Never	Total	N
Age							
Under 35	54	12	9	9	16	100	109
35-54	44	17	8	14	17	100	161
55-74	59	13	11	11	6	100	115
75 or more	78	18	4	0	0	100	27
Income							
$0-1999	61	8	14	5	12	100	59
2000-3999	64	11	4	15	6	100	88
4000-6999	50	18	8	11	15	100	103
7000-9999	44	15	7	14	20	100	81
10,000 or more	45	22	12	9	12	100	58
Not ascer-tained	--	--	--	--	--	---	23
Race							
White	52	17	9	9	13	100	351
Non-white	61	5	7	21	6	100	61

TABLE 41

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WHETHER RESPONDENT HAS ENOUGH RESPONSE TIME
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Did Respondent Have Enough Time						
	All items	Most items	Some items	Few items	No items	Total	N
Age							
Under 35	73	15	3	4	5	100	109
35-54	70	12	6	8	4	100	161
55-74	76	10	8	2	2	100	115
75 or more	93	0	4	3	0	100	27
Education							
0-8 years grade school	78	8	6	5	3	100	129
1-3 years high school	79	11	6	3	1	100	89
4 years high school	68	13	6	3	10	100	123
1 or more years college	73	13	2	6	6	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	---	4
Income							
$0-1999	86	3	3	2	6	100	59
2000-3999	76	6	7	6	5	100	88
4000-6999	71	16	5	4	4	100	103
7000-9999	73	14	6	2	5	100	81
10,000 or more	66	16	7	8	3	100	58
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	---	23
Race							
White	72	12	6	5	3	100	351
Non-white	87	8	0	5	0	100	61

78.

TABLE 42

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WHETHER
RESPONDENT ASKED CLARIFICATION OR
DEFINITION OF SPECIALIST CARD ITEM BY
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Did Respondent Ask Clarification, etc.?			
Education	Yes	No	Total %	N
0-8 years grade school	35	65	100	129
1-3 years high school	28	72	100	89
4 years high school	20	80	100	123
1 or more years college	25	75	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	---	4

TABLE 43

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOW RESPONDENT CONSIDERED SPECIALIST CARD
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	How Did Respondent Respond to Card				
	Considered carefully	Rushed through	Other	Total%	N
Age					
Under 35	89	4	7	100	109
35-54	86	4	10	100	161
55-74	79	5	16	100	115
75 or more	70	4	26	100	27
Education					
0-8 years grade school	76	7	17	100	129
1-3 years high school	86	5	9	100	89
4 years high school	87	2	11	100	123
1 or more years college	91	4	5	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	--	---	4
Income					
$0-1999	76	7	17	100	59
2000-3999	80	6	14	100	88
4000-6999	84	6	10	100	103
7000-9999	94	2	4	100	81
10,000 or more	93	0	7	100	58
Not ascertained	--	--	--	---	23
Sex					
Male	73	11	16	100	82
Female	87	3	10	100	330

TABLE 44

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOW MUCH OF SPECIALIST CARD INTERVIEWER READ
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

| | How Much of Card Read | | | | | |
	All	Some	None	Not Ascer-tained	Total %	N
Age						
Under 35	8	4	86	2	100	109
35-54	9	9	75	7	100	161
55-74	26	9	61	4	100	115
75 or more	41	11	48	0	100	27
Education						
0-8 years grade school	30	9	55	6	100	129
1-3 years high school	9	7	83	1	100	89
4 years high school	10	10	75	5	100	123
1 or more years college	9	2	85	4	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	---	4
Income						
$0-1999	27	7	63	3	100	59
2000-3999	26	9	59	6	100	88
4000-6999	13	9	74	4	100	103
7000-9999	3	7	85	5	100	81
10,000 or more	7	4	86	3	100	58
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	---	23
Race						
White	11	8	76	5	100	351
Non-white	39	8	51	2	100	61
Sex						
Male	21	4	67	8	100	82
Female	15	9	73	3	100	330

TABLE 46

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WHETHER INTERVIEWER HELPED RESPONDENT
WITH INCOME QUESTION BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

| | Did Interviewer Help Respondent | | | | |
	Yes	No	Not Ascertained	Total	N
Age					
Under 35	12	83	5	100	109
35 - 54	19	79	2	100	161
55 - 74	48	50	2	100	115
75 or more	56	33	11	100	27
Income					
$0 - 1999	58	39	3	100	59
2000 - 3999	48	49	3	100	88
4000 - 6999	18	80	2	100	103
7000 - 9999	12	80	8	100	81
10,000 or more	9	90	1	100	58
Not ascertained	13	83	4	100	23
Race					
White	23	73	4	100	351
Non-white	51	46	3	100	61
Education					
0 - 8 years grade school	47	50	3	100	129
1 - 3 years high school	28	71	1	100	89
4 years high school	11	83	6	100	123
1 or more years college	19	78	3	100	67
Not ascertained					4
Sex					
Male	22	73	5	100	82
Female	29	68	3	100	330

Respondent Attitude

Introduction

The SRC observation procedure attempted to measure the attitude of respondents by using both objective and subjective measures. Special emphasis was placed upon obtaining measures of respondent attitude at different points throughout the interview.

Respondent attitude was ascertained at the beginning of the interview by several objective measures, and by two ratings made by the observer of how polite, and how warm and friendly the respondent was before the interview began.

During the interview itself, observers attempted to rate the nature of the respondent's general attitude both near the beginning of the interview and also near the end of the interview.

Finally, after the interview was over and the interviewer and observer had left the household, the observer recorded overall impressions of respondent attitude.

Initial Respondent Attitude

While the interviewer was at the respondent's door explaining the survey and before the first interview question was asked, the observers recorded several behaviors and made two ratings to indicate how receptive the respondent was to being interviewed at that particular time. The recorded behaviors were:

How wide the respondent initially opens the door. It was thought that the degree to which the door is opened is a measure of the resistence of the respondent to being interrupted at this time. This rating is made as soon as the respondent appears at the door, before the interviewer begins her explanation. A five point scale was used with 0 indicating that the door was not opened, 1/4 indicating that the door was opened wide enough to "peek out," 1/2 indicating it was opened far enough for the observer to get a full view of the respondent, and "fully" was checked when it was possible for the interviewer to

83.

Respondent Attitude

Introduction

The SRC observation procedure attempted to measure the attitude of respondents by using both objective and subjective measures. Special emphasis was placed upon obtaining measures of respondent attitude at different points throughout the interview.

Respondent attitude was ascertained at the beginning of the interview by several objective measures, and by two ratings made by the observer of how polite, and how warm and friendly the respondent was before the interview began.

During the interview itself, observers attempted to rate the nature of the respondent's general attitude both near the beginning of the interview and also near the end of the interview.

Finally, after the interview was over and the interviewer and observer had left the household, the observer recorded overall impressions of respondent attitude.

Initial Respondent Attitude

While the interviewer was at the respondent's door explaining the survey and before the first interview question was asked, the observers recorded several behaviors and made two ratings to indicate how receptive the respondent was to being interviewed at that particular time. The recorded behaviors were:

How wide the respondent initially opens the door. It was thought that the degree to which the door is opened is a measure of the resistence of the respondent to being interrupted at this time. This rating is made as soon as the respondent appears at the door, before the interviewer begins her explanation. A five point scale was used with 0 indicating that the door was not opened, 1/4 indicating that the door was opened wide enough to "peek out," 1/2 indicating it was opened far enough for the observer to get a full view of the respondent, and "fully" was checked when it was possible for the interviewer to

enter the house immediately. A fifth category was checked if the door was already open or if the respondent was outside.

The number of questions the respondent asks. It is possible that respondent resistance to being interviewed is reflected by the number of questions or reservations he expresses while the interviewer is explaining the survey. This category includes all questions, statements, expressed reservations, etc., related to the survey (not those related to the weather or some other topic). All questions of this nature asked by the respondent up until the first interview question is asked are included.

Number of polite acts for which the respondent took the initiative. It is likely that a respondent who is receptive to the idea of being interviewed will tend to be more polite to the interviewer. All acts of the following kinds, accompanied by verbal behavior, were counted and classified according to whether the interviewer or respondent introduced the subject: getting in the door, suggesting a chair or other seating arrangement, suggesting a table, taking the interviewer's coat, offering refreshments, offering to turn off the television set, and any other acts designed to create a favorable interviewing climate.

Rating of how polite the respondent was. This rating was based as much as possible on outward, visible signs of respondent politeness. In general, making one polite gesture was considered "average" in the rating.

Rating of how warm and friendly the respondent was. This rating was designed to capture respondent feelings and behaviors toward the interviewer as a person.

The results obtained for the three "objective" measures of how receptive the respondent was initially are given in Table 47.

These objective measures seem to indicate that most respondents are initially receptive, or at least not unreceptive to the interviewer and the prospect of being interviewed. The number of "polite" acts initiated is possibly lower than expected. Part of the reason for this may be that the interviewer takes the initiative by asking to be let in, asking for a place to sit, etc., before the respondent has a chance to offer these courtesies. A further discussion of this point appears in Appendix A.

TABLE 47

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF THREE
MEASURES OF INITIAL RESPONDENT
RECEPTIVITY OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Amount door opened initially	% of Interviews
Not opened	3
One-fourth	7
One-half	15
Fully	34
Already open or R outside	33
Not ascertained	8
	100% N = 412

Number of Respondent Questions	
None	60
One	22
Two or more	15
Not ascertained	3
	100% N = 412

Number of Polite Acts Respondent Initiates	
None	27
One	30
Two	34
Three or more	8
Not ascertained	1
	100% N = 412

Finally, observers made two ratings of respondent-initiated receptiveness. The ratings were made after everyone was seated and the interview begun. The ratings and their distributions are given in Table 48.

These ratings also indicate that respondents, in general, have a somewhat positive initial attitude. The ratings have skewed distributions with almost all respondents rated as average or somewhat above. The intercorrelation of the ratings is .70. They show a moderate, positive relation to the number of respondent polite acts[*], but no relation to the degree the door was opened or the number of initial respondent questions.

Both the behavioral and rated measures indicate that the initial attitude of most respondents is somewhat receptive, but there is almost no indication that respondents are extremely positive.

Respondent General Attitude During the Interview

At two points in the interview, the observer rated each respondent on the presence or absence of five possible attitudes as she thought they were reflected in respondent behavior up to that time. The attitudes rated were: "Enthusiastic, Attentive, Neutral, Bored, and Irritated." These items form an ordinal scale from extremely positive to extremely negative.

The first rating of respondent attitude was made while the following NHS-HIS questions were being asked and answered:

    Question 3: How old were you on your last birthday?
    Question 4
        and 5: (not asked)
    Question 6: Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated,
                 or never married?
    Question 7: What were you doing most of the past 12 months.. .?

---

[*]R polite rating x polite acts = +36
R warm friendly rating x polite acts = +26

TABLE 48

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF TWO INITIAL
RATINGS OF RESPONDENT RECEPTIVENESS
OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

	Rating of Receptiveness	Percentage of Interviews

How polite has this respondent been to the Interviewer?

	Particularly polite	8%
	Slightly polite	29
	Average	54
	Slightly impolite	7
	Particularly impolite	0
	Not ascertained	2
		100% N= 412

How warm and friendly has this respondent been to the interviewer?

	Very warm and friendly	6%
	Somewhat warm and friendly	33
	Average or impersonal	52
	Somewhat unfriendly	7
	Very unfriendly	0
	Not ascertained	2
		100% N = 412

The second rating of attitude was made during the asking of the following questions:

Question 25: What is the highest grade you attended in school?
Question 26: Did you work at any time last week or the week before?

Table 49 shows the percentage distributions of the attitude ratings per interview over the 412 interviews at two points in the interview. In general, respondents are rated in the middle category (neutral) or the slightly positive category (attentive).

Individual respondents may be looked at in terms of whether they changed over the course of the interview in their rated general attitude. Table 50 shows the percentage of respondents who changed their attitude over the course of the interview and the percentage of respondents who were rated as not changing attitudes over the interview.

It can be seen that there is generally little change in attitude over the entire interview. The few changes which do show up are generally in a positive direction.

Final Ratings of Respondent Attitude

Three ratings of "attitude" were included as part of a set of overall ratings completed by the observer after she left each interview. These ratings will be discussed in more detail in a section of this report to follow. For present purposes, the percentage distributions of the three ratings for all respondents are presented in order to complete the picture of respondent attitudes. The three overall ratings are presented in Table 51 along with a brief description of the scales on which they were made. In general, respondents tend to be rated moderately cooperative, with few respondents portrayed as either extremely cooperative or uncooperative.

88.

TABLE 49

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OF
GENERAL ATTITUDE OF RESPONDENT AT TWO
POINTS IN THE INTERVIEW[*]

Attitude	Early Rating % of Interviews	Later Rating % of Interviews
Enthusiastic	6%	15%
Attentive	63	66
Neutral	44	33
Bored	5	7
Irritated	1	3

[*] Numbers are percentages of respondents rated as having each particular attitude. A respondent may have more than one attitude.

TABLE 50

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO SHOW ATTITUDE CHANGE
AND ATTITUDE STABILITY IN THE INTERVIEW FOR FIVE RATED ATTITUDES

| | Percentage of Respondents Who Show | | | | |
| | Attitude change | | No attitude change | | |
Attitude	Have attitude early, not late	Have attitude late, not early	Have attitude both times	Have attitude neither time	Total %
Enthusiastic	2	11	4	83	100
Attentive	12	15	51	22	100
Neutral	18	7	26	49	100
Bored	3	4	3	90	100
Irritated	1	3	1	95	100

Most respondents are rated as "very willing" to give the necessary time for the interview and only 8% are described as unwilling. Finally, most respondents are not rated as having any strong positive inclination to chat with the interviewer about matters not related to the interview.

General Comments on Respondent Attitude

The overall picture presented by these various types of respondent attitude measures seems to be that the respondent is reasonably receptive to the <u>idea of giving up some of her time to be interviewed</u> but, otherwise, has no strong feelings. The initial measures of respondent receptivity show that respondents engage in a number of behaviors which suggest that they are initially receptive, and seem not to engage in behaviors which have a negative overtone. The initial ratings of politeness and friendliness, as well as the final rating of respondent willingness to give up time, also suggest that, in general, respondents are somewhat positive toward being interviewed.

Attitudes during the interview and the final ratings (which reflect attitude toward the task rather than initial receptiveness) yield a more neutral picture. Assuming the validity of these measures, it appears that respondents do not have strong attitudes either way toward the <u>task of being interviewed</u>. It also appears that there is little variance among respondents with respect to these attitudes. It is quite possible that changing respondent attitude toward the task of reporting health information would have large effects on the outcome of the interview in terms of accuracy and completeness of information reported.

TABLE 51

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF THREE FINAL RATINGS
OF RESPONDENT ATTITUDE OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Rating of Attitude	% of Interviews
How cooperative was this respondent?	
Much more than average	10
Somewhat . more than average	33
About average	50
Somewhat less than average	4
Much less than average	2
Not ascertained	1
	100% N=412

How willing was the respondent to give all the time necessary for
   this interview?

Very willing	77
Somewhat willing	15
Not too willing	7
Very unwilling	1
Not ascertained	0
	100% N=412

How much did the respondent want to chat with the interviewer about
   matters unrelated to the (interview) schedule?

Very much	11
Somewhat	31
Almost not at all	57
Not ascertained	1
	100% N=412

Summary Ratings and Respondent Demographic Characteristics

After the interview was over and the observer and interviewer had left the house, the observer rated the respondent, interviewer, and overall situation on several dimensions. This part of the report presents data based on these ratings.

Generally, the ratings were made on five-point Likert-type scales. The way the 412 respondents were distributed on each of the ratings is not particularly meaningful in itself. Hence, each of the ratings is related to respondent demographic characteristics and interpreted with respect to them. In a section to follow, many of these same ratings are viewed in relation to sets of specific behavioral data, both of which should be reflecting the same underlying variables. Three of these ratings were also made in the middle of the interview. See Appendix C, "Quality task performance," for a comparison of these ratings as they changed from the middle to the end of the interview.

Table 52 presents a summary of the obtained relations between the overall ratings made at the end of the interview and respondent demographic characteristics. The most striking aspect of the table is that there are a great many relations between the ratings and demographic characteristics, something which was not generally true for the behavioral measures. These relations are heavily concentrated in the age, education, and income characteristics of the respondents. One basic pattern seems to emerge: the relation of the ratings to increasing age is usually opposite from the relation of these same ratings to increasing education and income.

93.

TABLE 52

SUMMARY OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FINAL RATINGS AND

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Rating	Age	Education	Income	Race[1]	Sex[2]
Respondent cooperation	0[3]	0	0	0	0
Respondent desire to "chat"	+	0	0	0	0
How well did respondent grasp questions	0	+	+	--	0
Accuracy of respondent reporting	---	+	0	0	0
Amount of respondent talking	+	0	0	0	0
Respondent tries hard to communicate	+	0	0	0	0
Interviewer clarifies, defines	+	--	--	0	0
Smoothness of interaction	--	--	0	0	0
Interviewer tries hard to communicate	+	--	--	0	0
Respondent is willing to give time	0	0	0	0	0
Quickness of pace of interview	--	0	0	0	0

1. + = non-whites high
2. + = females high
3. symbols indicate:
    0 = no relation
    + = positive relation
    -- = negative relation

94.

Older, as opposed to younger, respondents are rated as wanting to talk alot, trying hard to communicate, and not fully accurate. For these older respondents, the interviewer is rated as having to clarify extensively and trying hard to communicate. The pace of the interaction is seen as slow and unsmooth. A picture of a difficult, strained interview emerges for older respondents.

Respondents with high education levels are rated as understanding the questions well and reporting relatively accurately The interviewer is rated as not having to clarify a great deal and not having to try especially hard to communicate to her respondent. The interaction is characterized as unsmooth, even though high education respondents are rated as competent.

High income respondents are rated as being able to grasp the meaning of the interview questions well. The interviewer is seen as not having to clarify or try hard to communicate. There does not seem to be any systematic variance across income levels on the rated quality of the interaction.

With the exception that white respondents are rated as being better able to grasp the interview questions than non-white respondents, no other systematic variation is found between the ratings and respondent race or sex.

The tables which elaborate the positive and negative relationships described above are included on the following pages. While the relations are often large relative to the correlations of respondent demographic characteristics and behavioral measures, the variance within groups is still much larger than the variance between groups. This suggests that an understanding of variables operating among

demographic groups will provide some insight into the dynamics of reporting, but that other approaches are needed, and may prove more fruitful, in understanding differences in respondent behavior in the interview.

TABLE 53

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF "HOW MUCH DID THE RESPONDENT WANT TO CHAT
WITH THE INTERVIEWER ABOUT MATTERS UNRELATED TO THE SCHEDULE"
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	How Much Did Respondent Want to Chat				
	Very much	Somewhat	Almost not at all	Total	N
Age					
Under 35	4	21	75	100	109
35-54	12	31	57	100	161
55-74	10	42	48	100	115
75 or more	33	34	33	100	27

TABLE 54

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF "HOW WELL DID THIS RESPONDENT GRASP QUESTIONS"
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

		How Well Did This Respondent Grasp Questions?					
	Per-fectly	Very well	Fairly well	Not too well	Not well at all	Total	N
Education							
0-8 years grade school	9	42	32	15	2	100	129
1-3 years high school	11	51	34	2	2	100	89
4 years high school	23	53	20	2	2	100	123
1 or more years college	42	46	9	2	1	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	---	4
Income							
$0-1999	9	41	37	10	3	100	59
2000-3999	15	46	24	14	1	100	88
4000-6999	16	52	27	2	3	100	103
7000-9999	27	52	21	0	0	100	81
10,000 or more	33	50	15	0	2	100	59
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	---	23
Race							
White	22	46	24	6	2	100	351
Non-white	3	56	31	8	2	100	61

TABLE 55

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF "TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU FEEL THAT THE INFORMATION OBTAINED WAS ACCURAGE AND COMPLETE" BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Was Information Accurate						
	Com- pletely	Mostly	Some	Very little	Almost none	Total	N
Age							
Under 35	64	26	9	1	0	100	109
35-54	57	36	6	1	0	100	161
55-74	62	30	6	1	1	100	115
75 or more	52	30	7	7	4	100	27
Education							
0-8 years grade school	52	38	8	1	1	100	129
1-3 years high school	57	36	6	1	0	100	89
4 years high school	63	25	9	2	0	100	123
1 or more years college	72	22	4	2	0	100	67
Not ascer- tained	--	--	--	--	--	---	4

TABLE 56

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF "HOW MUCH TALKING DID
THIS RESPONDENT DO DURING THE INTERVIEW" BY
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Age	How Much Talking Did Respondent Do					Total	N
	Great deal	Quite a bit	Moderate	Not much	Very little		
nder 35	5	10	34	39	12	100%	109
35-54	11	19	40	23	7	100%	161
55-74	14	26	34	20	6	100%	115
75 or more	33	18	33	8	8	100%	27

TABLE 57

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF "HOW HARD DID
RESPONDENT TRY TO COMMUNICATE "BY
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

| Age | How Hard Did Respondent Try To Communicate | | | | | | |
	Very much effort	Much effort	Some effort	Slight effort	Almost no effort	Total %	N
Under 35	3	4	16	25	52	100	109
35-54	3	8	18	29	42	100	161
55-74	8	5	22	27	38	100	115
75 or more	15	15	33	11	26	100	27

TABLE 58

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF "HOW MUCH DID
THE INTERVIEWER HAVE TO CLARIFY AND INTERPRET FOR THIS
RESPONDENT" BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	How Much Did Interviewer Have To Clarify						
	Much more than average	More than average	Average	Less than average	Much less than average	Total %	N
Age							
Under 35	3	6	30	43	18	100	109
35-54	3	7	45	32	13	100	161
55-74	3	10	50	27	10	100	115
75 or more	22	11	59	8	0	100	27
Education							
0-8 years grade school	9	13	52	20	6	100	129
1-3 years high school	3	8	58	23	8	100	89
4 years high school	2	5	35	43	15	100	123
1 or more years college	0	3	25	47	25	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	---	4
Income							
$0-1999	10	10	49	24	7	100	59
2000-3999	7	9	51	25	8	100	88
4000-6999	3	8	40	38	11	100	103
7000-9999	0	6	40	33	21	100	81
10,000 or more	0	2	33	48	17	100	59
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	---	23

TABLE 59

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF "HOW SMOOTHLY DID
INTERVIEWER AND RESPONDENT WORK TOGETHER"
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	How Smoothly Did Interviewer And Respondent Work Together						
Age	Extremely smoothly	Very smoothly	Fairly smoothly	Not too smoothly	Not smoothly	Total %	N
Under 35	20	54	22	3	1	100	109
35-54	19	50	24	6	1	100	161
55-74	15	42	30	12	1	100	115
75 or more	11	33	26	26	4	100	27
Education							
0-8 years grade school	14	39	29	17	1	100	129
1-3 years high school	16	51	28	5	0	100	89
4 years high school	16	55	21	5	3	100	123
1 or more years college	28	48	21	11	2	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	---	4

TABLE 60

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF "HOW HARD DID THE INTERVIEWER TRY TO COMMUNICATE"
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	How Hard Did Interviewer Try to Communicate						
	Very much effort	Much effort	Some effort	Slight effort	Almost none at all	Total	N
Age							
Under 35	5	3	17	29	46	100	109
35-54	5	5	19	24	47	100	161
55-74	7	9	18	30	36	100	115
75 or more	22	11	37	8	22	100	27
Education							
0-8 years grade school	10	10	25	26	29	100	129
1-3 years high school	4	7	17	28	44	100	89
4 years high school	7	2	14	28	49	100	123
10 or more years college	3	3	18	22	54	100	67
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	---	4
Income							
$0-1999	8	10	19	34	29	100	59
2000-3999	10	11	15	27	37	100	88
4000-6999	5	3	20	26	46	100	103
7000-9999	4	2	15	22	57	100	81
10,000 or more	2	3	24	28	43	100	159
Not ascertained	--	--	---	--	--	---	23

104.

TABLE 61

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL PACE OF INTERVIEW
BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

| Age | General Pace Of Interview | | | | | | |
	Much easier than average	Somewhat easier than average	Average	Somewhat slower than average	Much slower than average	Total	N
Under 35	14	29	46	8	3	100%	109
35-54	14	20	55	9	2	100%	161
55-74	11	23	50	13	3	100%	115
75 or more	4	19	36	34	7	100%	27

Relationships Between Rating Scales and Observed Behaviors

Introduction

Observers used two basic types of measures to record the charac-
teristics of the interview: objective counts and impressionistic ratings.
It is necessary to see to what extent the objective data correspond with
the rated data for two reasons:

1. Certain sets of objective data and certain ratings were de-
signed to measure the same underlying concepts. A comparison of these
yeidls an estimate of how fully they agree in measuring similar concepts.

2. Some of the impressionistic ratings were designed to supple-
ment the interpretation of behavioral data. Therefore, comparing be-
havioral data designed to measure a particular concept with a rating of
that concept should show not only where the two types of measures agree,
but also where the strengths and weaknesses of each type lie.

In this section, the overall ratings made by the observer after
she left the interview situation are compared with the complimentary
behavioral items. First, the ratings are compared to one another in
a matrix of inter-correlations. Then, each is listed separately.
Under each rating appears a list of behaviors and other ratings which
were hypothesized to measure some aspects of the same concept. Beside
each item in the list is a Pearson Product-moment correlation coeffi-
cient expressing the degree of relation between the item and the rating.[*]

---

[*]The use of the Pearson Product-moment correlation requires that
data satisfy conditions which are not always met in the SRC scales.
However, the statistic still supplies a rough index of the degree of
relation between two variables, and appears to be adequate for the pur-
poses of this section.

General Rating Interrelationships

Of the 11 ratings at the end of the interview, seven are concerned with specific aspects of task orientation, three are concerned with characteristics of interaction, and one focuses on respondent interest in unrelated conversation.

Table 62 presents the extent to which these ratings are _related to each other_. Within the intercorrelation matrix, the first box represents the ratings of aspects of task orientation, the second box includes ratings of interaction.

The table contains moderate relationships among the ratings, generally in the expected directions. It does not seem to indicate, however, that the ratings reflect more than one independent factor. For example, the correlations of the task and interaction ratings are generally about the same magnitude as between task ratings.

TABLE 62

INTERCORRELATIONS OF OVERALL RATINGS

	R Cooperation	R Understand Qs	R Willing give time	R trying to communicate	R accuracy	I Clarifies	I trying to communicate	R wants to chat	Amount R talking	Smoothness	Quickness of Pace
R Cooperation											
R Understand Qs.	22										
R Willing give time	40	15									
R trying to communitcate	27	-30	08								
R accuracy	27	43	23	-07							
I clarifies	-03	-61	04	50	-28						
I trying to communicate	06	-48	-06	71	-28	60					
R wants to chat	13	-11	10	05	-05	18	13				
Amount R talking	29	-12	17	26	-02	30	27	71			
Smoothness	22	67	27	-45	42	-60	-66	-12	-18		
Quickness of Pace	-11	33	-17	-40	05	-39	-48	-15	-26	41	

Interrelations of ratings of task performance

Interrelations of interaction ratings

108.

Rating-Behavior Relationships

Table 63

Rating: How cooperative was this respondent?

Other Ratings	Pearson r
How willing was the respondent to give time?	.40
How hard was the respondent trying to communicate?	.27
How polite was this respondent (rated at beginning)?	.41

Expected Negative Relations

Number of initial respondent questions (while interviewer explaining survey)	.01
Number of respondent questions about the survey asked during the interview	-.09
Number of answers probed for further information	.15

Expected Positive Relations

Number of acceptable answers given	.21
Number of elaborated answers given	.19

Comment: It seems that other ratings containing an element of respondent cooperativeness are positively related to the cooperation rating, but the correlations are not always large. Behaviors which should stem from a cooperative attitude also seem to be positively, but weakly, related. Behaviors which would be expected to increase if the respondent attitude were uncooperative show no systematic relation. It appears, therefore, that the behavioral measures may be measuring something in addition to what is entailed in the cooperation rating, or they are inadequate measures in themselves. A distinction between the concept of cooperativeness and a concept of desire to perform well in the reporting task is discussed in a separate report.

109.

Table 64

Rating: How well did this respondent grasp the meaning of the questions?

Other Ratings	Pearson r
How much did the interviewer have to clarify?	.60
How smooth was this interview?	.67

Expected Negative Relations

Number of respondent requests for clarification -- selected parts	-.04
Number of respondent requests for clarification -- chronic and acute conditions List A	-.21
Respondent asks clarification on Specialists Card	-.14
Number of answers probed for further information	-.21
Number Interviewer gives clarification -- Selected Parts	-.09
Number Interviewer repeats question (probe) Selected Parts	-.34
Number Interviewer other non-directive probes, Selected Parts	-.19
Number Interviewer directive probes, Selected Parts	-.07
Number Interviewer probes, Chronic and Acute conditions List A	-.22

Comment: The rating of how well the respondent grasps the meaning of the questions relates reasonably well to other ratings of a similar nature. The relevant behaviors of both the interviewer and the respondent relate weakly, but in the right directions. It appears that the rating and the behaviors are accounting for a small to moderate amount of common variance.

Table 65

Rating: How willing was the respondent to give all the time necessary
         for this interview?

Other Ratings	Pearson r
How cooperative was this respondent?	.40
How polite has the respondent been (rated at beginning)?	.32
Other Possible Indications of Respondent Preoccupation	
Length of time respondent takes to answer door	-.05
Number of initial questions about the survey	-.16
Length of interview	.02

Comment: The rating of respondent willingness to give time was designed

to reflect whether the respondent wanted to do other things at the time

the interview occurred. Objective measures of such "barriers" to giving

the time required could not be easily devised. The two objective measures

used, length of time respondent takes to answer the door, and the number

of initial comments and reservations she expresses about the survey, are

related to the rating in the expected direction, but the relationship is

small. The initial rating of respondent politeness relates moderately

to the rating of respondent willingness to give time, and the rating of

amount of respondent cooperation also shows a moderate relation. It

appears that further work needs to be done on techniques of assessing

respondent willingness to take the time necessary for the interview.

Table 66

Rating: How hard did $\lfloor$ the respondent $\rfloor$ try to communicate?

Other Ratings	Pearson r
How much talking did this respondent do?	.26
How much did the interviewer have to clarify?	.50

Expected Positive Relations

Number of acceptable answers given	.32
Number of elaborated answers given -- selected parts	.42
Number of elaborated answers -- Chronic and Acute List A	.32
Number of times respondent questioned the adequacy of his answer -- selected parts	.10
Number of pauses --Chronic and Acute Conditions List A	.23

Expected Negative Relations

Number of answers probed for further information	.32
Number Interviewer repeats question (probe) Selected Parts	.18
Number Interviewer other non-directive probes -- Selected Parts	.27
Number Interviewer directive probes -- Selected Parts	.32

Comment: The rating of the amount of respondent talking relates, as expected, to how hard the respondent tries to communicate. Communication relates in the wrong direction to how much the interviewer had to clarify.

The expected positive relations were obtained to a moderate degree.

It was expected that as respondent communication activity increased, interviewer communication activity in the form of probes would decrease. This hypothesis is not confirmed by the data. The expected negative relations are found to be positive and of moderate magnitude. The alternative explanation in terms of the general activity level of the interview (discussed earlier in this report) seems applicable to these data.

Table 67

Rating: To what extent do you feel that the information obtained was accurate and complete?

Other Ratings	Pearson r
Respondent considered items on specialists card carefully	.26
Respondent has enough time to respond -- Chronic and Acute List A	.18
How well does respondent grasp the meaning of the questions?	.44
How much did the interviewer have to clarify?	-.28

Expected Negative Relations

Number of answers probed for additional information -- Selected Parts	-.06
Total number of interviewer probes -- Selected Parts	-.07
Number of interviewer probes -- Chronic and Acute List A	-.07

Expected Positive Relations

Number of acceptable answers	.02
Number of requests for clarification -- Selected Parts	-.01
Number consults other non-memory sources -- Selected Parts	.07
Number questions the adequacy of an answer	-.09
Number of pauses --Chronic and Acute Conditions List A	-.10

Comment: It is occasionally hypothesized that an observer can assess the quality and completeness of information obtained in an interview fairly accurately. This rating represents an attempt to test that hypothesis.

In general, this rating does not correlate significantly with any of the objectively measured variables of good reporting in the SRC study. Its relationship to other ratings is in the expected direction, but the possibility that this is due to a general "halo effect" cannot be discounted: the observer who rates a respondent high in one category may automatically rate him high in others like it.

On the basis of the above data, it is not appropriate to conclude that observers cannot judge how accurately a respondent is reporting, since it is also possible that the behavioral measures are at fault. However, on the basis of data presented in another report, the validity of the rating seems extremely low.

113.

Table 68

Rating: How much did the interviewer have to clarify and interpret
         for this respondent?

Other Rating	Pearson r
How well did the respondent grasp the meaning of the questions?	-.61

Expected Negative Relations

Number of acceptable answers given	.24
Number of pauses -- Chronic and Acute Conditions List A	.22

Expected Positive Relations

Number of answers probed for additional information	.36
Number of times respondent asks for clarification -- Selected Parts	.10
Number of times respondent asks for clarification -- List A	.28
Respondent asks for clarification, definition -- Specialists Card	.14
Interviewer gives clarification -- Selected Parts	.18
Total interviewer probes -- Selected Parts	.33
Total interviewer probes -- Chronic and Acute Conditions List A	.23
Interviewer helps respondent with income question	.31
Interviewer must read all or some of Specialists Card	.27

Comment: There is general agreement between the rating of interviewer

clarifying, and both the actual amount of interviewer effort to clarify

and behaviors indicating respondent need for clarification. The expected

negative relationships were not obtained. The rating and relevant beha-

viors are deemed at least partial measures of one underlying concept.

114.

Table 69

Rating: How hard did /̲ the interviewer_/̄ try to communicate?

Expected Positive Relations	Pearson r
Number of interviewer non-directive probes -- Selected Parts	.36
Number of interviewer directive probes -- Selected Parts	.30
Number of interviewer probes -- Chronic and Acute, List A	.26
Number of clarifications interviewer gives -- Selected Parts	.23
Number of introductory topics interviewer uses	.00

Comment: The number of interviewer probes and clarifications at various points in the interview relate moderately and in the right direction to the rating of how hard the interviewer tried to communicate during the interview. No relation was found between the rating and the number of topics the interviewer mentioned to the respondent when she was intro-ducing the survey at the door. The data suggest that the rating and behaviors which take place <u>during</u> <u>the</u> <u>interview</u> are at least partial measures of the same underlying concept.

Table 70

Rating: How much did the respondent want to chat with the interviewer about matters unrelated to the /‾ interview‾/ schedule?

Other Rating	Pearson r
How much was the respondent talking?	.71

Expected Positive Relations

Total unrelated conversation initiations of respondent	.20
Number of initiations of talks about self	.52
Number of initiations of laughs, jokes, etc.	.34
Number of initiations of questions about interviewer	.20
Number of initiations of suggestions to interviewer	.18
Length of conversation with interviewer after the interview was over	.23

Comment: The rating of how much the respondent wanted to engage the interviewer in conversation unrelated to the interview relates moderately and in the right direction to behaviors concerned with unrelated conversation. There is a strong relation between the rating of respondent desire to chat and the amount of respondent talking during the interview. The other, moderate relationships obtained suggest that the rating and behavioral measures are, to a reasonable degree, measures of some common variable. This underlying variable, however, may be a desire for conversation in general, rather than a desire for conversation specifically unrelated to the interview.

Table 71

Rating: How much talking did this respondent do during the interview?

Other Ratings	Pearson r
How hard did the respondent try to communicate?	.26
How much did the respondent want to chat about unrelated matters?	.71
Expected Positive Relations	
Number of acceptable answers given	.29
Number of elaborated answers given -- Selected Parts	.51
Number of elaborated conditions, List A	.43
Number of initiations of unrelated conversation -- respondent	.54

Comment: The rating of the amount of talking which the respondent did during the interview relates fairly well to the quantitative measures of verbal behavior during the interview. Correlations with task-related conversation and talking unrelated to the task are reasonably high, although there is some indication that the rating reflects unrelated conversation more than task-related conversation.

Table 72

Rating: In general, what was the pace of this interview? (Positive relation is for fast interview.)

Other Rating	Pearson r
How smooth was this interview?	.37

Expected Negative Relations

Number of pauses, Chronic and Acute List A	-.20
Interviewer looks up while reading conditions -- List B	-.18
Respondent has enough time to consider answer -- List B	-.13

Comment: Several ways of objectively assessing the pace of the interview were attempted during the pre-test phase of this study. Most proved impractical or unusable for various reasons. The three measures taken during the reading of Chronic and Acute Conditions Lists were retained. They relate weakly, but in the right direction, to the rating of the overall pace of the interview.

The major empirical finding with respect to the rating of the pace of the interview is that it relates negatively to most of the objective measures of behavior used in the study and to general activity level.

Rating: How smoothly did the interviewer and respondent work together?

Comment: The rating of "smoothness" was designed to reflect the quality of interaction between interviewer and respondent in performing the task. None of the behavioral variables singly were designed to relate to it. The rating will be discussed more fully in another report. For a further discussion of the rating in this report, see Appendix A, "Quality of Task Performance."

Summary of Relationships between Ratings and Behaviors

The data suggest a small but important relation between ratings and behaviors designed to measure common underlying variables. These relationships are not as large as expected, and suggest that there may be several contaminating factors operating. Chief among the possible confounding variables is of course random error, both in the subjective ratings and in the objective behavior measures. Two other factors may also be operating: a "halo effect" in the ratings, whereby an observer makes his description of the respondent consistent for several ratings, and the phenomenon of general activity level which accounts for much of the variance in the behavioral measures.

There is a very tentative suggestion that those ratings which require less inference (for example, interviewer clarifications, how well the respondent grasps the questions, and how hard the interviewer tries to communicate) correlate fairly well with the behaviors reflecting the same underlying concept. On the other hand, ratings for which a greater amount of inference is called for (such as respondent accuracy and respondent willingness to give time) tend not to relate strongly to the behavioral variables designed to measure the same concepts.

The relationships between these ratings and observed behaviors are explored more fully in a separate report.

119.

Appendix A: Special Observation Variables

In this section, data are reported which were obtained by a variety of special observation techniques not discussed previously in the report. In general, these data were not intended to be descriptive in themselves, but to be used in an overall program of data analysis for the larger SRC study. They are presented here merely to complete the description of observation procedures used.

Voice Volume

At two points during the interview, observers attempted to rate how loudly both the interviewer and respondent were speaking. By making this rating twice, it is possible to note any changes which have occurred over the course of the interview.

The first rating was made while NHS-HIS questions 3-7 were being asked. The second rating was made while NHS-HIS questions 25 and 26 were being asked.

Table 73 shows frequency distributions for the voice volume ratings.

The table indicates little variance in voice volume ratings at either point in the interview. Additional data analysis (not presented here) indicates, also, that there is little change in individual ratings of voice volume of either interviewer or respondent between the two points in the interview.

Initial Interviewer Behavior

Certain interviewer behaviors were recorded at the beginning of the contact between interviewer and respondent. They are designed to

120.

TABLE 73

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF RATED VOICE VOLUME
OF INTERVIEWER AND RESPONDENT AT TWO POINTS IN THE INTERVIEW

Interviewer		Voice Volume	Respondent	
Early	Late		Early	Late
0	1	Can't hear	2	4
30	29	Soft	99	104
361	364	Average	307	297
18	16	Loud	3	7
1	1	Shout	0	O
2	1	Not ascertained	1	O
412	412		412	412

reflect the amount of initiative the interviewer takes before the inter-

view begins. Several items were used:

1. Number of different things the interviewer mentioned when explaining the survey to the respondent.
2. Number of times the interviewer takes the initiative for structuring the physical situation* (asking to be let in, asking for a chair, etc.).
3. The number of interviews in which the interviewer sits down before the respondent does.

Observers kept track of the number of different ideas each

interviewer used to introduce and explain the survey to each of her

respondents. The variance is small. The average number of topics or

ideas used per interview was 2.4. The percentage breakdown by idea

content is shown in Table 74.

In another section, the number of respondent polite acts were recorded.

These acts included such things as inviting the interviewer in, offering a

chair, a table, etc. It is also possible that the interviewer will re-

quest these things herself before the respondent has a chance to offer

them, or compensate for the respondent's not offering them by taking ini-

tiative herself. The percentage distribution of these interviewer attempts

to structure the situation is given in Table 75.

In general, the respondent initiates more polite gestures than does

the interviewer (mean for respondent is 1.2, for interviewer .56).

Finally, the observers recorded whether the interviewer or respondent

sat down first to begin the interview. Results are shown in Table 76.

In most of the interviews, the interviewer sits first. The surprising

finding is that in 11 per cent of the interviews, the respondent does not

*The same categories of observation were used here as were used
to record the number of respondent "polite acts" (see section D
above).

TABLE 74

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EXPLANATIONS USED BY INTERVIEWERS
TO INTRODUCE THE SURVEY INITIALLY

Topic	Per Cent of Interviews in Which It Was Mentioned
U. S. Bureau of Census	96 %
U. S. Public Health Service	71
Interview Process*	61
NHS-HIS (specifically)	9
Advance letter	6
Other**	4

N=412

*Anything which describes the interview, for example, "I want to ask some questions about your health," or "It should take about 20 minutes."

**Usually indicates interviewer showed her credentials to respondent, but neglected to mention either of the sponsoring agencies.

TABLE 75

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INITIAL INTERVIEWER "STRUCTURING" ACTS
OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Structuring Acts	Percentage of Interviews
None	59%
One	28
Two	8
Three or more	4
Not ascertained	1
	100%
	N=412

TABLE 76

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WHO SITS FIRST
AT THE BEGINNING OF THE INTERVIEW, OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Who Sits First?	Percentage of Interviews
Interviewer	80%
Respondent	7
Respondent doesn't sit	11
Not ascertained	2
	100%

124.

sit down but remains standing or carries on with what she was doing

before the interview began.

Characteristics of the Interview Situation

Introduction

Almost all of the observation records and ratings in the SRC

procedure focus upon the two main persons in the interview. Another

set of variables, which often are found to be good predictors of

behavior, are characteristics of the situation. It was possible to

obtain a few measures describing the physical characteristics of the

situation.

Items used are listed below. They were designed to detect possible

situational barriers to good reporting.

    a. Time of day interview began.

    b. Length of time it takes respondent to get to the door
       after the interviewer knocks.

    c. Number of interviews in which the interviewer and respon-
       dent are sitting close enough for good communication.

    d. Number, type, and rated effect of distractions during the
       interview.

    e. An overall rating of the effect of distractions in the
       interview.

Time of day

Time of day at which the interview is begun can serve as a

very rough index of how busy the respondent (usually female and a

housewife) might be if she were not being interviewed. Times when

the respondent might be preparing meals would be 7-9, 11-1, 4-7. If

children are present, they would need attention during meals and after

school (late afternoon).

Table 77 gives a distribution of when the observed interviews were begun. Modes (hours when many interviews took place) were at 11:00-11:59 A.M. and 3:00-3:59 P.M. Both could be times when the respondent is busy. Interviews were not begun as often in mid-morning, early afternoon, and evening, times when the respondent might be less preoccupied, but also not so likely to be at home. A more detailed discussion is presented in a separate report.

Waiting time

Table 78 gives a percentage distribution of the observed interviews by the amount of time that the interviewer had to wait for the respondent to answer the door. It seems reasonable to assume that, on the average, the longer it takes the respondent to get to the door after the interviewer knocks or rings the doorbell, the more occupied she is with other tasks. In general, waiting was not excessive. Only about eight per cent of the time was it necessary to wait 30 seconds or more.

These two measures yield data which suggest a slight degree of respondent preoccupation with other things at the time of the interview, but the extent of this preoccupation cannot be determined using these data. The effects of preoccupation on reporting will be discussed in a separate report.

Seating arrangement

It is necessary, during the NHS-HIS interview, for the interviewer and respondent to pass several items back and forth. This makes it necessary for them to sit within arms reach of one another if the exchange is to take place comfortably. It is felt that if interviewer and respondent are sitting this closely, verbal communication will be

126.

TABLE 77

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS
OF THE TIME OF DAY INTERVIEWS ARE BEGUN

Time of Day	Number of Interviews Begun	Percentage of Interviews
8:00 - 8:59 . .A.M.	0	0 %
9:00 - 9:59	16	4
10:00 - 10:59	37	9
11:00 - 11:59	50	12
12:00 - 12:59 P.M.	42	10
1:00 - 1:59	37	9
2:00 - 2:59	40	10
3:00 - 3:59	45	11
4:00 - 4:59	35	8
5:00 - 5:59	35	8
6:00 - 6:59	32	8
7:00 - 7:59	24	6
8:00 - 8:59	8	2
9:00 - 9:59	0	0
10:00 - 10"59	1	0
Not ascertained	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>
	N = 412	100 %

TABLE 78

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE AMOUNT OF TIME
THE INTERVIEWER HAD TO WAIT FOR THE RESPONDENT TO ANSWER THE DOOR,
OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Time Waiting for Door to Open	Per cent of Interviews
None	31 % *
1 - 9 seconds	45
10 - 29	15
30 - 60	3
60 +	5
Not ascertained	1
	100 %

*It should be noted that these interviews were taken in the late spring of 1964. Weather in many parts of the country permitted respondents to be outside, hence taking no time to "answer the door."

128.

facilitated. In at least two-thirds of the cases, interviewer and respondent sat conveniently close to one another. These data are presented in Table 79.

Interruptions and distractions

It is possible that other people in the interview situation, as well as activities taking place nearby, will affect the character of the interview.

Observers were instructed to record every noticeable event which took place during the interview which could have interrupted or distracted the participants.

Such events were classified by source and effect on the interview, according to the following categories.

   a. Inhibits, causes respondent to withhold information she might otherwise report.

   b. Distracts, causes at least slight communication difficulty, but no withholding of information or interruption in the task.

   c. Interrupts, causes either interviewer or respondent to take her attention away from the task.

   d. Helps, gives some aid to respondent in recalling or reporting relevant information.

   e. No effect.

Table 80 gives the frequency distribution of the number of distractions of each type observed in the interview. Minor distractions are present in many interviews ("distracts" and "no effect"). The number of such distractions for a given interview is sometimes fairly large. Interruptions occur at least once in about half of the interviews, and two or more times in about a third of the interviews. There were no recorded cases of conditions which forced the respondent to withhold information, and in 27% of the interviews,

TABLE 79

PERCENTAGE OF INTERVIEWS IN WHICH INTERVIEWER AND RESPONDENT

ARE SITTING WITHIN ARMS REACH OF ONE ANOTHER

Sitting within arms reach	68 %
Not sitting within arms reach	17
Inappropriate (someone standing) or not ascertained	<u>15</u>
	100 %

TABLE 80

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWS
IN WHICH EACH TYPE OF DISTRACTION WAS OBSERVED
AND FREQUENCY WITH WHICH IT WAS OBSERVED

Type of Distraction	Frequency in Interview					
	0	1	2-4	5-7	8 or more	%
Inhibits	100	--	--	--	--	100
Distracts	55	11	17	6	11	100
Interrupts	55	18	18	5	4	100
Helps	73	6	8	7	6	100
No effect	48	7	13	13	19	100

131.

persons were present who occasionally helped the respondent give information.

Table 81 gives a percentage distribution of the rating observers made of the general effect of distractions and interruptions on the interview. The distribution is heavily skewed, with no indication that distractions had a profound effect on any more than three per cent of the interviews.

Reactions to Conversation not Directly Related to the Questions

Introduction

Throughout the interview, in addition to recording who initiated certain types of unrelated conversation, observers recorded the reaction of the other person to what was initiated. Attention to such reactions may shed some light on how the interviewer and respondent are treating each other during the interview. It should be possible to see whether the atmosphere is generally supportive and encouraging, or dominated or hurried by one of the persons.

Three categories of reactions were recorded. Although they range from positive to negative, there is no indication that they form an equal interval scale. Data, therefore, for each type of reaction are presented separately and only tentative comparisons between categories are made. The three response categories used were:

    a.   Rewards the other person for making his comment by answering, elaborating, expanding, encouraging him to continue.

    b.   Neutral, permits other to finish his comment. Neither interrupts nor rewards, except possibly by a brief acknowledgement that the comment was made (e.g., "uh hum").

    c.   Discourages, does not permit other to finish his comment or does not answer a question asked by the other.

132.

TABLE 81

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVER RATING
"HOW MUCH DID THE DISTRACTIONS AND INTERRUPTIONS AFFECT THE INTERVIEW?"

Degree of Effect	Percentage of Interviews
Very much	1 %
Much	2
Somewhat	10
Little	20
Very little	67
Not ascertained	0
	100 %

N=412

Note: Not answering an unrelated question is coded as a discouraging, rather than neutral, response.

Respondent reactions to interviewer unrelated conversation

Table 82 shows how respondents reacted to specific kinds of interviewer initiations of unrelated conversation.

The table indicates that respondents divide their reactions to interviewer initiations about equally between "encourages" and "neutral" (55% and 44% respectively). Differences do occur, however, in how respondents react to the topic of irrelevant comment. Encouraging reactions are most frequent when the interviewer talks about the respondent, or the purpose of the survey, use of results, and other related topics. Neutral reactions are most frequent when the interviewer laughs or chuckles and, second, when she talks about herself. "Discouraging" reactions are seldom recorded. They were most frequent when the interviewer initiated conversation about the respondent which was not part of the interview questions.

Interviewer reactions to respondent unrelated conversation

Interviewer reactions to the various kinds of unrelated conversation initiated by the respondent are given in Table 83.

Over three-fourths of the interviewer reactions were classified as "neutral," and almost all of the remaining reactions in the "encourages" category. The interviewer is most likely to react encouragingly when the respondent asks about the purpose of the survey, use of results, or the purpose of some particular questionnaire item. She is almost as likely to be encouraging when the respondent initiates conversation about the interviewer. The neutral reactions are most prevalent when the respondent talks about himself or his family and when he laughs, jokes, or shows other signs of tension. These last

134.

TABLE 82

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENT REACTIONS
TO INTERVIEWER INITIATIONS OF UNRELATED
CONVERSATION BY CONTENT OF INITIATION

Content of inter-viewer initiation	Respondent Reaction				Total
	Encourages	Neutral	Discourages	N	%
Talks about respondent	70	28	2	272	100
Talks about herself	60	40	0	90	100
Talks about purpose, etc. of interview	76	24	0	17	100
Humor	40	60	0	326	100
Total Initiations	55%	44%	1%	705	100%

135.

TABLE 83

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWER REACTIONS
TO RESPONDENT INITIATIONS OF UNRELATED
CONVERSATION BY CONTENT OF INITATION

Content of Respon-dent Initiation	Interviewer Reaction				Total %
	Encourages	Neutral	Discourages	N	
Talks about in interview	62	34	4	146	100
Talks about self	20	79	1	3121	100
Asks or comments about interview	75	24	1	284	100
Humor	15	85	0	2965	100
Total Initiations	21	78	1	6516	100

two categories represent the large majority of respondent initiations of irrelevant conversation.

Comparison of respondent and interviewer reactions

The respondent initiates almost ten times as many items of unrelated conversation as does the interviewer. Possibly because of this, the interviewer is more likely to respond in a neutral manner to the respondent. Respondent reactions, on the other hand, are about evenly divided between neutral and enouraging, with the latter slightly more frequent. Aside from this difference, the respondent and interviewer respond in about the same ways to the four different content areas. Both are more likely to respond enouragingly to initiations concerned with themselves or the interview than they are to initiations about the other person, or initiations classified as "humor." Neither interviewer or respondent gives reactions classified as "discouraging."

It appears, therefore, that the atmosphere of the interview is neither overly friendly or extremely unfriendly. A respondent is more likely to "encourage" interviewer unrelated conversation than vice versa, but whether these reactions have any real effect on the amount of unrelated conversation or on the overall atmosphere of rapport cannot be ascertained at this time.

Other Conversation Unrelated to the Interview Questions

Introduction

Another instance of conversation unrelated to the interview questions is that which takes place after the interview is officially over. The recording of this conversation is of special importance since it can give a clearer picture of the extent to which interviewer and respondent wish to talk to each other in a friendly way,

137.

unconstrained by the requirements of the interview task.

Several measures and ratings were taken after the interviewer had asked her last interview question and the respondent had answered it.

    a. Whether any conversation took place.

    b. The length of the conversation.

    c. A judgemental rating of who most wanted to continue
        the conversation.

The amount of post-interview conversation and who wanted to continue it

The amount or length of any conversation taking place between the interviewer and principal respondent after the interview was finished was recorded on a five point scale. Table 84 indicates that there was additional conversation in 76% of the observed interviews and that the length of the conversation was distributed from none to over five minutes. There was no additional conversation in about one-fourth of the interviews. Half of the interviews had conversation lasting from one to five minutes.

Observers also tried to rate who wanted to continue the conversation, the interviewer, the respondent, or both. The fact that eight per cent were not ascertained indicates the rating was comparatively difficult to make. Otherwise, the ratings are distributed as shown in table 85.

Quality of Task Performance

In the middle of the interview, when NHS-HIS questions 18 and 19 concerning the utilization of dental services were being asked, observers were asked to give ratings of how well the respondent was doing and how smoothly the interviewer and respondent were getting along. These ratings were also included in the set of comprehensive ratings which the observer made after leaving the household.

138.

TABLE 84

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LENGTH OF POST-INTERVIEW
CONVERSATION OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Length of Conversation	Percentage of Interviews
No conversation	24 %
Less than one minute	18
1 - 3 minutes	42
3 - 5 minutes	12
Over 5 minutes	3
Not ascertained	1
	100 %

N = 412

TABLE 85

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RATING OF WHO WANTED TO CONTINUE
POST-INTERVIEW CONVERSATION OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Who Wanted to Continue Conversation	Percentage of Interviews
No conversation	24 %
Respondent	26
Interviewer	12
Both	30
Not ascertained	8
	100 %

N = 412

The two sets of ratings and their distributions are compared in Table 86.·   The distributions of the ratings made in the middle of the interview are essentially identical to the distributions obtained at the end of the interview. There is not a great deal of rated variation between respondents. Most respondents are rated high in grasping questions and working smoothly with the interviewer. Other data (not presented in this report) indicate that few individuals were rated as changing very much from the middle to the end of the interview on any of the three ratings. The few observed changes were in the direction of increased smoothness, less respondent talking, and decreased respondent ability to grasp the questions. The magnitude of these changes was almost never greater than one interval on the scale.

TABLE 86

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF RATINGS OF RESPONDENT PERFORMANCE
AT MIDDLE AND END OF INTERVIEW

<u>Middle Rating</u>   <u>End Rating</u>

How well does (did) the respondent grasp the meaning of the questions?

Middle		End
22 %	Perfectly	19 %
49	Very well	48
23	Fairly well	25
5	Not too well	6
1	Not well at all	2
0	Not ascertained	0
100 %		100 %

N = 412

How much talking is this respondent doing (did this respondent do?)

Middle		End
10 %	A great deal	11 %
22	Quite a bit	19
35	A moderate amount	36
25	Not too much	25
8	Very little	8
0	Not ascertained	0
100 %		100 %

N = 412

How smoothly are (did) interviewer and respondent working (work)
together?

Middle		End
18 %	Extremely smoothly	18 %
48	Very smoothly	48
25	Fairly smoothly	25
8	Not too smoothly	8
1	Not smoothly at all	1
0	Not ascertained	0
100 %		100 %

N = 412

APPENDIX B

ELABORATIVE TABLES

TABLE 87

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF ACCEPTABLE ANSWERS
GIVEN PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Acceptable Answers	Percentage of Interviews
0-9	3
10-19	17
20-29	19
30-39	22
40-49	12
50-59	9
60-69	7
70-79	5
80-89	1
90 or more	5
	100%

N=412

143.

TABLE 88

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ANSWERS WHICH REQUIRED FURTHER PROBING
PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Answers Requiring Probing	Percentage of Interviews
none	37
1-2	32
3-4	17
5-6	7
7-8	3
9-10	1
11 or more	3
	100%

N=412

TABLE 89

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ANSWERS WHICH RESPONDENTS
ELABORATED UPON PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Elaborated Interviews	Percentage of Interviews
None	5
1- 4	27
5- 9	27
10-14	15
15-19	11
20-24	6
25-29	3
30 or more	6
	100%
	N=412

TABLE 90

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE PROPORTION OF ACCEPTABLE ANSWERS
WHICH WERE ELABORATED UPON PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Proportion of Elaborated Answers	Percentage of Interviews
.00-.09	16
.10-.19	30
.20-.29	20
.30-.39	15
.40-.49	10
.50-.59	5
.60 or more	4
	100%

N=412

TABLE 91

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES
RESPONDENTS ASK INTERVIEWER FOR CLARIFICATION, DEFINITION, ETC.
PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Times Clarification Requested	Percentage of Interviews
None	62
1	22
2	10
3 or more*	6
	100%

* range: 0-27   N=412

TABLE 92

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES
RESPONDENT CONSULTED OTHER, NON-MEMORY SOURCES OF INFORMATION
PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Times Other Sources Consulted	Percentage of Interviews
None	88
1	8
2 or more*	4
	100%

*range: 0-18   N=412

148.

TABLE 93

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES
RESPONDENT QUESTIONS THE ADEQUACY OF A JUST-GIVEN ANSWER
PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Times Respondent Questions Adequacy of an Answer	Percentage of Interviews
None	86
1	10
2 or more*	4
	100%

*range: 0-4   N=412

149.

TABLE 94

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF TWO TYPES
OF INTERVIEWER NON-DIRECTIVE PROBES
PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Occurrences	Percentage of Interviews		
	Repeats Question	Other Non-Directive	Total Both Categories
None	71	33	27
1	16	19	18
2	5	14	14
3	3	9	12
4	1	7	6
5- 9	3	13	16
10 or more	1*	5**	7***
	100%	100%	100%

*range: 0-29

**range: 0-23

***range: 0-40

N=412

150.

TABLE 95

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWER DIRECTIVE PROBES
PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Directive Probes	Percentage of Interviews
None	39
1	22
2	11
3	9
4-9	15
10 or more*	4
	100%

*range: 0-37   N=412

TABLE 96

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES
THE INTERVIEWER CLARIFIES THE MEANING OF A QUESTION
PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Clarifications	Percentage of Interviews
None	60
1	22
2	11
3	3
4- 9	4
10 or more*	0*
	100%

*One case of 24 clarifications   N=412

152.

TABLE 97

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES THE INTERVIEWER
SUGGESTS THAT THE RESPONDENT CONSULT OTHER, NON-MEMORY SOURCES
OF INFORMATION PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Times Interviewer Suggests Other Sources be Consulted	Percentage of Interviews
None	96
1 or more*	4
	100%

*range: 0-3   N=412

153.

TABLE 98

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THREE TYPES
OF RESPONDENT UNRELATED CONVERSATION WHICH FOCUS ON INTERVIEWER
PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Initiations by Respondent	Percentage of Interviews		
	Flatters or Praises	Shows Curiosity	Gives Suggestion
None	96	89	92
1 or more	4*	11**	8***
	100%	100%	100%

*range: 0-3
**range: 0-8
***range: 0-3

N=412, for each type
of conversation

154.

TABLE 99

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES RESPONDENT "TALKS ABOUT
SELF, FAMILY, FRIENDS, ETC." PER
INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Times R Talks About Self, etc.	Percentage of Interviews
None	23
1-3	29
4-9	24
10-19	12
20 or more*	12
	100%

*range indeterminant = over 98   N = 412

TABLE 100

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES RESPONDENT "LAUGHS, JOKES,
SHOWS OTHER SIGNS OF TENSION" PER
INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Times R Laughs, etc.	Percentage of Interviews
None	11
1-3	29
4-9	34
10-19	19
20 or more*	7
	100
*range 0-59	N = 412

TABLE 101

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF THE THREE TYPES OF INTERVIEWER UNRELATED CONVERSATION
WHICH FOCUS ON RESPONDENT PER
INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Initiations by I	Percentage of Interviews		
	Flatters or Praises	Shows Curiosity	Gives Suggestion
None	85	89	88
1	8	8	7
2+*	7	3	5
	100%	100%	100%

*ranges indeterminant, approx. 0-8   N=412, each category

TABLE 102

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES. INTERVIEWER "TALKS ABOUT
SELF, FAMILY, FRIENDS, ETC." PER
INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Times I Talks About Self, etc.	Percentage of Interviews
None	87
1	11
2 or more*	2
	100%
*range 0-8	N=412

TABLE 103

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES INTERVIEWER "LAUGHS, JOKES,
SHOWS TENSION" PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Times I Laughs, etc.	Percentage of Interviews
None	64
1	19
2 or more*	17
	100%

*range: 0-15   N=412

TABLE 104

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF LIST A

CONDITIONS RESPONDENT PAUSES TO CONSIDER

PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Pauses	Percentage of Interviews
0	53
1	19
2	13
3	5
4	5
5	2
6	0
7	2
8 or more*	1
	100%

*range indeterminant   N = 412

TABLE 105

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF LIST A CONDITIONS
RESPONDENT ASKS FOR CLARIFICATION, DEFINITION,
PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Asks for Clarification	Percentage of Interviews
0	82
1	15
2	2
3 or more*	1
	100

*range 0-7   N = 412

TABLE 106

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOW MANY

LIST A CONDITIONS RESPONDENT ELABORATED ON

PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Number of Elaborated Conditions	Percentage of Interviews
0	36
1	27
2	14
3	10
4	6
5	3
6	2
7	1
8 or more*	.1
	100%
	N = 412

*range indeterminant

TABLE 107

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOW MANY LIST A CONDITIONS
THE INTERVIEWER HAD TO ASK ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS, PROBE,
OR SUGGEST AN ANSWER FOR PER INTERVIEW OVER 412 INTERVIEWS

Additional Questions	Percentage of Interviews
0	72
1	20
2	5
3 or more*	3
	100%
*range 0-5	N = 412

163.

APPENDIX C: <u>Interview Observation Manual</u>

Corrections

1. (not necessarily opening it)

2. Check 1/4 if respondent is merely peeking out.
   Check 1/2 if you get a full body view of the respondent.
   Check "fully" if one person could enter easily with the respondent standing there.

3. ...questions, statements, and reservations

4. Use outward, visible signs of politeness when possible. One outward, visible sign of politeness is to be considered average. From there, work a balance either way according to whether there are more indications either of politeness or impoliteness.

5. See observation form for NHS questions for which this type of recording is to be done. The instructions for table one are incorrect and should read:

   > Include all conditions, accident table, and activities card
   > for all persons reported for by the principle respondent.
   > DO NOT include Table 11.

6. Any answer which the interviewer indicates that she is unwilling to accept as accurate or complete. Non-acceptance is indicated only when the interviewer probes. You, as an observer, should not judge which answers are adequate or inadequate except on the basis of the above "probe" criterion.

7. including adults who are responding for themselves.

8. Do not tally clarifications requested by the respondent.

9. Do not include questions about instructions, procedures, or time reference here.

Survey Research Center
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
in cooperation with the
United States Public Health Service
and the Bureau of the Census

INTERVIEW OBSERVATION MANUAL

The interview observation project in which you are participating is part of a
large study about interviews and what makes them effective. Recent studies by
the Survey Research Center have indicated that respondents sometimes did not
give correct medical information in health surveys even for such simple questions
as the number of times they had visited the doctor in the past two weeks, or the
number of times they had been hospitalized in the past year.

The present project will try to discover why faulty or incomplete information
comes out of the interview. Two of our assumptions are that very few respondents
deliberately lie, and that no interviewer deliberately conducts a bad interview.
We assume that an interviewer is well trained and is carrying out her assignment
correctly. We also assume that the respondent has at least some desire to give
the correct information. If no one is actually trying to lie or do a poor job of
interviewing, we must look elsewhere for the trouble. We think that a minute-by-
minute observation of the interview process will give us some clues as to the
significant factors affecting the giving and obtaining of health information.

The Observation Forms

There are nine different forms designed to get information on the processes of the
actual interview itself. The first two forms are filled out before the interview
actually begins. Since we cannot observe and record everything that occurs
during the interview, we must use some sort of sampling procedure. Most of the
rest of the forms are filled out while specific NHS-HIS questions are being asked
and answered. The forms of this type have the specific NHS-HIS question or
questions printed in a box at the top of the page. You should fill out these
forms only when those particular questions are being asked and answered.

One form, entitled "Conversation not Related Directly to the Interview Questions,"
appears on the right side of your booklet continuously throughout the actual
interview. These forms are filled out whenever any of the things on them occur.

Finally, there are two pages of overall ratings which should be filled out after
you leave the dwelling unit.

Numbering Systems: Two numbering systems are used on the observation forms.
The main numbering system refers to the order of the items within the observation
booklet. The other numbering system refers to the numbers of the NHS-HIS
interview questions. These numbers are preceded by the letter "Q" to avoid
confusion.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

You are asked to do four things in filling out the observation booklet: check, tally, write, and code. Every form contains instructions on which method of recording is to be used.

In general, whenever a series of boxes appears, you are to <u>check</u> (✓) at least one in each group. Never leave a set of boxes blank.

On several forms, the behavior you observe may occur more than once. When we are interested in how often a particular behavior occurs, we ask you to make a <u>tally</u> mark (卅) each time it happens. Items calling for tally marks may be left blank if no instances of that behavior are observed.

On most forms you are asked to <u>write</u> down (usually opposite a category "other" or in the margins) any unusual circumstances which occur and which are not covered by the items on that form.

The "Unrelated Conversation" form makes use of two sets of "codes." Here a letter is used to designate reactions or effects of distractions and interruptions. See the manual for specific instruction on the use of these codes.

Unusual Circumstances:

> Since all behavior which could take place in the interview has not been included on the observation forms, there may be times when something important happens but there is no place on the form being used at that time to record it. Whenever this happens, write a brief note in the margin explaining what happened.

Legigility:

> Finally, since the pace of the interview is sometimes very fast, your writing and recording may get a little sloppy. Before any booklet is turned in, make sure that a coder can read what you have written, tell how many tally marks you have made, which boxes have been checked, etc.

Definition of the Principal Respondent

> The observation forms are, in most cases, designed to apply to only one respondent. It is, therefore, necessary to choose one person in the interview situation as the respondent to be observed. This choice should be made as soon after the interview begins as possible and then never changed at any time during the interview.

> You should choose as the principal respondent, the one to be observed, the person who not only answers for herself but who answers for other members of the family if there are any others.

> If two or more people seem to be reporting equally often, choose the female.

> If two females are reporting equally, choose the younger (but do not choose a female under age 18).

Filling out the forms

Fill out the observation forms only for the principal respondent you have
chosen. If someone else is reporting, you are to ignore this. There will
be a few cases where it will be impossible to get good observation data
if a second respondent is reporting. If you run across one of these
situations, record as best you can and write a note explaining the circum-
stances on the forms for which had trouble.

Before the Interview - At the Door

1. The time the interviewer knocks on the door is _____ | A.M. |
   | P.M. |

   As the interviewer approaches the door, look constantly at your watch
   and notice the exact time to THE NEAREST MINUTE that the interviewer
   FIRST knocks or rings.

   Fill in the blank in HOURS and MINUTES, e.g., 2:45, 10:56, etc.

   Check the A. M. or P.M. box depending upon which applies.

2. Check number of seconds waiting for door to open.

   As soon as the interviewer first knocks, start counting to yourself the
   number of seconds the respondent takes to appear at the door. An
   accurate way of counting seconds is to count 1001, 1002, 1003, etc.
   Do not attempt to do anything else while counting. If you talk to the
   interviewer, or fill in your cover sheet, etc., your counting may not
   be accurate.

   When the respondent answers the door,[1] stop counting and check one of
   the 4 boxes to indicate how far you counted. In the case of a tie, e.g.,
   9½ seconds, use the larger category, e.g., 10-29 seconds.

   If someone clearly not the respondent, such as a child, answers the door,
   write this in the margin and start counting the time it takes for the
   respondent to appear after being called.

   If, for any other reason, these time categories do not apply or something
   unusual occurs, write a note describing the unusual situation in the
   margin.

3. How far was door opened at first?

   Check the box which indicates how far the respondent opened the outer
   door at first: 0, ¼, ½, fully.[2] It is important to make this rating as
   soon as the respondent comes to the door and before the interviewer
   starts talking. Ratings made after the interviewer begins to speak
   are unacceptable.

   If the respondent talks through a door, or from a window, check "0".

   If someone other than the respondent answers the door, check the box
   labeled "NA" (which means not applicable or not appropriate.).

   If the respondent is out in the yard, etc., check "NA."

   If the door is already open for some other reason, check "NA."

   Write a note describing any unusual situations in the margin.

4.

4. How many questions did the respondent ask?

Keep track of the number of questions³ RELATED TO THE SURVEY that the respondent asks PRIOR TO THE TIME THE FIRST INTERVIEW QUESTION IS ASKED.

You should count questions such as:

"Is this the survey I got a letter about?"

"Could you come back later?"

"Is this something about Medicare?"

Etc.

You should not count questions not related to the survey or other unrelated statements which the respondent makes. Do Not count questions like the following:

"Isn't it a nice day today?"

"Where did you get that lovely hat?"

Etc.

Keep track of the number of survey-related questions by making a tally mark at the bottom of the page each time the respondent asks one.

Check one of the three boxes, "none," "one," or "20 or more" to indicate how many questions the respondent asked.

If the respondent says anything which you think will affect the interview or its atmosphere, write a brief note in the margin telling what is said.

5. Check those things interviewer mentions at the door.

Every time the interviewer mentions something at the door or any time before the first interview question is asked, including answers to any questions from the respondent, place a check mark in one of the boxes provided.

a. "Public Health Service." Place a check mark in the adjoining box each time any of the following is mentioned by the interviewer:

The Public Health Service

The Department of Public Health

The Health Department

The Health Service

b. "Census Bureau." Place a check mark in the adjoining box each time any of the following is mentioned by the interviewer:

The Bureau of the Census

The Census Bureau, or department

Census

5.

5. Check those things interviewer mentions at the door. (continued)

c. "The 'Dear Friend' letter to respondents or the brochure."

Whenever the interviewer mentions any material previously sent to the respondent, place a check mark in the adjoining box each time it is mentioned.

d. "The interview."

Place a check mark in this box each time the interviewer says something concerning the conduct or content of the actual interview. This category includes a large class of statements and answers to questions such as the following:

"It usually takes about have an hour."

"I am going to ask you about your family's health."

"I have a questionnaire to fill out."

"If your husband is home, I would like to talk to him, too."

e. If other things are mentioned, write what is said briefly in the larger blank boxes (starting with the box labeled "other") and place a check mark in the adjoining smaller box each time the item is mentioned, including the first time it is mentioned.

Examples of other things which the interviewer might mention in her introductory remarks are:

Statements about sampling procedures, how respondents are chosen.

Statements about the purpose of the survey, how the results are used, the fact that they are converted to statistics, etc.

If the interviewer merely shows her credentials but does not explain, in words, whom she represents, write "credentials" in one of the blank boxes and place a check mark after it. If she both shows her credentials and tells the respondent whom she represents, proceed as above and also place a check mark opposite the sponsors she does mention.

Also write in the blank boxes "National Health Survey" (NHS) or "Health Interview Survey" (HIS) if either is mentioned. Place a check mark opposite each to indicate how many times it was mentioned.

6. What occurs? Who takes the initiative?

General instructions: Check the boxes to indicate those things which are SPOKEN about. If gestures are used in place of words, do not check the boxes.

a. Getting in the door.

Check who takes the initiative for getting in the door. Check interviewer if she says "May I come in," "May we go inside," etc. Check respondent if she says "Come in," etc.

b. Suggests chair.

Check respondent if the respondent uses words to offer the interviewer a place to sit. If the interviewer decides to sit elsewhere and mentions this fact using words, e.g., "Do you mind if I sit here instead?", you should also check the interviewer box.

If the interviewer alone mentions the seating arrangement, e.g., "May we sit over here?" "May I sit down?" etc., check the interviewer box only.

c. Suggests table.

Indicate, as you have done for the preceding two items, who takes the initiative by using words for furnishing a table or other writing surface for the interviewer.

Any or all of the above three categories should be left blank (no check marks in any of the boxes) if there is no conversation about them. When you notice that gestures are being used to indicate the getting in the door, suggesting a chair, etc., write this under "Specifications" below.

d. "Other (specify)."

Write in the large boxes any other statements made regarding setting up the PHYSICAL interview situations and indicate who made them by checking who initiates them.

Examples might be:

Suggests they go to another room - √ (respondent)

Asks that TV be turned off - √ (interviewer)

Offers coffee - √ (respondent)

Suggests respondent continue preparing lunch during interview - √ (interviewer)

6. What occurs? Who takes the initiative? (continued)

   e. "Specifications:..."

      Write down anything else which might affect the situation, environment,
      or atmosphere in which the interview will be carried out.

      Write in information about the "gestures," if any, which you observed
      above.

      Write down the presence of distractions, such as a loud TV set or the
      fact that the washer repair man was there.

      Indicate any behavior which seems to be preparing the respondent for
      the interview (rapport building) by briefly writing down your impressions
      here.

      Write down any examples of behavior like that you have been checking
      above which is initiated by someone OTHER THAN INTERVIEWER or RESPONDENT.
      Write down the actual behavior and who initiated it.

7. Who sits first?

   Look up before either the interviewer or respondent is seated and carefully
   observe who sits first.   Check the appropriate box. If both sit at the same
   time, check both boxes.

8. Are the respondent and interviewer sitting close to each other?

   Check "yes" if they can hand the materials (the activities or specialists
   cards) back and forth comfortably - without straining or getting up. Check
   "no" if they cannot comfortably hand the materials back and forth. A
   comfortable distance is usually less than six feet apart.

GENERAL RATINGS.

   You should make the following two general ratings on the basis of all that
   has happened up to the time the first interview question is asked. You
   should allow enough time to give each of them careful consideration.

9. How polite has the respondent been to the interviewer?

   Check whichever one of the five boxes comes closest to describing how polite
   the respondent was before the interview actually began.[4]

   Some of the signs of expected social courtesy or politeness are:

      Did the respondent invite the interviewer in?

      Did she offer her a chair, writing surface, etc.?

      Did she let the interviewer sit first?

9. How polite has the respondent been to the interviewer? (continued)

> Did she do anything else to make the interviewer physically comfortable or to make the interview situation more convenient for the interviewer?

> Did she treat the interviewer like a guest in her home?

It is important to note that a respondent may be very polite and yet not be particularly warm or friendly.

10. How warm and friendly has this respondent been to the interviewer?

Check one of the five boxes to indicate how warm and friendly the respondent has been toward the interviewer before the interview began.

Friendliness refers to behavior directed toward the interviewer AS A PERSON whereas politeness refers only to the socially expected courtesies.

> Does the respondent show a genuine interest in the interviewer as a person?

> Does she smile or laugh?

> Does she engage in unexpected polite behavior such as offering refreshments?

> Does she talk about the interviewer personally (e.g., "You must be very tired.")?

If the respondent does not react to the interviewer as a person but shows no signs of antagonism, unfriendliness, displeasure, etc., check the middle box.

Check the last two boxes depending upon the amount of unfriendliness, displeasure, or antagonism shown before the interview starts.

11. (32) Which of the following describes the respondent now?

_ Check ALL of the boxes which apply to the respondent and the way she has behaved up to this point in the interview according to the following definitions . A check indicates an extreme instance.

Enthusiastic: Check this box if the respondent shows signs of extreme interest in the survey, its questions, its goals, or shows signs of pleasure to be participating in it. Enthusiasm may show up in several ways such as asking questions about the survey which show interest rather than antagonism, giving detailed responses, or expressing pleasure at answering specific questions.

Attentive: Check this category if the respondent paid attention to the questions rather than to something else (like her children, the television set, etc.) Attention is also indicated if the respondent almost always responded to the questions by giving concise answers which completely answer that question and only that question.

Neutral. Check neutral if the respondent did not show any of the attitudes listed in this item and, in addition, did not show strong feelings of any kind.

Bored: Check this category to indicate an uninterested (see enthusiastic, above) respondent who is passive in showing her lack of interest, i.e., is not "irritated" (see below). Signs of boredom are inattention (see above), yawning, or a generally low level of activity or motivation.

Irritated: Check this category to show that the respondent is ACTUALLY SHOWING strong negative feelings toward the study or toward the interviewer in an open way. Examples of irritation would be acts of criticism, complaining, antagonism, unfriendly comments, etc.

Can't Rate: If you feel none of the above items apply to this respondent, check this box.

12. (33) How loud is each speaking?

Check one of the five boxes for the interviewer and for the respondent to indicate how loud each has been speaking generally.

When making this judgment in observation item 33, be sure that if there has been any general change in speaking volume for either person since you checked item 12, you indicate this by checking a different one of the five boxes for the person who changed.

If the speaking volume remains the same throughout the interview, you should have checked the same box on item 33 as you did on item 12.

CONVERSATION DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE INTERVIEW

General Instructions [5]

Place a _tally_ mark opposite the appropriate category _every time_ the interviewer or respondent says something as part of the interview. The following interviewer conversation, however, SHOULD NOT BE TALLIED:

When the interviewer FIRST asks the question.

When the interviewer FIRST USES A PROBE WHICH IS WRITTEN ON THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE.

13. (Also 21 & 26) How does RESPONDENT respond to questions?

    A. Gives adequate answer.

       Any answer (whether true or false, long or short) which supplies the information required by the interview question is considered adequate.

    b. Elaborates response.

       Tally the number of instances when the respondent gives extra information directly related to the health information which the question asks for (for example, an attempt to place it in time, relating it to other conditions, giving a few details, etc.)

       Consult the section entitled "Conversation not related directly to the interview questions" for the distinction between that and "elaborative information."

    c. Answers inadequately. [6]

    d. Asks for clarification or repetition.

       Tally the number of times the respondent asks the meaning of a question or probe or asks that all or part of a question be repeated.

    e. Consults another person or records.

       Tally the number of times the respondent consults someone else (other than the interviewer) for information RELEVANT to the question.

       Tally also the number of times the respondent consults relevant records on health, income, etc.

    f. Consults calendar.

       Tally the number of times the respondent consults a calendar in connection with answering any of the interview questions.

g. Questions the adequacy of answer.

Tally the number of times the respondent gives any indication that she wishes to know whether the information she gave is what the interviewer wants.

h. Other (specify)

Write down any other important ways the respondent answers questions and tally the number of times each occurs.

14. (Also 22 & 27) What does interviewer do in an attempt to get adequate answers?

a. Repeats question from schedule.

Tally the number of times the interviewer REPEATS a question or probe from the interview schedule EXACTLY AS WORDED.

DO NOT tally the FIRST TIME the question or probe is asked.

If the question is reworded or rephrased when repeated, you should place a tally mark in one of the next two categories.

b. Asks question not from schedule which DOESN'T SUGGEST an answer...

Tally the number of times the interviewer asks a question or probe which is not exactly that which appears on the interview form, which does not suggest a specific response but which is designed to get information necessary to fill in the questionnaire (not some question about the weather, etc.).

A question does not suggest an answer if it gives the respondent a choice between at least two plausible alternatives.

Examples of questions not from the schedule which do not suggest a specific response are:

"You said you first noticed the condition about a year ago. Was it more than 12 months ago or less than 12 months ago?"

"Can you tell me the approximate number of times?"

"Would you give me an example?"

"Could you be more specific?"

c. Asks question not from schedule which MAY SUGGEST A specific answer, or asks respondent if she agrees to a specific answer.

Tally the number of times the interviewer is forced to ask a respondent a question which may suggest a specific answer, even if the suggested answer is most appropriate for the respondent.

Questions which ask the respondent to agree to a statement or give only one plausible alternative are in this category.

Examples of questions which suggest specific answers are:

"Were you in the hospital three times during the past 12 months?"

"Would you say statement three best describes your husband in terms of health?"

"Are you saying that you have chronic liver trouble, Mrs. X?"

"That was in the past two weeks, Mr. B?"

d. Clarifies the meaning of the question from the schedule.

Tally the number of times the interviewer explains the meaning of a question by GENERALLY clarifying, elaborating, or interpreting, by providing more information than the question contains, or by rephrasing it.

(If the interviewer suggests an answer in the process of clarifying, etc., tally in item "c" also.)

A question is not considered clarified if the interviewer just repeats it exactly as worded.

e. Suggests records, calendar, or other people be consulted.

Whenever the interviewer suggests the respondent get information from some place other than memory (for example, asking other people; looking up income tax records, hospital, or doctor bills; or looking at a calendar) make a tally mark in this category.

f. Other.

Write here anything the interviewer does which has a significant effect on the exchange of information and tally the number of times each occurs.

You may write that the interviewer thanked the respondent for an answer.

You may write that the interviewer shook her pencil under the respondent's nose when the respondent did not wait to hear the whole question.

CONVERSATION NOT RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

General Instructions

Each time during the interview that interviewer or respondent says something NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO GIVING OR GETTING THE INFORMATION REQUIRED BY THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE you should fill out this form.

i. Decide what is said according to the list of categories at the left of the page.

ii. Decide who brings up the topic.

iii. Place a _tally_ mark in the box which indicates what is said and who brings it up.

iv. Listen for the reaction of the other person.

v. _Code_ the reaction of the other person by placing a letter (A, B, C) in the appropriate reaction box.

a. Flatters or praises

Includes conversation about the other person which is of a friendly, approving, and encouraging nature, including sympathy.

For example: "That's a nice picture you have there."

"You're doing a very fine job."

"He's a healthy looking youngster."

"I'm glad everything turned out all right after the operation."

b. Questions about the other person.

Includes any indications of curiosity about the other person beyond asking the usual interview-related questions.

c. Gives suggestions to other.

Includes all instances of suggestions, demands, orders beyond those contained in the interview schedule. Examples might include:

"Please go ahead and finish getting the children's lunch."

"Let's move out to the kitchen; it's getting too noisy in here."

"Would you mind turning the radio down?"

"Would you read the questions a little slower?"

14.

d. Talks about self, family, friends, etc.

This category comes very close to "elaborates answer" on another observation form but is quite distinct from it.

By its very nature, the interview itself encourages the respondent to talk about health problems for herself and her family. She will do this quite often. You must decide whether what is being said at any point represents an honest attempt to answer a question, including giving information which could be viewed as helpful, or whether the respondent is rambling on about herself or family merely because she enjoys talking this way and/or because she seems to have lost sight of the original interview question.

If there seems to be a definite point to the respondent's conversation such as trying to recall events related to the last time her husband was in the hospital so she can give a more accurate hospitalization date, treat this as "elaborated response." On the other hand, if the respondent rambles on about her husband's last hospitalization, its effects on the family income, the weather at the time, etc., treat this as an example of "Talks about self, friends, family, etc."

e. Talks about things she would rather be doing now.

Includes any mention (usually by respondent) of things she would like to be doing now - possibly instead of being interviewed - such as going to the store, starting supper, watching a favorite TV program, taking a nap, etc.

f. Talks about things she is avoiding now.

Includes any comments indicating that the present interview is replacing or postponing things she wants to avoid doing such as ironing, dusting, taking care of the neighbor's children, etc.

If another activity is mentioned but you are in doubt as to whether it belongs in "e" or "f", tally it in "e", "things she would rather be doing" and write a brief note in the margin to the right describing your decision problems.

g. Asks purpose of study or of question.

Includes all instances when the RESPONDENT asks a question about or makes a comment about the general aims of the survey or the reason WHY a particular question or series of questions is being asked. For example:

"What is all this for, anyway?"

"Does this have something to do with social security?"

"Why do you have to know my income?"

"I suppose you are asking that to find out if people have enough health insurance."

"Why do you only want to know about the past two weeks?"

etc.

15.

If the interviewer mentions something about the purpose of the survey or the purpose of specific questions, you should use this category (with a tally in the interviewer box) PROVIDING that the interviewer comment was not in response to a comment or question from the respondent. For example: "I need to ask you for your telephone number in case I have to call you for more information on your child's accident."

h. Asks about Health Service, Census.

Includes questions by the respondent or independent comments of the interviewer concerning the GENERAL duties and functions of the Public Health Service or the Bureau of the Census. Specific questions about the Health Interview Survey should be tallied in "g" above.

i. Other.

Includes any other questions or comments about the survey, the interview, sample selection procedures, uses of the results, etc.

j. Laughs, jokes, tries to relieve tension.

Includes all instances of laughing, joking, nervous chuckling, etc., no matter how brief the occurrence is or whether you think it is a "major charge" from the interview task or not.

k. Other, Specify.

Includes any instances of conversation which departs from the interview task but not included in the above categories. Conversation about the weather, local politics, etc., should be included.

CODE REACTION OF OTHER PERSON.

Each statement tallied should have a reaction to it coded for the other person. Use the following codes to specify what you think will be the effect of the reaction on future conversation.

A. Encouraging further conversation.

The response expands or elaborates on the remark, indicates some approval of what was said, or is in the form of a sufficient answer to a question which the other has asked.

B. Neutral.

Permits the other to finish his comment but offers no elaboration. The response may or may not include a brief, polite acknowledgment such as "Uh huh."

C. Discouraging future conversation.

The responder interrupts or otherwise does not permit the other person to finish his statement

OR

The responder does not answer a question of the other.

USE OF FIRST OR LAST NAMES OR OTHER PERSONAL REFERENCE TERMS

Whenever a first name, last name, or other term is used to designate the other person, check the appropriate box. If some term such as ma'am, sir, honey, etc., is used, check the "other" box. You do not need to specify the other term used.

DISTRACTIONS AND INTERRUPTIONS

Children Present. Children are defined as any persons under the age of 18. They are present if they are in the same room in which the interview is being conducted.

Adults Present. Adults are any persons age 18 or over.[7] They are present if they are in the same room in which the interview is being conducted.

TV, radio. If the television set, radio, or phonograph is ON during the interview, this category should be used. It should be ignored if these appliances are present but not operating.

Other. Write other interruptions or distractions which occur during the interview, for example, street drilling, something burning in the kitchen, telephone calls, etc.

DISTRACTION CODE

General instructions. Whenever any of the distraction and interruption categories apply to the interview situation, you must check at least one of the five code boxes, indicating the effect of the distraction or interruption. More than one box may be checked. Note that the codes do not form a scale. Therefore, consider each of the five items separately.

A. Inhibits, causes to withhold information.

Indicate that the source (children, adults, TV, other) caused the respondent to withhold some information about her own or others' health which would otherwise have been given.

You should write a brief note explaining why you checked this category. Do this after the interview is over.

B. Distracts but does not cause an interruption

Indicates the source was noticeable and made the job of giving and getting health information at least slightly more difficult. The source did not cause anyone to divert his attention from the interview.

Use this category if the radio is turned up loud enough to cause either interviewer or respondent to raise her voice.

C. Causes an interruption

Indicates that the source caused either the respondent or the interviewer to take her attention away from the interview for more than three seconds.

If the respondent asks the interviewer to repeat a question because her attention was directed somewhere else, use this code.

D. Helps respondent give answers

Indicates that the source (usually another person who is not responding for himself at that time) helps the interviewer get more accurate and complete health information.

E. No effect

Indicates that the source has no effect on the interview situation.

Q. 12 and Q. 13 - CHRONIC AND ACUTE CONDITION LISTS

15. How many conditions does respondent pause to consider?

Tally the number of times the respondent pauses to think about the answer she will give. A pause is indicated:

a. When the respondent starts to give an answer, stops, and then continues

b. When the respondent delays answering for at least two or three seconds

c. When the respondent turns her eyes upward, contorts her face, or shows any other physical sign of thought like scratching her head, turning her eyes upward, etc.

16. Number of conditions respondent asks for clarification, definition.

Tally the number of times the respondent ASKS FOR the meaning of a particular condition or whether a set of symptoms fit the definition of that condition.

17. How many conditions does the respondent elaborate on?

Tally the number of conditions for which the respondent gives additional, relevant information. (Consult section on "elaborates answer" for further discussion of elaborative information.)

18. How many conditions did the INTERVIEWER have to ask additional questions, probe, or suggest an answer for?

Tally the number of times the interviewer has to re-read a condition, or ask any other question to obtain an adequate answer for each health condition. Include here all questions the interviewer asks aimed at clarifying or understanding better the answer which the respondent gives 8

19. Does the interviewer look up at the respondent after reading each condition?

Estimate the number of times the interviewer takes her eyes off of her materials after reading a condition and looks at the respondent. Then check one of the five boxes to indicate how often this happened.

"Almost always" indicates this happened all the time

"Often" indicates about 3/4 of the conditions.

"Sometimes" indicates about 1/2 of the conditions

"Seldom" indicates about 1/4 of the conditions

"Almost never" indicates never

19.

20. Does the respondent have enough time to think about each condition before the interviewer asks the next?

Estimate whether the respondent was given enough time to consider each condition before the next condition was asked, regardless of whether she used the time or not.

Base your decision on the pace at which the interviewer asked the questions; was the pace too fast to give the respondent time to consider each condition? Did the interviewer immediately ask the next condition after the respondent answered or did she wait long enough to let the respondent think about the answer given?

Check one of the five boxes to indicate whether the respondent had enough time to consider each condition as follows:

All items - had enough time on all items

Most items - had enough time on about 3/4 of the items

Some items - had enough time on about 1/2 of the items

A few items - had enough time on about 1/4 of the items

None of the items - had enough time on none

20 and 21.   See 13 and 14.

Do not tally during question 22.

20.

23. How well does the respondent grasp the meaning of the questions?

Check one of the five boxes to indicate how well the respondent understands the questions which she has been asked up to this point in the interview. Signs of lack of understanding are:

The number of inadequate answers given.

The number of times the respondent gives too much information, information that is totally irrelevant, more than the interviewer asked for or wanted.

The number of times the respondent responds with a blank, uncomprehending stare.

The number of times the interviewer must repeat or clarify questions without the respondent asking her to do so.

24. How much talking is this respondent doing?

Check one of the five boxes to indicate how much talking this respondent has been doing, regardless of whether the talking is in answer to the questions or about other things.

Does she answer the questions briefly or with full explanations?
Does she volunteer information that is not specifically asked for?
Does she bring up things that are unrelated to the interview?

25. How smoothly did the respondent and interviewer work together?

Check one of the five boxes using the following as your guide:

Do the respondent and interviewer understand one another? How often does one fail to understand what the other means?

Does the respondent have the same goals as the interviewer; is she trying to give complete and accurate information rather than trying to finish the interview quickly, watch television, or whatever?

Does the respondent work easily with the interview schedule or does she show she is annoyed with the occasional repetitions?

Does the interviewer easily adapt to the respondent's style of reporting or must she continually ask for clarification?

26 and 27.   See 13 and 14.

SPECIALISTS CARD

28. Did respondent ask for definitions, clarification, or the meaning of any
     of the items on the card?

     Check the "yes" box if the respondent, at any time before she hands the
     card back to the interviewer, asks what any of the specialists do, what
     types of health problems they treat, etc. If no questions of this
     type were asked, check the "no" box.[9]

29. Did the respondent ask any other question?

     Check "yes" if the respondent asks any other question (besides defining,
     clarifying, etc., the role of the specialists) which is RELEVANT to the
     specialists question, such as "Is my family doctor a specialist because
     he treats our ear, nose, and throat problems?" Do not check the "yes"
     box if you tally the question on the "unrelated conversation" form.

     Check the "no" box if the respondent did not ask any other question.

30. How did the respondent respond to the card?

     Check ONE and ONLY ONE of the three boxes:

     Considered the items carefully - check here if the respondent took a lot
     of time filling out the card, asked for clarifications and/or definitions,
     or showed physical signs of thought such as turning her eyes upward,
     scratching her head, etc.

     Rushed through it - check here if the respondent quickly went down the list,
     checking the items about as quickly as she could move her pencil. Do not
     check this box if the respondent stopped to consider even one of the items.

     Other (specify) - Indicate here any other way the respondent responded to the
     items on the card such as refusing to check any of the items. Check the box
     and write down what you observed the respondent doing.

31. Did the interviewer have to read any of the list to the respondent?

     Check one of the three boxes to indicate how much of the specialists card the
     interviewer actually read to the respondent. All of it, some of it, or
     none of it.

32 and 33.   See numbers 11 and 12.

34. Did the respondent ask the reason for the question?

     Check "yes" if the respondent asks why this particular question (income) is
     being asked in the survey. DO NOT TALLY THIS ON THE "UNRELATED CONVERSATION"
     FORM.

     Check "no" if the respondent does not ask the reason for the question.

35. Did the interviewer help the respondent arrive at an answer?

     Check "yes" if the interviewer helps the respondent add figures, etc., or
     does anything to suggest which of the income categories the respondent
     should give as an answer.

     Check "no" if the interviewer renders no help other than reading the
     questions one or more times.

CLOSE OF INTERVIEW

36. Time last question... answered: _____ o'clock

     Write the exact time in hours and minutes, (e.g., 3:12) that the
     respondent finished answering the last interview question (including
     supplements, filling out release forms, etc.) Record time to the
     nearest minute.

     You should check with the interviewer before you begin the day's work
     as to which questions she usually asks last.

37. Was there some conversation after the last question was answered?

     Check "yes" if there was any conversation took place after the last
     question was answered other than the standard Thank You letter statement,
     "Good-bye", etc. If no conversation took place (except for the above
     exceptions), check "no".

38. If "yes": Who wanted to continue the conversation?

     If you indicated that conversation did take place after the last question
     was answered, check one of the boxes to indicate who seemed to want to
     continue the conversation by talking a lot, asking questions, etc.

     If both the interviewer and respondent seem to want to continue the
     conversation (even if they want to in different degrees), check the box
     marked "both."

     If you are unable to make this judgment, check the box marked "D.K."
     (Don't know).

39. Time leave house: _____o'clock.

     Write the exact time in hours and minutes (e.g., 3:15) that you and the
     interviewer leave the door of the dwelling unit. EXCEPTION: If the
     interviewer and respondent are still talking as you go through the door,
     wait until the conversation has definitely stopped before you read your
     watch and write in the time.

23.

OVERALL RATINGS OF THE RESPONDENT

Make the overall ratings of the respondent after the interview is completed. The best time to complete them is while the interviewer is filling out her "report."

General instructions: The ratings are designed to summarize what you observed about the interviewer and respondent during the interview. Therefore, think carefully about the entire interview when making the ratings. On the other hand, we want you to use your IMPRESSIONS of what went on in the interview as a guide in rating. So, unless you absolutely cannot remember information on a particular rating, do not go back and look at your previous ratings while you are completing these pages.

Check one of the boxes for each set of ratings. Do not leave any rating item blank. If you have trouble making any of the ratings, check one of the boxes anyway and write a note in the margin describing the difficulty.

1. How cooperative was this respondent?

    <u>Check</u> one of the five boxes to indicate how cooperative the respondent has been during the entire interview.

    Cooperation may be shown in many ways including the following:

        Willingness to answer the questions.

        Willingness to answer in the exact way required by the NHS-HIS interview schedule.

        Absence of antagonism, complaining, and hostile remarks.

        Absence of criticism, resistance.

        Signs of being helpful and considerate toward the interviewer.

        Volunteering and elaborating answers.

        Paying attention.

2. How well did this respondent grasp the meaning the questions?

    Make this rating using the same rules you used in observation item 23. Do not consult your rating of item 23 unless absolutely necessary.

3. How much talking did this respondent do during the interview?

    Make this rating using the same rules you used in observation item 24. Do not consult your rating of item 24 unless absolutely necessary.

4. How willing was respondent to give all the time necessary for this interview?

    <u>Check</u> one of the five boxes to indicate how willing the respondent was to take all the time necessary to give accurate and complete information.

The respondent is not considered willing to give all the necessary time if:

She continually refers to things she would rather be doing.

She continually comments on the length of the interview or asks how long it will take.

She tries in any way to speed up the interview.

She shows boredom or lack of interest.

The respondent is considered willing to take the necessary time if:

She refers to the interview as an excuse not to do things she doesn't want to do.

She shows enthuriasm for or extreme interest in the interview itself.

She talks at length about unrelated things.

She takes time to consult records.

She asks for clarification of questions when necessary.

She appears relaxed.

5. How much did respondent want to chat with the interviewer about matters unrelated to the interview schedule?

   Check one of the three boxes to indicate how much the respondent wanted to chat with the interviewer about anything.

   When you make this rating consider two things:

   a) How often the respondent carried on or at least tried to start a conversation that was unrelated to the questions, and whether or not this conversation was of a friendly nature.or If the respondent was friendly and talkative, check the "very much" box.

6. How much did the interviewer have to clarify and interpret for this respondent?

   Check the box which indicates how often the interviewer had to clarify, define, interpret, explain, etc., the interview questions and procedures for this respondent. Consider the number of times the interviewer had to clarify, etc., the meaning of words or questions, or had to explain something else to the respondent about what was expected of her.

OVERALL RATINGS OF INTERVIEW

1. How smoothly did interviewer and respondent work together?

    Make this rating using the same rules you used in observation item 25. Do not consult your rating of item 25 unless absolutely necessary.

2. How hard did each try to communicate?

    Check one of the five boxes for both the interviewer and the respondent.

    When you make this rating, consider:

    The number of attempts made to explain or clarify a question or response.

    How closely the person was listening to what the other was saying.

    How carefully the person thought about what she was saying during the interview.

    The general level of attention of the person throughout the interview.

3. In general, what was the pace of this interview?

    Check one of the five boxes to indicate the general feeling of relaxation or pressure which this interview contained.

    Consider the following in making your decision:

    How fast each talked.

    The number of times the interviewer and respondent interrupted each other to go on with the interview.

    The amount of unrelated conversation which took place.

    The quickness in asking the first interview questions.

    The speed with which they went through the lists of chronic and acute conditions.

    The amount of time the respondent used to check the Specialists Card.

    The speed with which the respondent answered the questions (pause vs. right away).

    The amount of time the interviewer waited after an answer before asking the next question.

4. How much did distractions and interruptions affect the interview?

    Check one of the five boxes to indicate GENERALLY the amount of effect the distractions and interruptions had on the process of giving and getting interview information. Use the discussion of the distraction codes on manual pages 17 and 18 as a guide. If none, check "very little."

5. To what extent do you feel that the information obtained was accurate and complete?   (Product)

Check one of the five boxes to indicate the quality of the interview this respondent gave.

Base your judgment on whether:

The respondent understood the questions and what she was supposed to report.

She gave exact or approximate dates.

She reported fully or held back any personal or embarrassing health, income, etc. information.

She reported all minor illnesses or not.

She made an effort to consult records, other persons, or a calendar whenever necessary.

SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

IN COOPERATION WITH THE
UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
AND THE
UNITED STATES BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

CONFIDENTIAL - All information which would permit identification of the individual will be held strictly confidential, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any other purposes. (42 CFR 1.101-1.108)

Name of Principal respondent: Miss
Mrs._____Age:_____
Mr.

Address:_____
            Street   City   State

Identification Code: PSU No. _____

                    Segment No. _____

                    Serial No. _____

                    Interviewer's Name _____

Instructions for reaching DU, if rural:

Time of Calls:

A.M.	A.M.	A.M.	A.M.	A.M.
P.M.	P.M.	P.M.	P.M.	P.M.

Date of Interview:

Name of observer:_____

BEFORE THE INTERVIEW - AT THE DOOR

1. The time the interviewer knocks on the door is _____ o'clock

   [A.M.]
   [P.M.]

2. Check number of seconds waiting for door to open.

   ☐ 0 - 9 seconds

   ☐ 10 - 29 seconds

   ☐ 30 - 60 seconds

   ☐ Over 60 seconds

3. How far was door opened at first? [0] [1/4] [1/2] [fully] [NA]

4. How many questions did the RESPONDENT ask?

   ☐ None

   ☐ One

   ☐ 2 or more

5. Check those things INTERVIEWER mentions at the door.

Public Health Service	
Census Bureau	
The "Dear Friend" letter to respondents or the brochure	
The interview	
Other (specify)	

2.

BEFORE THE INTERVIEW - INSIDE THE HOUSE

6. What occurs?

	Who takes the initiative?	
	Respondent	Interviewer
Getting in the door		
Suggests chair		
Suggests table		
Other (specify)		

Specifications: (Describe anything else which occurs to affect the setting or physical atmosphere of the interview.)

7. Who sits first? | Respondent | | Interviewer |

8. Are the respondent and interviewer sitting close to each other?

| Yes | | No |

GENERAL RATINGS

9. How <u>polite</u> has the respondent been to the interviewer?

☐ Particularly polite
☐ Slightly polite
☐ Average
☐ Slightly impolite
☐ Particularly impolite

10. How warm and friendly has the respondent been to the interviewer?

☐ Very warm and friendly
☐ Somewhat warm and friendly
☐ Average - Impersonal
☐ Somewhat unfriendly
☐ Very unfriendly

```
Q. 3.  How old were you on your last birthday?
Q. 4.  Race
Q. 5.  Sex
Q. 6.  Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated, or
        never married?
Q. 7.  (a)  What were you doing most of the past 12 months...?
        (b)  Are you retired?
```

GENERAL RATINGS

11. Which of the following describes the respondent now? (Check one or more)

☐ Enthusiastic   ☐ Bored

☐ Attentive   ☐ Irritated

☐ Neutral   ☐ Can't rate

12. How loud is each speaking?

Interviewer | Can't hear | | Soft | | Average | | Loud | | Shout |

Respondent | Can't hear | | Soft | | Average | | Loud | | Shout |

CONVERSATION NOT RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

(Use this form only for MAJOR changes)

Talks about:		Who brings the topic up? (tally) Respondent	Interviewer	Code Reaction of other person
Other person	Flatters or praises			
	Questions about the other person			
	Gives suggestions to other			
Self	Talks about self, family, friends, etc.			
	Talks about things she would rather be doing now			
	Talks about things she is avoiding now (like ironing)			
Inter-view	Asks purpose of study or of question			
	Asks about Health Service, Census			
	Other			
Humor	Laughs, jokes, tries to relieve tension			
Other	Specify			

REACTION
CODE

A = Encourages or answers adequately

B = Allows, evades

C = Discour-ages, no answer

Interviewer calls respondent   First name   Last name   Other

Respondent calls Interviewer   First name   Last name   Other

DISTRACTION CODE

A. Inhibits, causes to withhold information

B. Distracts but does not cause an interruption

C. Causes an interruption

D. Helps respondent give answers

E. No effect

DISTRACTIONS & INTERRUPTIONS (check)

	A	B	C	D	E
Children present	A	B	C	D	E
Adults present	A	B	C	D	E
TV, radio	A	B	C	D	E
Other	A	B	C	D	E

5.

Q. 8.   Were you sick at any time LAST WEEK OR THE WEEK BEFORE?
Q. 9.   Last week or the week before did you take any medicine or treatment for
        any condition?
Q.10.   Last week or the week before did you have any accidents or injuries?
Q.11.   Did you ever have an accident or injury that still bothers you or affects
        you in any way?

                    (Including (a) and (b) for each question)

13. How does RESPONDENT respond to   14. What does INTERVIEWER do in
     questions? (tally)   attempt to get adequate answers?
                                                  (tally)

_____ ANSWERS IMMEDIATELY _____

    _____ Gives adequate
                       answer

    _____ Elaborate response

    _____ Answers inadequately

_____ DELAYS ANSWER _____

    _____ Asks for clarifica-
                       tion or repetition

    _____ Consults another
                       person or records

    _____ Consults calendar

_____ WANTS FEEDBACK _____

    _____ Questions the
                       adequacy of answer

_____ OTHER _____

    _____ Other (specify)

_____ Repeats question from schedule

_____ Asks question not from
           schedule which DOESN'T SUGGEST
           an answer (e.g., could you
           explain that, please?)

_____ Asks question not from
           schedule which MAY SUGGEST a
           specific answer, or asks
           respondent if she agrees to
           a specific answer

_____ Clarifies the meaning of the
           question from the schedule

_____ Suggests records, calendar, or
           other people be consulted

_____ Other (specify)

6.

CONVERSATION NOT RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

(Use this form only for MAJOR changes)

Talks about:		Who brings the topic up? (tally) Respondent	Interviewer	Code Reaction of other person
Other person	Flatters or praises			
	Questions about the other person			
	Gives suggestions to other			
Self	Talks about self, family, friends, etc.			
	Talks about things she would rather be doing now			
	Talks about things she is avoiding now (like ironing)			
Interview	Asks purpose of study or of question			
	Asks about Health Service, Census			
	Other			
Humor	Laughs, jokes, tries to relieve tension			
Other	Specify			

REACTION
_____
CODE

A = Encourages or answers adequately

B = Allows, evades

C = Discourages, no answer

Interviewer calls respondent | First name | | Last name | | Other |

Respondent calls Interviewer | First name | | Last name | | Other |

DISTRACTION CODE

A. Inhibits, causes to withhold information

B. Distracts but does not cause an interruption

C. Causes an interruption

D. Helps respondent give answers

E. No effect

DISTRACTIONS & INTERRUPTIONS (check)

Children present   [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

Adults present   [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

TV, radio   [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

Other   [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

```
12.  Has anyone in the family--you, your--,
     etc., had any of these conditions
     DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS?

     Asthma, tuberculosis, chronic
     bronchitis, repeated attacks of
     sinus trouble... epilepsy, chronic
     nervous trouble, cancer, chronic
     skin trouble, hernia or rupture,
     prostate trouble.
```

(Tally)

15. _____ How many conditions does respondent pause
                              to consider?

16. _____ Number of conditions respondent asks for
                              clarification; definition?

17. _____ How many conditions does respondent
                              elaborate on?

18. _____ How many conditions did the INTERVIEWER
                              have to ask additional questions, probe,
                              or suggest an answer for?

```
13.  Does anyone in the family have any
     of these conditions?

     (Deafness through any condition
      present since birth.)
```

19. Does the interviewer look up at the respondent after reading each
    condition?

    ☐ Almost   ☐ Often   ☐ Sometimes   ☐ Seldom   ☐ Almost
      always   never

20. Does the respondent have enough time to think about each condition
    before the interviewer asks the next?

    ☐ All items ☐ Most items ☐ Some   ☐ A few   ☐ None of
                                  items   items   the items

8.

CONVERSATION NOT RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

(Use this form only for MAJOR changes)

Talks about:		Who brings the topic up? (tally) Respondent	Interviewer	Code Reaction of other person
Other person	Flatters or praises			
	Questions about the other person			
	Gives suggestions to other			
Self	Talks about self, family, friends, etc.			
	Talks about things she would rather be doing now			
	Talks about things she is avoiding now (like ironing)			
Interview	Asks purpose of study or of question			
	Asks about Health Service, Census			
	Other			
Humor	Laughs, jokes, tries to relieve tension			
Other	Specify			

REACTION
CODE

A = Encourages or answers adequately

B = Allows, evades

C = Discourages, no answer

Interviewer calls respondent   First name   Last name   Other

Respondent calls Interviewer   First name   Last name   Other

DISTRACTION CODE

A. Inhibits, causes to withhold information

B. Distracts but does not cause an interruption

C. Causes an interruption .

D. Helps respondent give answers

E. No effect

DISTRACTIONS & INTERRUPTIONS (check)

	A	B	C	D	E
Children present	A	B	C	D	E
Adults present	A	B	C	D	E
TV, radio	A	B	C	D	E
Other	A	B	C	D	E

9.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                         TABLE ONE                             │
│                                                               │
│  Did you ever at any time talk to a doctor about... (condition)? │
│  What did the doctor say it was?  Did he give it a medical name, │
│  etc.?                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

(Tally entire table, for conditions 1, 3, 5, 7, etc.)

21. How does RESPONDENT respond to
     questions? (tally)

_____ ANSWERS IMMEDIATELY _____

```
┌───────────────────────────────────────┐
│ _____ Gives adequate       │
│                   answer               │
│ _____                      │
│                                        │
│                                        │
│ _____ Elaborates response  │
│                                        │
│ _____                      │
│                                        │
│ _____ Answers inadequately │
│                                        │
│ _____                      │
└───────────────────────────────────────┘
```

_____ DELAYS ANSWER _____

```
┌───────────────────────────────────────┐
│ _____ Asks for clarifica-  │
│                   tion, repetition     │
│                                        │
│ _____ Consults records,    │
│                   calendar             │
└───────────────────────────────────────┘
```

_____ WANTS FEEDBACK _____

```
┌───────────────────────────────────────┐
│ _____ Questions the        │
│                   adequacy of answer   │
└───────────────────────────────────────┘
```

_____ OTHER _____

```
┌───────────────────────────────────────┐
│ _____ Other (specify)      │
│                                        │
└───────────────────────────────────────┘
```

```
┌───────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│ _____ Repeats question from schedule         │
│                                                │
│ _____ Asks question not from                 │
│         schedule which DOESN'T SUGGEST         │
│         an answer (e.g., could you             │
│         explain that, please?)                 │
│                                                │
│ _____ Asks question not from                 │
│         schedule which MAY SUGGEST a           │
│         specific answer or asks                │
│         respondent if she agrees to            │
│         a specific answer                      │
│                                                │
│ _____ Clarifies the meaning of the           │
│         question from the schedule             │
│                                                │
│ _____ Suggests records, calendar, or         │
│         other people be consulted              │
│                                                │
│ _____ Other (specify)                        │
│                                                │
└───────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

CONVERSATION NOT RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

(Use this form only for MAJOR changes)

Talks about:		Who brings the topic up? (tally)		Code Reaction of
		Respondent	Interviewer	other person
Other person	Flatters or praises			
	Questions about the other person			
	Gives suggestions to other			
Self	Talks about self, family, friends, etc.			
	Talks about things she would rather be doing now			
	Talks about things she is avoiding now (like ironing)			
Interview	Asks purpose of study or of question			
	Asks about Health Service, Census			
	Other			
Humor	Laughs, jokes, tries to relieve tension			
Other	Specify			

REACTION

CODE

A = Encourages or answers adequately

B = Allows, evades

C = Discourages, no answer

Interviewer calls respondent | First name | | Last name | | Other |

Respondent calls Interviewer | First name | | Last name | | Other |

DISTRACTION CODE

A. Inhibits, causes to withhold information

B. Distracts but does not cause an interruption

C. Causes an interruption

D. Helps respondent give answers

E. No effect

DISTRACTIONS & INTERRUPTIONS (check)

Children present [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

Adults present [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

TV, radio [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

Other [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

11.

Q. 18.   LAST WEEK OR THE WEEK BEFORE did anyone in the family go to a dentist?

Q. 19.   If "no," ask: About how long has it been since you went to a dentist?

GENERAL RATINGS
  (While interviewer is asking questions 18 and 19 rate the respondent
  on his general behavior up to now.)

23.   How well does this respondent grasp the meaning of the questions?

- [ ] Perfectly
- [ ] Very well
- [ ] Fairly well
- [ ] Not too well
- [ ] Not well at all

24.   How much talking is this respondent doing?

- [ ] A great deal--lots of elaboration; unusually talkative
- [ ] Quite a bit
- [ ] A moderate amount
- [ ] Not too much
- [ ] Very little--gives minimum answers; unusually reticent

25.   How smoothly are interviewer and respondent working together?

- [ ] Extremely smoothly--no strain
- [ ] Very smoothly
- [ ] Fairly smoothly
- [ ] Not too smoothly
- [ ] Not smoothly at all--working at cross-purposes

CONVERSATION NOT RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

(Use this form only for MAJOR changes)

Talks about:		Who brings the topic up? (tally) Respondent	Interviewer	Code Reaction of other person
Other person	Flatters or praises			
	Questions about the other person			
	Gives suggestions to other			
Self	Talks about self, family, friends, etc.			
	Talks about things she would rather be doing now			
	Talks about things she is avoiding now (like ironing)			
Interview	Asks purpose of study or of question			
	Asks about Health Service, Census			
	Other			
Humor	Laughs, jokes, tries to relieve tension			
Other	Specify			

REACTION

CODE

A = Encourages or answers adequately

B = Allows, evades

C = Discourages, no answer

Interviewer calls respondent [First name] [Last name] [Other]

Respondent calls Interviewer [First name] [Last name] [Other]

DISTRACTION CODE

A. Inhibits, causes to withhold information

B. Distracts but does not cause an interruption

C. Causes an interruption

D. Helps respondent give answers

E. No effect

DISTRACTIONS & INTERRUPTIONS (check)

Children present [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

Adults present [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

TV, radio [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

Other [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

13.

Q. 20.   LAST WEEK OR THE WEEK BEFORE did anyone in the family go to a doctor or to a doctor's office or clinic? (Include (a) - (f))

Q. 21.   About how long has it been since you have seen or talked to a doctor?

26. How does RESPONDENT respond to questions? (tally)

27. What does INTERVIEWER do in attempt to get adequate answers. (tally)

_____ ANSWERS IMMEDIATELY _____

_____ Gives adequate answer

_____ Elaborates response

_____ Answers inadequately

_____ DELAYS ANSWER _____

_____ Asks for clarification, repetition

_____ Consults another person

_____ Consults records, calendar

_____ WANTS FEEDBACK _____

_____ Questions the adequacy of answer

_____ OTHER _____

_____ Other (specify)

_____ Repeats question from schedule

_____ Asks question not from schedule which DOESN'T SUGGEST an answer (e.g., could you explain that, please?)

_____ Asks question not from schedule which MAY SUGGEST a specific answer or asks respondent if she agrees to a specific answer

_____ Clarifies the meaning of the question from the schedule

_____ Suggests records, calendar, or other people be consulted

_____ Other (specify)

14.

<u>CONVERSATION NOT RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS</u>

(Use this form only for MAJOR changes)

Talks about:		Who brings the topic up? (tally)		Code Reaction of other person
		Respondent	Interviewer	
Other person	Flatters or praises			
	Questions about the other person			
	Gives suggestions to other			
Self	Talks about self, family, friends, etc.			
	Talks about things she would rather be doing now			
	Talks about things she is avoiding now (like ironing)			
Interview	Asks purpose of study or of question			
	Asks about Health Service, Census			
	Other			
Humor	Laughs, jokes, tries to relieve tension			
Other	Specify			

REACTION

<u>CODE</u>

A = Encourages or answers adequately

B = Allows, evades

C = Discourages, no answer

Interviewer calls respondent   First name   Last name   Other

Respondent calls Interviewer   First name   Last name   Other

<u>DISTRACTION CODE</u>

A. Inhibits, causes to withhold information

B. Distracts but does not cause an interruption

C. Causes an interruption

D. Helps respondent give answers

E. No effect

<u>DISTRACTIONS & INTERRUPTIONS</u> (check)

Children present	A	B	C	D	E
Adults present	A	B	C	D	E
TV, radio	A	B	C	D	E
Other	A	B	C	D	E

15.

```
+------------------------------------------------------------------+
|                        SPECIALISTS CARD                          |
|                                                                  |
|  Q. 23.   DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS has ANYONE in the family--that is, you, |
|           your_____, etc.--received any services from any of the persons |
|           listed on this card?  Please check "Yes" or "No" for each one listed. |
+------------------------------------------------------------------+
```

28. Did respondent ask for definitions, clarification, or meaning of any of the items on the card?

     ☐ Yes   ☐ No

  1a. (If yes) What did the interviewer do?

     ☐ Gave thorough information (according to instruction manual)

     ☐ Gave partial information

     ☐ Other (specify)

29. Did respondent ask any other question?

     ☐ Yes   ☐ No

30. How did respondent respond to the card?

     ☐ Considered the items carefully

     ☐ Rushed through it

     ☐ Other (specify)

31. Did the interviewer have to read any of the list to respondent?

     ☐ All of it   ☐ Some of it   ☐ None of it

```
+------------------------------------------------+
| Check nothing for the probes which may follow  |
+------------------------------------------------+
```

CONVERSATION NOT RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

(Use this form only for MAJOR changes)

Talks about:		Who brings the topic up? (tally) Respondent	Who brings the topic up? (tally) Interviewer	Code Reaction of other person
Other person	Flatters or praises			
Other person	Questions about the other person			
Other person	Gives suggestions to other			
Self	Talks about self, family, friends, etc.			
Self	Talks about things she would rather be doing now			
Self	Talks about things she is avoiding now (like ironing)			
Inter-view	Asks purpose of study or of question			
Inter-view	Asks about Health Service, Census			
Inter-view	Other			
Humor	Laughs, jokes, tries to relieve tension			
Other	Specify			

REACTION CODE

A = Encourages or answers adequately

B = Allows, evades

C = Discourages, no answer

Interviewer calls respondent   [First name]   [Last name]   [Other]

Respondent calls Interviewer   [First name]   [Last name]   [Other]

DISTRACTION CODE

A. Inhibits, causes to withhold information

B. Distracts but does not cause an interruption

C. Causes an interruption

D. Helps respondent give answers

E. No effect

DISTRACTIONS & INTERRUPTIONS (check)

Children present   [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

Adults present   [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

TV, radio   [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

Other   [A] [B] [C] [D] [E]

17.

Q. 25.   (a) What is the highest grade you attended in school?

Q. 26. Did you work at any time last week or the week before?
        If "no", ask: Even though you did not work last week or the week
        before, do you have a job or business? Were you looking for work
        or on layoff?

GENERAL RATINGS

32. Which of the following describes the respondent now? (Check one or more)

☐ Enthusiastic   ☐ Bored

☐ Attentive   ☐ Irritated

☐ Neutral   ☐ Can't rate

33. How loud is each speaking?

Interviewer | Can't hear | Soft | Average | Loud | Shout |

Respondent | Can't hear | Soft | Average | Loud | Shout |

Q. 27. Which of these income groups represents your total combined family
        income...?

34. Did respondent ask the reason for the question?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

35. Did the interviewer help the respondent arrive at an answer?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

18.

CONVERSATION NOT RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

(Use this form only for MAJOR changes)

Talks about:		Who brings the topic up? (tally) Respondent	Who brings the topic up? (tally) Interviewer	Code Reaction of other person
Other person	Flatters or praises			
Other person	Questions about the other person			
Other person	Gives suggestions to other			
Self	Talks about self, family, friends, etc.			
Self	Talks about things she would rather be doing now			
Self	Talks about things she is avoiding now (like ironing)			
Interview	Asks purpose of study or of question			
Interview	Asks about Health Service, Census			
Interview	Other			
Humor	Laughs, jokes, tries to relieve tension			
Other	Specify			

REACTION
CODE

A = Encourages or answers adequately

B = Allows, evades

C = Discourages, no answer

Interviewer calls respondent	First name	Last name	Other
Respondent calls Interviewer	First name	Last name	Other

DISTRACTION CODE

A. Inhibits, causes to withhold information

B. Distracts but does not cause an interruption

C. Causes an interruption

D. Helps respondent give answers

E. No effect

DISTRACTIONS & INTERRUPTIONS (check)

Children present	A B C D E
Adults present	A B C D E
TV, radio	A B C D E
Other	A B C D E

CLOSE OF INTERVIEW

36. Time last question ("What is the telephone number here?") answered:

_____ o'clock.

37. Was there some conversation after the last question was answered?
(Excluding standard thank you letter statement)

Yes   No

If yes:

38. Who wanted to continue the conversation?

R   I   Both   D.K.

Time leave house:_____ o'clock

20.

YOUR OVERALL RATINGS OF THE RESPONDENT

1. How cooperative was this respondent?

☐ Much less than average
☐ Somewhat less than average
☐ About average
☐ Somewhat more than average
☐ Much more than average

2. How well did this respondent grasp the meaning of the questions?

☐ Perfectly ☐ Very well ☐ Fairly well ☐ Not too well ☐ Not well at all

3. How much talking did this respondent do during the interview?

☐ A great deal--lots of elaboration; unusually talkative
☐ Quite a bit
☐ A moderate amount
☐ Not too much
☐ Very little--gives minimum answers; unusually reticent

4. How willing was the respondent to give all the time necessary for this interview?

☐ Very willing ☐ Somewhat willing ☐ Not too willing ☐ Very unwilling

5. How much did the respondent want to chat with the interviewer about matters unrelated to the schedule?

☐ Very much ☐ Somewhat ☐ Almost not at all

6. How much did the interviewer have to clarify and interpret for this respondent?

☐ Much more than average
☐ Somewhat more than average
☐ Average
☐ Somewhat less than average
☐ Much less than average

YOUR OVERALL IMPRESSIONS OF THE INTERVIEW

1. How smoothly did interviewer and respondent work together?

☐ Extremely smoothly--no strain
☐ Very smoothly
☐ Fairly smoothly
☐ Not too smoothly
☐ Not smoothly at all--working at cross-purposes

2. How hard did each try to communicate? (Check one box for each)

Interviewer ☐ Very much effort ☐ Much effort ☐ Some effort ☐ Slight effort ☐ Almost none at all

Respondent ☐ Very much effort ☐ Much effort ☐ Some effort ☐ Slight effort ☐ Almost none at all

3. In general, what was the pace of this interview?

☐ Much faster than average
☐ Somewhat faster than average
☐ About average
☐ Somewhat slower than average
☐ Much slower than average

4. How much did the distractions and interruptions affect the interview?

☐ Very much ☐ Much ☐ Somewhat ☐ Little ☐ Very little

5. To what extent do you feel that the information obtained was accurate and complete?

☐ Completely ☐ Mostly ☐ Some ☐ Very little ☐ Almost none

$$\frac{20 \frac{4}{4}}{8.1}{}^{6}$$