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Why are expenditures underreported?

• Main concern of “Interview Structure” issue paper is that expenditures are underreported
  – Stated more explicitly in Gemini Project Vision document, p.2

• It is proposed that
  – underreporting may be due to question order that cuts across Rs’ memory for expenditures and so does not promote retrieval
  – a question order that better fits Rs’ memory structures will promote more complete reporting
An Alternative Explanation

• Underreporting is not about the order of questions but the content of questions, in particular, the categories

• *Rs* may not think about their expenditure events, at the time they occur, as instances of the CE categories

• If they do not, then asking about CE categories in the interview won’t bring relevant events to mind – irrespective of the order in which *Rs* is asked
Underreporting Instances of *Unnatural* Categories

• Conrad, Brown & Dashen (2004) tested this idea in lab experiment
  – **Study phase**: participants read 109 ordinary nouns, one at a time
  – **Test phase**: asked how many words just studied
    • belong to particular taxonomic category
    • contain a particular property

• Study phase analogous to purchase events
• Test phase analogous to CE interview
  – Taxonomic categories – natural categories – correspond to the “dental products” in the example
  – Properties – unnatural categories – correspond to “electrical personal care products”
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Implicit Property group

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{STUDY} \\
\text{corn} \\
\text{ammonia} \\
\text{chocolate} \\
\text{salt} \\
\text{garbage} \\
\text{ivory} \\
\text{peach} \\
\text{daffodil} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{TEST} \\
\text{SMELLY} \\
\text{YELLOW} \\
\text{FUZZY} \\
\text{ROUND} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Explicit Property group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMELLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ammonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chocolate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMELLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garbage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ivory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daffodil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMELLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUZZY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Signed Error

Taxonomic: -2.95
Implicit Property: -4.73
Explicit Property: -2.12
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Proportion “hits” to all enumerated items

Signed Error

Proportion “hits” to all enumerated items
Implications of Study for CE Interview

• On the downside:
  – Asking Rs about expenditures from CE categories will not make contact with Rs’ memory for many relevant expenditures, leading to underreporting
  – If there is misalignment during purchase episode (encoding), there may be little that can done during the interview (recall) to help

• On the positive side
  – When Rs do encode expenditures as instances of CE categories, their recall will be good
  – Might be possible to train Rs across waves to think about expenditures as CE does
Making CE Categories Natural

• May be possible to intervene in first interview so that Rs learn to think of their purchases, when they occur, as instances of CE categories

• But probably too many categories to do this exhaustively

• Could focus on those categories most at odds with Rs’ natural classification of expenditures
  – Would need to determine this with experiment like the one just described
  – May still be too many to train Rs on all and training might not be effective
Context Reinstatement

• An alternative to training Rs to think like CE analysts is help them recall all relevant purchases, irrespective of CE category, by helping the recall the purchase context

  – Since the last interview did you purchase anything online? On the phone? By mail? In drive-through outlets? In enclosed malls? In convenience stores? ...

  – If “yes,” what did you purchase?

  – Any reported purchases are coded into CE categories by interviewer or coder after the fact
Context Reinstatement (2)

• $R$ might indicate she made many online purchases and then list “books,” “computer hardware,” “cell phone service,” “plane tickets” and “cosmetic surgery”
  
  – Note it is the $purchase$ context not the $consumption$ context that matters
  
  – $R$ paid for air travel online but consumed the service in the air
Context Reinstatement (3)

- Used to improve eye witness reports as one of several memory improvement techniques known as *cognitive interviewing* (CI) (e.g., Bekerian & Dennett, 1993)
  - Not the same as pretesting method
  - Other memory improvement techniques in CI include varied physical perspective and varied recall order
  - Context reinstatement probably locus improved recall in CI (Milne & Bull, 2002)

- Based on *encoding specificity* (Tulving & Thompson, 1973)
Context Reinstatement (4)

• In CI, participant generates context, e.g., of a crime, but idea for CE is to provide contexts to $R$
  – Should make it easier: more recognition than recall

• May be that contexts need to be presented at finer level of detail
  – e.g., “online purchases” may need to be decomposed into “online purchases that involved shipping a physical product,” “online purchases of a downloadable product,” and “online purchases of an offline service,” etc.
Similarity to Event History Calendars

• Proposed approach has some of the character of Event History Calendars (EHC) (e.g., Belli, Shaye & Stafford, 2001)
  – Recalled context stimulates subsequent recall
  – In EHC, recall from one life theme (e.g., employment) serves as cue for retrieval of events from another theme (e.g., residential moves)
    • Parallel retrieval (Belli, 1998)
  – In current proposal, interviewer provides context

• To the extent that purchases are narratives, extended over time, the context reinstatement and EHC approaches are similar
  – But this may not often be the case
Similarity to EHC (2)

• Question order:
  – EHCs inherently unstructured
  – context reinstatement approach noncommittal:
   • contexts must be presented in some order but no theoretical guidance (yet) on whether any order produces better recall than others
   • Certainly if recalling online book purchases brings to mind book purchases in brick and mortar outlet, sensible to record those purchases at that time
Flexible Data Entry

• Issue paper describes context effects as rationale for maintaining fixed question order

• Seems low risk for in this domain
  • Hard to see how asking about home furnishings before clothing for one R and reverse for another introduces substantial measurement error (underreporting)
  • especially if the different orders are the result of different self-generated reminders

• Makes sense to accommodate Rs’ preference to report on one category (or context) by allowing interviewer to enter expenditures in whatever order R happens to report them
Flexible Data Entry (2)

• User interfaces to promote flexible entry
  – May require moving outside Blaise comfort zone
  – Representing questionnaire as clickable network would allow direct access to any question
  – Multimodal user interfaces could allow interviewer to
    • enter notes with stylus into onscreen notepad linked to categories
    • speak notes while entering data with keypad

• Johnston (2007) argues multimodal interfaces more natural than single mode for survey interviews because support everyday practice of combining speech, pointing, and gesture as needed
Conversational Interviewing
(e.g., Schober & Conrad, 1997; Conrad & Schober, 2000)

• Issue paper points to *conversational interviewing* as example of “order-free” interviewing

• I believe this somewhat mischaracterizes the approach that Schober and I have explored which is concerned with improving *R*’s understanding of individual questions, not with variable question order

• The extra time required by the approach
  – due to the time taken to clarify question meaning and help *R* establish the correspondence between question concepts and their circumstances
  – not variable question order
Research Program and Some Questions

1. **Unnatural Categories:**
   - For which CE products are expenditures most underestimated under the current approach?
   - In what contexts are they most likely to be purchased?

2. **Context Reinstatement**
   - Does the proposed approach help Rs recover purchase events that do not come to mind when probed with CE categories?

3. **Flexible Data Entry**
   - What are the temporal costs of following respondents’ unstructured recall?
   - Can interviewers do this effectively in real time?
   - What user interface approaches, e.g., what combinations of input devices and modes, best support flexible data entry in semi-structured verbal tasks?
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