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Willingness Ratings

- Interviewers know cases best
- Can assess cases’ willingness to complete survey
- How likely is this case to ever complete?
Practical Reasons for Willingness Ratings

- Direct efforts to most promising cases
  - Reduce data collection costs
  - Increase response rates

- Add power to response propensity models

- NSFG, NatSal
Additional Reasons for Willingness Ratings

- In face-to-face surveys, interviewers decide
  - which cases to work
  - when and how to try them again

- These judgments can introduce NR bias
  - Interviewers act on their willingness assessments
  - And assessments related to survey variables
Research Questions

- Do they correlate with response propensity?

- What influences willingness ratings
  - Respondent characteristics
  - Interviewer characteristics
  - Call characteristics

- Are there interviewer effects?
  - If we use these to direct effort or adjust weights, we’d like there to be no interviewer variability
Call History Dataset

- Telephone survey of adults in Germany (n=2400)
  - LINK Institute
  - RR: 16-22% across 3 strata

- Interviewers assessed willingness after contact
  - 0 – 100 scale

- Do not see score assigned by other interviewers
Call History Dataset

- **10,004 calls** with willingness ratings (72,650 total)
  - No ratings on calls where case complete
  - Limited refusal conversion in this study
  - 88% of calls led to appointments
  - 50

- 4,666 cases with ratings

- 39 interviewers
  - 35 with completed interviewer questionnaires
Willingness by Case
Willingness by Interviewer
Performance by Willingness Deciles

- Average willingness over all calls correlates with completion probability
Random Effects Models of Willingness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indep. Variable</th>
<th>Est. Coefficient in Percentage Points</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call number</td>
<td>-0.2 *</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target person reached</td>
<td>9.2 *</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>6.4 *</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum: Unemployed</td>
<td>reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum: Welfare</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum: Employed</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rho(interviewer)</td>
<td>0.38 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rho(case)</td>
<td>0.07 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Answers to Research Qs

- Willingness does correlate with completion rate

- Influences on willingness ratings:
  - Respondent characteristics – no association so far
  - Interviewer characteristics – no association so far
  - Call characteristics – strong association

- Yes, there are interviewer effects
Future Research

- Do ratings affect how interviewers approach a case?
  - Show interviewers average of prior ratings of case
  - Manipulate prior rating – effect on performance?

- Do ratings correlate with any survey variables?

- Do ratings improve propensity models?
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