

Catalogue No. 96-04

**SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWERS' DEBRIEFING
QUESTIONNAIRES:
1996 JANUARY LABOUR INTERVIEW**

Product Registration Number 75F0002M

July 1996

Michèle Price, Household Surveys Division

The SLID Research Paper Series is intended to document detailed studies and important decisions for the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics. These research papers are available in English and French. To obtain a summary description of available documents or to obtain a copy of any, please contact Philip Giles, Manager, SLID Research Paper Series, by mail at 11-D8 Jean Talon Building, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA K1A 0T6, by INTERNET (GILES@STATCAN.CA), by telephone (613) 951-2891, or by fax (613) 951-3253.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In January 1996, the third labour interview was conducted for the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID).

This report is based on comments from a sample of interviewers from each regional office who were selected to complete a debriefing questionnaire on the SLID 1996 Labour Interview. The debriefing questionnaire was used to assess respondents' responses, and also to assess the interviewers' reaction to changes or features of the computer-assisted interviewing (CAI) application.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES	2
3. SUMMARY OF SLID INTERVIEWER DEBRIEFING QUESTIONNAIRES	17

1. Introduction

In January 1996, the third labour interview was conducted for the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID).

This report is based on comments from a sample of interviewers from each regional office who were selected to complete a debriefing questionnaire on the SLID 1996 Labour Interview. The debriefing questionnaire was used to assess respondents' responses, and also to assess the interviewers' reaction to changes or features of the computer-assisted interviewing (CAI) application.

The 'yes' or 'no' responses to the questions asked in the debriefing questionnaire have been summarized in table format at the Canada level, and also for the individual Regional Offices (included in section 3). A summary of interviewers' responses is also provided following every question. It should be mentioned however that space for comments was only provided for the 'yes' answers in the debriefing questionnaire, therefore the comments described below are a reflection of only the 'yes' answers, unless otherwise stated. Responses and comments are generally consistent across all regional offices.

2. Questions and Responses

For this collection, SLID was conducted under a different version of Case Management and there were some changes to the content.

Question 1. Did you notice any improvements?

	#	%
Yes	22	29%
No	32	42%
N/A	22	29%

- For some, adding new household members was very slow and tedious.

Comments regarding Improvements:

- Many interviewers found it much quicker to enter and exit cases; that is, it was quicker between cases and between screens.
- Some commented that the tax permission question being asked in the January 1996 labour interview to those who had refused permission to access their tax records was a good addition.
- One interviewer noted that asking for a work telephone number was a good idea but that the relevant household member should be reflected with each given telephone number at the 'view and select' screen.
- The calculation of age was found to be improved.
- For a few interviewers, it was impossible to assess improvements as it was their first time on the SLID survey.
- In addition to noting improvements, favourable remarks regarding the dates module were offered. In particular, the date feeds and reasons for absence in questions DATES-Q2T1 and DATES-Q2T2 were very helpful for

interviewers and also for respondents who could not easily recall their dates.

Question 2. Did you notice any parts that were more difficult?

	#	%
Yes	19	25%
No	46	61%
N/A	11	14%

Comments regarding difficult or problematic areas:

- 7 out of 16 interviewers in the Montreal region, along with a few others from different regions, found the waiting time for entering the labour component (entering labour cases) quite long. For some, this was especially problematic for cases where several household members were eligible for an interview.
- Found the 'relationships' section of the application lengthy.
- Some interviewers noted an error with the [feeds] in question CHAR-Q4.2. Where it should have read: "How did [respondent] get his/her job with [employer]...", the employer feed was being replaced by the respondents' name.
- Correcting respondents' and employers' names was found to be more difficult in real cases as compared to practice cases.
- Updating the 'Roster' where respondent information is viewed was found to be irritatingly slow. A suggestion was made to have a prompt asking "Are you still..." of each member and to make changes only when necessary. New members would go through the existing format.
- A few interviewers did not know you had to scroll down to view outcome codes such as 'answering machine'.

- The trace folder was hard to get used to, eg. When a code for ‘busy’ was entered, a code 60 (Need to be traced) was still being shown in the calls status screen.
- In tracing, did not like that the existing trace notes could be changed, preferred the old system. Also found it long to use the F3 for updating trace information.

Question 3. Were there any features you lost?

	#	%
Yes	13	17%
No	47	62%
N/A	16	21%

- For interviewers who responded ‘yes’ to this question, the main problem seems to have been the loss of permanent notes. It was suggested that important information, such as persons with disabilities, could be entered into these permanent notes so as to not have to re-ask these respondents about their condition every year.
- Loss of tracer notes in the trace folder.
- Another problem for some interviewers was the loss of names of employers who had previously been entered but were now seemingly unrecorded in the list of past employers.
- A few interviewers commented that being able to backtrack into previous questions, including demographic questions, for editing and/or updating would be an important feature.
- When the application went into ‘suspend/final’ mode, some were unable to get back into the cases to complete the interview for the last household member on the component screen.

- A few interviewers also had difficulties with losing cases temporarily. Most cases would return a few days later but some would not return.
- Some interviewers reported losing spawned cases. One interviewer lost three partially complete cases after having experienced a system crash.
- An interviewer had nineteen completed cases without codes.
- Trouble with a personal refusal. After having assigned a refusal code for the husband, it was impossible for one of the interviewers to enter the wife's case.
- The view workload report for senior interviewers. It would have been nice to see how the interviewers were doing.
- Trouble with transmissions such as cases being lost in transit was reported for this January.

Question 4. Did respondents, who preferred an Income interview in May, comment about being asked the tax permission question again in January?

	#	%
Yes	11	14%
No	61	80%
N/A	4	5%

- Only 14% of interviewers reported having respondents who were annoyed at being asked the permission question again this year who commented that being asked once was enough. One interviewer suggested that some respondents may get angry if asked repeatedly and could eventually refuse as they feel they are being pressured to comply.
- Included in the 80% of interviewers who reported having respondents having no comments to make about being asked the tax permission question again, there are several respondents who in fact changed their minds. Approximately twenty percent of these interviewers made remarks

that many of their respondents decided to give permission to access their tax records, some being because they were surprised to hear that so many others had already given permission. A few interviewers commented that they were able to convince up to 50% or 75% of their respondents to reconsider.

- Some respondents who gave permission remarked that they were relieved about not receiving another call in May.
- Some interviewers commented that some of their respondents appreciate or expect being asked again even if they didn't change their minds. It reinforces the idea that not all government departments have access to everyone's personal information.
- Many of the respondents who had given permission seemed to think a call in January for the labour component would also have been eliminated.
- Some found the wording of the permission question a little complicated.

In sum, while some respondents do get annoyed at being asked the permission question again, the majority of respondents are not complaining and many are in fact changing their minds and are agreeing to the direct tax route.

Question 5. Did respondents ask you for more information about giving permission to access their Revenue Canada tax records?

	#	%
Yes	13	17%
No	62	82%
N/A	1	1%

- There are respondents still concerned about the confidentiality of their information. A few respondents asked if Revenue Canada or anyone else

could access their 'SLID' information, and also wanted to know how long Statistics Canada would be accessing their income tax records.

- Interviewers found the 'questions & answers' section in the interviewer's manual very helpful in reassuring respondents and answering their questions. Some feel that it would be a good idea to explain 'how' this linking to their tax records is actually done in the next newsletter as interviewers are continuously having to explain to them the procedure in detail.
- Some enquired about having a written consent form, others wanted to be sure that their income information was only being used for statistical purposes.
- There are some respondents who could not recall having given permission or did not realize that it would be for six years. There were other respondents who were surprised to get a call in January as they thought that by giving permission, they would never be contacted again for an interview.
- A few respondents think that government and any department therein can access their Revenue Canada income tax records. A respondent wanted to discuss the issue with a chartered accountant first.
- Respondents who read the newsletter seem to be more prepared to give permission.

Question 6. There were some different date edits this year. Did any edits cause you problems?

	#	%
Yes	18	24%
No	51	67%
N/A	7	9%

- Several interviewers encountered problems when trying to enter 1994 information as the date limits were for 1995. For example, if respondents who were being traced moved in 1994, or respondents lived together or separated previous to 1995, interviewers had to enter that they moved or separated etc. in 01/01/1995 due to the date limits.
- Interviewers reported that at Search Q1.1, for those who weren't working, the question came up- 'Were you looking for work at the beginning of Jan.1996?' - This question should have read 'Were you looking for work at the beginning of Jan.1995?'
- If a respondent had not previously reported a job, the start and end dates had to be within the ranges specified.
- Easy to understand and very helpful in 'jogging' the memory of respondents.
- Would like to keep the format of dates d/m/y consistent throughout the application.
- Found it long and repetitive to reconfirm marital status, addresses and employer's names. They suggested that if no changes were made in the composition of household, a feature such as pressing enter or F12 to confirm 'no changes' should be added.

Question 7. Did you have any joiners who completed the preliminary questions?

	#	%
Yes	59	78%
No	17	22%
N/A	0	0%

Question 8. For the new preliminary component, did you have any specific problems with particular questions?

	#	%
Yes	20	26%
No	37	49%
N/A	19	25%

- Many respondents did not always know the level of education attained by their parents and don't understand why this question is of importance; this question was also found to be a source of embarrassment for respondents. One interviewer had a respondent who refused to answer this question.
- Questions regarding marital status such as divorce dates were quite sensitive for some.
- Some interviewers were not able to change the last names of respondents who were married within the last year.
- Some respondents did not want to reveal their ethnic origin. They declare themselves Canadians and feel that their ethnic origin is irrelevant to that status.
- The Full time and Part-time work questions (with its inclusions) caused some confusion and thus lengthy explanations. One of the problems was having to make sure respondents did not include jobs while in school. The wording of these questions was also confusing and many respondents have difficulty remembering dates. (Q1A and Q7).
- Some interviewers found that the questions in general were either too long, repetitive or quite similar to one another. One interviewer noted that some respondents thought they were being asked the question concerning the number of years worked more than once. Others found the education questions repetitive.

Question 9. Was it useful to have the application calculate the number of years ago the respondent started working?

	#	%
Yes	43	57%
No	12	16%
N/A	21	28%

- The majority found it very useful, especially for respondents who couldn't remember dates.
- Some found it took a long time for calculating part-time and full-time periods, others found it confused respondents.
- One interviewer reported difficulties when trying to enter 3.5 years, so had to round up and enter 4 years.
- Some of the interviewers are still used to calculating the dates with paper and pencil and therefore couldn't comment on the usefulness of this feature.

Question 10. Were there any questions that were considered sensitive?

	#	%
Yes	44	58%
No	25	33%
N/A	7	9%

- The most sensitive and embarrassing question was the question "Has...fathered any children?"
- The next most sensitive questions were those concerning wage/salary or income levels, and the level of education attained by their parents or

themselves. Some respondents also feel uncomfortable telling interviewers that they are on social assistance.

- Marital status questions are sensitive questions especially when being asked to recently separated or divorced individuals. Asking how long respondents have been living together was also sensitive.
- Several respondents questioned why they were being asked questions regarding their wages when they are already being asked those questions in the May income interviews.
- Asking disability (Disab. Q1) questions to respondents who have previously declared a disability is very sensitive. Some respondents also get embarrassed by this question and want to emphasize that their disability is not a mental condition.
- Asking older people if their long term condition limited his/her activities at work was sensitive.
- There were cases where a respondent passed away and interviewers would ask their contact person or relative about the date. These questions were quite difficult to answer.
- Some respondents do not wish to disclose their ethnic origins as they feel that their being a Canadian citizen is all interviewers need to know.
- Contact information was sometimes not disclosed.

Question 11. Overall, were there any other specific problem areas for you or suggestions you would like to make?

- Many interviewers commented that they found the computers slow. They find that this lengthens the interview which is already found to be repetitive and long for respondents.
- The waiting periods between the labour components from one person to the next in a household was a problem. Some respondents complained and others hung up.

- While many interviewers found it much quicker to enter and exit, some found the waiting time for entering the labour component (entering labour cases) was quite long.
- Several interviewers found the Interviewers Manual, especially chapter 8 “How do I...?”, which explains some of the features and functions of the SLID application, has been improved and well constructed.
- At Case Management level, interviewers were instructed to select a final status code by pressing ‘ESC, cancel or select’, however the only way they were able to save the code was by pressing F12, which had not been indicated.
- At the F3 demographics screen, there is no way to identify the longitudinal respondent. The interviewer thus is unable to identify *who* they wish to speak with or trace. This causes a lot of confusion and anger at the household level.
- Would like to have more room in the permanent notes section to enter important information.
- Interviewers would like the application changed so that it would be able to accept a ‘don’t know’ or ‘refuse’ code in all areas.
- The final status screen should have ‘F12 to continue’ indicated at the bottom of the screen otherwise the remaining choices of outcome codes do not appear ie, ‘Left message for respondent to call’.
- Interviewers entering confusing information sometimes prefer to jot the information down on paper first, then skip through the confusing questions and return to them after the interview. The problem is that since the application will not allow them to skip through and leave questions blank, they are forced to enter irrelevant information and sometimes find that they cannot re-enter into the case and change some of the answers.
(ie.,Demographic questions)

- It would be very helpful to be able to access after completion in order to make changes.
- Unable to change date of birth if have previously entered it in erroneously.
- If a respondent has finished a job on 31/12/1995, and is not working in 1996, the application still asks for a work telephone number.
- The contact name is not up to date for some households. Spawns (ie. When a household member moves and creates new household) then create two cases with the same contact person.
- Telephone number information given in original cases do not appear on newly created cases (spawns). This information gets lost when data is entered.
- Why is that in question CON Q6, interviewers are instructed to press 'insert' first to change the street name but not to change the postal code? This leads to erroneous addresses.
- Question CHAR Q38.1 asks if the respondent was working at this job on Jan 1/95 when the starting date (eg. March 15/95) has been previously asked.
- Many respondents have difficulty remembering how many absences they had from work and the respective dates for question CHAR.Q46.1.
- Respondents in a situation where they move into a house with new roommates for example have expressed that although they don't mind being part of the survey themselves, they do not want their roommates to have to participate in the survey as well.
- Had difficulty getting through the 'relationships' section. Most people would say that everything was the same as last year wanting to get through the interview quickly.
- Respondents find it repetitive when they are being asked if they still work for the same employer and then are asked if the name of employer is still the correct one

- The disability questions caused some confusion as they were found to be similar to one another.
- Several interviewers found the questions for students working part-time very awkward.
- For some respondents, income questions for commission sales or piece workers were difficult to answer as they did not have T4 slips to consult.
- Interviewers again stressed the importance of respondents receiving their newsletters.

SUGGESTIONS:

- For some sections of information which doesn't change year to year, such as employment history or household composition, it would be much easier to be able to have a feature or function to simply press to confirm the existing information.
- Demographics could be made much simpler by simply pressing 'F12' for confirmation on all screens unless a change needed to be recorded. For example, instead of asking if each person was living in the household individually, could a list of all the members in the household be asked at the same time?
- Many interviewers would like to be able to re-enter a component after completion.
- A few interviewers have suggested that it would be much easier and quicker if interviewers were able to scroll back and forth throughout the application with ease.
- The final status screen should indicate a down arrow to show the remainder of outcome codes.
- Some interviewers feel it would be preferable to keep their original cases.

- Rather than tracing, a new option to record and update a telephone number from the telephone folder which is no longer in service, would be more efficient.
- The 'best time to call' indicates outdated information from three years ago. There is nowhere to change the 'best time to call' except in the permanent or temporary notes section. This was a problem for several interviewers.
- Would like to have a 'best time to call' for joiners, and would also like to be able to update this lists in the future.
- Should have the best time to call, telephone number and last contact as the first items on the Case Management screen.
- Several interviewers feel it would be much easier if the contact number could be accessed without having to go to the trace file.
- Is it possible to have the work telephone number come back as a feed rather than asking every year?
- It would be preferable in question CON Q6B if the old telephone number was displayed and not erased after a move.
- Suggestion to have room for notes in the appointment section because often the appointment is not for a specific time, such as between 2:00pm and 4:00pm. Also, several interviewers have commented that they would like to have the previous year's appointments deleted before receiving the cases.
- Since the responses for questions such as Con-Q6C, 'Do you now live in a...single detached house..' are not likely to change for many respondents, is it possible to have a feature to simply re-confirm if there have been no changes?
- Suggestion to have the question "Are you ... planning to move in the next six months..." read: "Are you ... planning to move in the next year..." for those who accept to give permission for access to their tax records.

- It would be useful to be able to use the F7 key, which scrolls through parts of the application, throughout the entire questionnaire.
- In order to save time, would it be possible to combine questions; say four questions per screen?
- Some interviewers feel would it be best to start the labour interviews the second week of January instead of the first when many people are still away on holidays.
- Perhaps the Interviewer's reports which include changes of addresses should be sent a few weeks before the interviews to ensure that they arrive on time.
- Within the interviewers' reports, it would also be very helpful to include the 'person identification' as well as the previous address in order to update the files.
- Interviewers feel that the newsletters should once again explain the purpose and objectives of the survey as there are many new joiners and some respondents could use a reminder. Perhaps an overview of the purposes of the survey could be sent to households with joiners, along with the thank-you letter to help carry those respondents into the future.

3. Summary of Slid Interviewer Debriefing Questionnaires

CANADA

QUESTION #	YES	NO	N/A	%	
				YES	NO
Question 1	22	32	22	29	42
Question 2	19	46	11	25	61
Question 3	13	47	16	17	62
Question 4	11	61	4	14	80
Question 5	13	62	1	17	82
Question 6	18	51	7	24	67
Question 7	59	17	0	78	22
Question 8	20	37	19	26	49
Question 9	43	12	21	57	16
Question 10	44	25	7	58	32

* Table calculated based on 76 questionnaires, total of all regional offices

N/A = Questions which were not answered, situations not encountered by interviewer.

ATLANTIC

QUESTION #	YES	NO	N/A	% YES	% NO
Question 1	4	3	1	50	38
Question 2	0	7	1	0	88
Question 3	1	6	1	13	75
Question 4	1	7	0	13	88
Question 5	0	8	0	0	100
Question 6	1	6	1	13	75
Question 7	6	2	0	75	25
Question 8	2	4	2	25	50
Question 9	6	0	2	75	0.00
Question 10	2	5	1	25	63

* Table calculated based on 8 questionnaires

N/A = Questions which were not answered, situations not encountered by interviewer.

MONTREAL

QUESTION #	YES	NO	N/A	% YES	% NO
Question 1	4	6	6	25	37.50
Question 2	10	6	0	63	38
Question 3	5	9	2	31	56
Question 4	1	13	2	6	81
Question 5	5	10	1	31	63
Question 6	5	10	1	31	63
Question 7	16	0	0	100	0
Question 8	5	10	1	31	63
Question 9	9	4	3	56	25
Question 10	11	5	0	69	31

* Table calculated based on 16 questionnaires

N/A = Questions which were not answered, situations not encountered by interviewer.

STURGEON FALLS

QUESTION #	YES	NO	N/A	% YES	% NO
Question 1	2	2	4	25.00	25
Question 2	3	3	2	38	37.50
Question 3	0	4	4	0	50
Question 4	2	6	0	25	75
Question 5	2	6	0	25	75
Question 6	2	6	0	25	75
Question 7	5	3	0	63	38
Question 8	0	5	3	0	62.50
Question 9	3	1	4	38	13
Question 10	3	5	0	38	63

* Table calculated based on 8 questionnaires

N/A = Questions which were not answered, situations not encountered by interviewer.

TORONTO

QUESTION #	YES	NO	N/A	% YES	% NO
Question 1	6	11	6	26	48
Question 2	1	16	6	4	70
Question 3	3	15	5	13	65
Question 4	4	18	1	17	78
Question 5	1	22	0	4	96
Question 6	4	15	4	17	65
Question 7	14	9	0	61	39
Question 8	5	11	7	22	48
Question 9	11	5	7	48	22
Question 10	13	6	4	57	26

* Table calculated based on 23 questionnaires

N/A = Questions which were not answered, situations not encountered by interviewer.

EDMONTON

QUESTION #	YES	NO	N/A	% YES	% NO
Question 1	4	8	4	25	50
Question 2	4	9	3	25	56
Question 3	4	6	6	25	38
Question 4	2	13	1	13	81
Question 5	4	12	0	25	75
Question 6	5	10	1	31	63
Question 7	14	2	0	88	13
Question 8	6	6	4	38	38
Question 9	11	2	3	69	13
Question 10	13	3	0	81	19

* Table calculated based on 16 questionnaires

N/A = Questions which were not answered, situations not encountered by interviewer.

VANCOUVER

QUESTION #	YES	NO	N/A	% YES	% NO
Question 1	2	2	1	40	40
Question 2	1	4	0	20	80
Question 3	0	4	1	0	80
Question 4	1	4	0	20	80
Question 5	1	4	0	20	80
Question 6	1	4	0	20	80
Question 7	4	1	0	80	20
Question 8	2	1	2	40	20
Question 9	3	0	2	60	0
Question 10	2	1	2	40	20

* Table calculated based on 5 questionnaires

N/A = Questions which were not answered, situations not encountered by interviewer.