Is There a Trade-Off Between Quality and Cost?

An Experiment Comparing Telephone vs. Face-to-Face Responses to the National Beneficiary Survey

May 13, 2011

Presented at the 66th Annual American Association for Public Opinion Research Conference (Phoenix, Arizona)

Matt Sloan • Debra Wright • Kirsten Barrett





- Multimode designs are used to boost response rates while controlling costs
- Measurement error may occur if the mode affects the interview process
- This problem may be exacerbated with certain populations



- Telephone and face-to-face interviews are similar in that both involve an interviewer
- The two modes are different in that face-toface interviews:
 - Allow the interviewer to more readily develop a rapport
 - Make it easier to match pace, communication style





- Certain response errors may be more likely to occur in telephone interviews than in face-toface interviews (Jordan et al. 1980; Jackle et al. 2010)
- Krosnick (1991) suggests that the greater the cognitive demand placed on respondents, the more likely they are to satisfice
- There is evidence that satisficing may be more pronounced among respondents with limited cognitive ability (Chang and Krosnick 2010)





Are there differences in the quality of data collected by telephone versus face-to-face in a study of persons with disabilities?

- Sponsored by the Social Security Administration (SSA)
- Collects information from SSA beneficiaries on their health and well-being, service use, and employment
- 45-minute, dual-mode survey (CATI/CAPI)
- In 2010, 8,038 cases were fielded, and 5,080 were completed

Experiment Design

- Randomized control design:
 - 645 cases were randomly selected from the sample frame for CAPI-only treatment
 - The comparison group consisted of regular sample members who were interviewed by telephone
 - Regular cases sent to CAPI were considered nonrespondents for this experiment
 - Yielded 1,574 completed cases: 1,229 completed by CATI, and 345 completed by CAPI
 - 73% = CATI response rate
 - 54% = CAPI response rate





- Item nonresponse
- Social desirability
- Nondifferentiation
- Acquiescence



Individual Items	CATI Non- Response	CAPI Non- Response
Expects to work for pay next year	2.44%	1.45%
Expects to work for pay in the next five years	3.58%	4.64%
Race	5.37%	3.77%
Father's education	35.39%	32.17%
Mother's education	22.13%	19.42%
Respondent's weight	2.85%	2.32%
Household income*	30.68%	43.48%

Series of Items	CATI Non- Response	CAPI Non- Response
Awareness of SSA programs	4.56%	2.32%
Health insurance*	6.83%	1.45%

Questions	CATI Response	CAPI Response
Goals include moving up (yes)*	51.43%	43.32%
Expects to work for pay next year (agree)	30.61%	25.59%
Expects to work for pay in the next five years (agree)*	48.35%	37.99%
Felt need to cut down on drinking (no)	84.60%	79.35%
Used drugs in past 12 months (no)	94.20%	95.94%

 $\overline{=}$

Social Desirability (cont'd.)

Question	CATI Response	CAPI Response
Household income	\$24,082	\$20,468

=

Nondifferentiation in Response	CATI	CAPI
Yes	21.48%	20.58%
No	78.52%	81.09%





Question	CATI Response (Yes)	CAPI Response (Yes)
Heard of Blind Work Expense	7.62%	5.56%
Heard of expedited re-instatement *	12.53%	8.50%
Heard of benefits specialist	20.12%	15.84%
Heard of Ticket to Work *	34.21%	26.61%



- Data collection mode appears to have a modest effect on data quality for this population
- Compared to CATI respondents, CAPI respondents tended to exhibit:
 - About the same level of item nonresponse and nondifferentiation
 - Fewer socially desirable responses
 - Less acquiescence





- Vague or demanding items in the telephone interviews showed the greatest drop in quality
- Results may reflect differences caused by the mode itself or characteristics of responders in each mode.



For More Information

Please contact

- Matt Sloan
 - msloan@mathematica-mpr.com
- Debra Wright
 - dwright@mathematica-mpr.com
- Kirsten Barrett
 - kbarrett@mathematica-mpr.com

Also visit www.DisabilityPolicyResearch.org

