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EXPLAINING INTERVIEWER EFFECTS ON SURVEY UNIT NONRESPONSE: A CROSS-SURVEY ANALYSIS

Daniela Ackermann-Piek, Annelies Blom, Julie Korbmaecher, Ulrich Krieger

MOTIVATION/AIM

Previous research on interviewer effects on survey unit nonresponse show a great variability across surveys in findings, survey characteristics, and explanatory variables available for analyses. This calls for a more orchestrated effort in explaining interviewer effects on survey unit nonresponse.

RESEARCH QUESTION

Are there similarities in the factors explaining interviewer effects on unit nonresponse across surveys?

DATA & METHOD

- We use 4 face-to-face surveys, all conducted in approximately the same time period in Germany by TNS Infratest Sozialforschung.
- Across the four surveys, we estimate the same models, in which we examine the same interviewer characteristics and control for the same sample composition characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study information</th>
<th>Fieldwork period</th>
<th>Sampling frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIAAC</td>
<td>Germany implementation 2011, August 2011 - March 2012, local community registers of individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIP 2012</td>
<td>Face-to-face recruitment 2012, May 2012 - August 2012, database of areas, listing of households in areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARE</td>
<td>German refresher sample 2013, February - September 2013, local community registers of individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIP 2014</td>
<td>Face-to-face recruitment 2014, April 2014 - August 2014, database of areas, listing of households in areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIAAC</th>
<th>GIP 2012</th>
<th>SHARE</th>
<th>GIP 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact rate (%)</td>
<td>82,2</td>
<td>85,9</td>
<td>97,7</td>
<td>80,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Contact</td>
<td>20,6</td>
<td>18,5</td>
<td>60,6</td>
<td>17,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation rate (%)</td>
<td>59,6</td>
<td>50,7</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>54,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Cooperation (%)</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>12,8</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>17,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The interviewers employed in the four surveys are rather similar with regard to:
  - Most of their socio-demographic characteristics
  - Work experience
  - Working hours
  - Behavior and reporting about deviations from standardized interviewing techniques
  - How they achieve response
  - Reasons for working as an interviewer

- We identified a high variability of interviewer characteristics that explain interviewer effects on survey unit nonresponse across the surveys.

CONCLUSION

- We can not find common interviewer characteristics explaining interviewer variance on unit nonresponse across surveys.
- Differences between the four surveys – such as topic, definition of the sample, target population, sponsor, research team, or survey specific interviewer training – could explain the high variability of explanatory factors of interviewer effects on survey unit nonresponse.