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How to detect undesirable interviewer behavior (UIB) during CAPI field interviews
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By Birgit Jesske, infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences

In this study, the authors present a method to detect undesirable interviewer behavior (UIB) during computer-assisted personal interviews (CAPI) in labor market and poverty research in Germany. The study is based on the PASS, a long-term panel study that has been conducted since 2002. The panel includes the deprivation module and the annual survey waves that have been taking place since 2003. The authors have developed a monitoring process for the data quality assurance. The study design of PASS includes various measures to monitor and reduce the number of error and effects at different levels. For CAPI and PASS, a protocol-based interviewing instrument (structured questionnaire and interview guide) is used. All interviews were jointly prepared by means of one-day training sessions. Prior to Wave 12 interviews, audio recordings were actively recorded for training purposes. The selected cases based on the raw interviews for the present report. The implementation of the strategies can be reported by using the data of Wave 12 for PASS as an example. The surveys for Wave 12 took place between February and September 2018.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

- Undesirable interviewer behavior (UIB) could be one reason for data errors and measurement effects. In the context of standardized interviewing techniques, survey organizations have identified that errors and effects are minimized by monitoring and evaluating their data collection processes in the entire survey period. Particularly, UIB caused by interviewers must be identified as early as possible.

**ABSTRACT**

The Labor Market and Social Security Panel (PASS) is a central data set for labor market and poverty research in Germany. The panel was established in 2002 and is the basis for the employment, housing and social policy research. This study describes a new method to monitor undesirable interviewer behavior (UIB) during the telephone interviews (as well as face-to-face in surveys). The study design of PASS includes various measures to monitor and reduce the number of error and effects at different levels. For CAPI and PASS, a protocol-based interviewing instrument (structured questionnaire and interview guide) is used. All interviews were jointly prepared by means of one-day training sessions. Prior to Wave 12 interviews, audio recordings were actively recorded for training purposes. The selected cases based on the raw interviews for the present report. The implementation of the strategies can be reported by using the data of Wave 12 for PASS as an example. The surveys for Wave 12 took place between February and September 2018.

**TRAINING**

Each interviewer should receive a minimum of three interviews at the beginning and at least two per year. The recording of the interviews is necessary to ensure the quality of the data. The recording of the interviews in Germany requires the consent of the respondent and the recording of the audio by the interviewer during the interview. The audio recordings posed a new challenge for the data collection processes during the entire survey period. Particularly, errors and effects are minimized by monitoring and validating their data collection processes promptly at the beginning of the survey team at infas. With the aim of ensuring standardization in the survey, the researchers had to ensure a high level of standardization in the data. The recording of the interviews with deviations on the coding scheme was created for each interviewer during the training.

**STATISTICAL PROCEDURES – ASSUMED UIB**

Undesirable interviewer behavior can also be supervised by statistical methods. Principal behavior in this sense assumes that the interviewer’s behavior influences the respondents’ answers and thus the data. Table 1 presents the data. The interviewer’s behavior influence the respondents’ answers and thus the data. However, the effort with regard to time and costs is much less than for behavior coding because it does neither depend on case selection as well as on respondents’ specific characteristics. The specific example shows that the results are complementary to the validation of interviewer behavior.

The 14423 fully rated interviews refer to 298 interviewers. With the aim of monitoring interviewer behavior promptly at the beginning of the field period and providing quick feedback, the selection of an interviewee included an average of 2.5 recordings per interview. In total, 298 fully rated interviews were selected for the analysis. Every interviewer received an average of one to two fully rated interviews. The selection of interviews for statistical validation was made for each interviewer according to the randomization scheme. The feedback was used to assess interviews. Table 2 shows the results of the statistical validation.

**RESULT**

The behavior coding clearly showed that interviews demonstrated more frequently while dealing with the respondent’s answers while making out the question and answer categories. The concrete examples from the coding also had a bearing in the question categories that are off the mark by some of the respondents. In addition, the behavior coding indicated that some respondents were more effective with a shorter rating scheme and reducing costs would result into selecting feedback. Feedback training and field testing were not included in the coding scheme and reducing costs would result into selecting feedback. Feedback training and field testing were not included in the coding scheme and reducing costs would result in selecting feedback. Feedback training and field testing were not included in the coding scheme and reducing costs would result in selecting feedback. Feedback training and field testing were not included in the coding scheme and reducing costs would result in selecting feedback. Feedback training and field testing were not included in the coding scheme.