

SUPPLEMENT TO

"Mode and Interviewer Effects in Egocentric Network Research."

Part A. More Details on Sampling and Method

Fuller descriptions of procedures, the survey instrument, the codebook and a link to the actual data are available at the project website, <http://ucnets.berkeley.edu/>.)

Using address-based methods, we randomly sampled households from 30 census tracts randomly selected proportional to population. Solicitation letters invited any member of the sampled household who qualified by age to join the panel and be paid for participating. This recruitment procedure sufficed to generate the 50-to-70 year-old sample (n= 674), but attracted not enough 21-to-30 year-olds, who are notoriously hard to reach. We supplemented the young sample by asking existing respondents to invite friends, yielding 35 cases, for a total of 195 young adults randomly assigned to condition for the present analysis. (We gained another 290 completed cases through Facebook advertisements, but because all those respondents took the survey online, they are excluded from our methods analysis.) We estimate that the final panel enrollment rate, from solicitation to completion at about three percent, as comparable to the better commercial panel studies. Although for other purposes, post-stratification weights can be used to correct for an over-representation of women and the highly-educated, for the present methodological analyses, each case is equally weighted.

The fieldwork agency assigned interviewers on the basis of date and time availability, with their distance to the designated respondents as a secondary consideration. Other factors were not considered.¹ In training, interviewers were permitted to deviate from the script insofar as keeping to the script would have stilted the conversation and irritated the interviewees. For example, asking respondents how long they had known their mothers seemed unwise. But this also allowed interviewers to skip text that felt repetitive in order to keep the interaction natural.

The random assignment to FTF versus web worked as planned with the older sample. Given difficulties with recruiting the younger sample, we had to adjust the assignment ratios to end up with a roughly 3:1 ratio at the end (exclusive of the Facebook recruits).

¹ Report from the fieldwork manager (personal communication, May 18, 2017). "Once or twice, respondents requested to be assigned an interviewer of a specific gender..." [and] as many as 10 cases may have been assigned to particular interviewers "because of their skills in dealing with difficult personalities." Moreover, "reluctance to sign up for the study or reluctance to completely answer screener questions flagged a respondent as potentially 'difficult' or less willing to give all responses. Also, respondents who seemed more skeptical (asked many questions regarding the legitimacy of the study or the company, etc.) were also considered to be potentially difficult cases."

Part B. Texts of Name-Eliciting Questions (FTF version)

1. [IF MARRIED:] Please tell us your spouse's name.
2. [IF UNMARRIED:] Is there someone whom you consider a partner or are in a romantic relationship with? [IF YES:] Please tell me this person's name.
3. Please name all the people, besides you, who live with you at least part of the time, counting all the adults and children, if there are any.
4. Please think about people you typically do these sorts of things [leisure activities²] with – or other social things as well, such as going shopping, out for drinks, to the park, or just hanging out. Who are the people you usually do these sorts of things with? [Include (spouse/partner name) if appropriate.] I can take up to nine names.³
5. Sometimes personal matters come up that concern people, like issues about relationships, important things in their lives, or difficult experiences. Do you ever confide in someone about these sorts of things or do you never confide in anyone? [IF YES:] Who do you confide in about these sorts of things? [Include (spouse/partner name) if appropriate.] I can take up to six names.
6. When you have to make important decisions – for example, about taking a job, family issues, or health problems – are there any people whose advice you seek out or would seek out in making those decisions? They can be family, friends, or professional advisors. [IF YES:] Whose advice do you or would you seek out? I can take up to six names.
7. In the last few months, have any friends, relatives, or acquaintances [(who do not live with you)] given you any practical help like moving furniture, doing repairs, picking up something at the store, looking after a child, giving you a ride, or things like that? [IF YES:] Please give us the names of people who have done things like this for you in the last few months. I can take up to six names.
8. If you were seriously injured or sick and needed some help for a couple of weeks with things such as preparing meals and getting around, who would you ask?..... [IF WOULD ASK INDIVIDUALS:] Who would those people be? These can be people you have named before or new people. I can take up to six names.
9. We have been asking about people who help you out in different ways. Now, let's turn things around. Who are the people that you help out practically, or with advice, or in other kinds of ways at least occasionally? They can be people you've already named or new people. I can take up to six names.
10. There are sometimes people we know who ask a lot of us, who are sometimes demanding or difficult. Who are the people that you sometimes find demanding or difficult? They can be people you've already named or new people. I can take up to six names.

² Previous questions asked about the frequency of dining with others in homes, dining with others outside the home, and going with others to "concerts, plays, clubs, sports, or other events."

³ These phrases, "I can take . . . names," do *not* appear in the web version of the survey.

Part C. Text of Name-Descriptor Questions

Asked of all alters.

1. People can be connected to each other in a few different ways, even family members. Here is a list of the ways people can be connected. When I read a name to you, please tell me all the different ways that you are connected to that person nowadays. What are all the ways that you are connected to [NAMED OF ALTER]?
 - a. Spouse/partner
 - b. In a romantic relationship, but not married
 - c. My parent
 - d. My step-parent
 - e. My child
 - f. My step-child
 - g. My brother/sister
 - h. My step-brother/step-sister
 - i. My half-brother/half-sister
 - j. Other relatives, including ex's (please specify):
 - k. Housemate/roommate
 - l. Neighbor
 - m. Know at work
 - n. Know at school
 - o. Know at church, synagogue, temple, or mosque
 - p. Friend
 - q. Acquaintance
 - r. Know another way (please specify):
2. Which of the people on this list are also [GENDER OF RESPONDENT]?
3. Which of the people on this list are about ___ to ___ years old? [PLUS/MINUS 6 YEARS OF RESPONDENT]
4. Which of the people on this list are about ___ or older? [GREATER THAN 6 YEARS OVER RESPONDENT'S AGE]
5. Which of the people on this list did you meet just in the last year or so?
6. Which of the people on this list do you feel especially close to?
7. Which of the people on this list live in your neighborhood – say, within a 5-minute drive or so?
8. Which of the people on this list live over an hour's drive away from you?
9. [IF RESPONDENT EVER EMPLOYED:] Which of the people on this list do/did the same kind of work as you do/did?
10. [IF R CURRENTLY IN SCHOOL:] Which of the people on this list are also going to school?
11. [IF R CURRENTLY UNEMPLOYED:] Which of the people on this list are also unemployed?
12. [IF R CURRENTLY CARING FOR HOME:] Which of the people on this list also take care at home (do not have a paid job)?
13. Which of the people on this list are of the same religion as you are?
14. Which of the people on this list are from the same racial or ethnic background as you are?
15. Which of the people on this list hold political opinions that are different from yours?

SCREENSHOTS

1. Example of name-eliciting question. This is from the FTF program. The sections highlighted in yellow do *not* appear in the web version.

Who do you confide in about these sorts of things? Include ann if appropriate. I can take up to six names. (These can be different people for different matters.)

Tom

Dick

Harry

Ann

Sue

[Int.] Volunteered: Never, Nobody

<< Back Next >>

Don't know Refuse Not applicable

2. Example of detailed name-descriptor. This is from the FTF program. The sections highlighted in yellow do *not* appear in the web version.

What are all the ways that you are connected to Sue?

Spouse/partner

In a romantic relationship, but not married

Family:

My parent

My step-parent

My child

My step-child

My brother/sister

My step-brother/step-sister

My half-brother/half-sister

Other relatives, including ex's (please specify):

Other connections:

Housemate/roommate

Neighbor

Know at work

Know at school

Know at church, synagogue, temple, or mosque

Friend

Acquaintance

Know another way (please specify):

<< Back Next >>

Don't know Refuse Not applicable

3. This is an example of a name-descriptor check-off question. This is from the FTF program. The sections highlighted in yellow do *not* appear in the web version. (Note that the household member, Ann, does not appear on the list.)

[Int: SHOW CARD 6] Which of the people on this list live in your neighborhood – say, within a 5-minute drive or so?

- Dick
- Father
- Harry
- Mother
- Sister Jean
- Sue
- Tom

- All of them
- None of them

<< Back Next >>

Don't know Refuse Not applicable

Part D. Detailed Table of Number of Names Elicited by Mode**Average number of Alters Named by Type and Name-Eliciting Question, by Mode.**

	Face-to-Face (n=647)		Web (n=222)		Diff.	Test
	mean	SD	mean	SD		
<i>Global Measures</i>						
Total N of unique alters	9.9	4.3	11.1	4.5	1.2	**
Mn. N of alters per name-elic. question ^a	2.9	1.3	3.5	1.2	0.6	***
N listed in household	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.1	0.1	
N kin (excl. spouse)	3.2	2.4	3.4	2.5	0.2	
N nonkin (excl. partner)	6.0	3.8	7.1	4.2	1.1	***
<i>Counts for Specific Questions</i>						
N named as social companion	5.4	2.8	6.2	2.6	0.8	***
N named as confidant	3.0	1.9	3.6	1.9	0.6	***
N named as advisor	2.5	1.8	3.4	1.8	0.9	***
N named as practical helper	1.7	1.7	2.2	1.8	0.5	***
N named as emergency helper	2.8	1.7	3.5	1.6	0.7	***
N named as recipient of help from respond.	3.7	1.8	4.5	1.6	0.8	***
N named as difficult	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.4	0.3	**

Notes: Mode effects significant at ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. Statistical tests are based on two-way ANOVA with cohort sample as a crossed factor.

^a Only includes questions listed in table, not questions 1-3 in Part B above.

Part E. The Mode Effect is Specific to Network Results.

We tested mode effects on 20 different items across the interview instrument. Two mode differences are significant at $p < .01$ (compared to, for example, eight for cohort differences). These two—dining with others and wishing to know more people—fit the expectation that online respondents are likelier to confess to socially undesirable traits, but other social desirability answers did not show mode effects. Perhaps any desirability effects in this survey revolve specifically around personal ties, given its purpose. (The invitation to join the study read: "This research is about our social lives . . . at how changes in social connections happen and how they affect health. . . .") And yet: social desirability pressures should have led FTF respondents to provide more names than web respondents; but they provided fewer.

Means or Proportions for Twenty Assorted Questions, by Mode.

	Face-to-Face (n=647)		Web (n=222)		Diff.	Test ^a
	mn./prop.	SD	mn./prop.	SD		
Prop. Anyone move in with respondent recently	.15	.36	.22	.41	.07	*
Prop. Have a pet	.48	.50	.48	.50	.00	
Mn. Freq. dine with others in home (high to low) ^b	2.48	1.30	2.77	1.26	.29	**
Prop. Confident that family would help in emergency	.72	.45	.72	.45	.00	
Prop. Who wish they knew more people who help ^c	.23	.42	.35	.48	.12	***
Prop. Have anything more to say about networks	.35	.48	.32	.47	-.03	
Prop. Report any trouble paying bills	.17	.38	.20	.40	.03	
Prop. Report any recent good economic event	.51	.50	.46	.50	-.05	
Prop. Anyone close to respondent die in last year	.37	.48	.35	.48	-.02	
Prop. Experienced a break in relationship in last year	.37	.43	.33	.42	-.04	
Mn. Self-rated health (excellent to poor)	2.36	1.07	2.36	1.04	.00	
Prop. Reported <u>no</u> serious health issues	.69	.46	.65	.48	-.04	
Mn. Nmbr. nights per week trouble falling asleep	1.34	2.27	1.41	1.94	.07	
SAQ ^d : Respondent's self-reported weight (lbs.)	166.85	43.18	163.31	38.35	-3.54	
SAQ: Mn. Nmbr. days a week respondent felt happy	4.52	2.30	4.30	2.36	-.22	
SAQ: Prop. Have had thoughts of suicide	.05	.21	.04	.20	-.01	
Prop. Volunteer "other" as their racial identity	.09	.29	.05	.23	-.04	
Prop. Say they are members of religious organization	.31	.46	.28	.45	-.03	
Mn. Attendance at religious services (high to low)	3.61	1.49	3.73	1.53	.12	
Prop. Willing to answer short surveys later	.96	.21	.96	.20	.00	

Notes: The questions are listed here in their order in the survey instrument.

a. ANOVA for continuous or ordinal variables; Chi-Square for dichotomies. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

b. There were, however, no significant differences in the frequency of dining with others in public nor in going to public events like concerts with others.

c. Web respondents were also likelier to say that they wished they knew more people to see socially 59 percent versus 41 percent, $p < .001$.

d. "SAQ" refers to a self-administered question. In the FTF condition, interviewers handed the laptop to respondents to answer a set of more private questions.

Part F. Assessing Differential Self-Selection as a Cause of Mode Differences

This analysis estimates to what extent differential self-selection explains why more alters were named by web than by FTF respondents. Such self-selection would entail *dropouts* from the web condition having fewer actual alters in their lives than those assignees to the web respondents who did complete the survey. To address the issue, we used two strategies.

The first one involved isolating web-assigned respondents who dropped out and simulating what their network size (measured as mean number of names provided per name-eliciting question) *would have been* had they completed. We tried three estimating procedures. In one, we assumed that these people would have been like the roughly dozen who had completed the survey but had insisted on being transferred from the web to the FTF condition. In the second, we assumed that the dropouts from the web condition were like the completers who had told the screening interviewer either that they had no access to the internet or that they were uncomfortable with computers. In the third, we assumed that the web dropouts were like the respondents who did *not* say, in later part of the survey, that they used email to contact their families. The results of these exercises (available from the authors) based on the idea that self-selection by technology aversion would have reduced the difference in mean number of names by no more than 14 percent, leaving a substantial mode gap to be explained. The main reason that the simulations mattered little is that so few of the older respondents assigned to the web condition failed to finish the name-eliciting section on the web (n=28).

We also considered the possibility that the personalities of the dropouts interacted with mode. Perhaps shyer, less social respondents in the end preferred not to do the survey, but those assigned to a personal interviewer found it harder to opt out than those on the web, so that the remaining web respondents were unrepresentatively high in network size. But the average personality profile of the respondents did not differ by mode.⁴

Finally, we tested the possibility that the dropouts from the web mode were disproportionately people with small networks by estimating their *expected* number of names using our screener survey. The survey vendor asked a set of questions to would-be respondents who answered the call for participation and used the answers to determine eligibility and mode assignment. For this analysis, 227 qualified would-be respondents received a mode assignment (174 to FTF and 53 to the web) but did not end up completing the main survey and thus do not appear in the final sample.⁵ We know several things about these dropouts that we also know about the respondents who completed the study, 641 of those assigned to FTF and 211 to web.⁶ We know age, gender, household structure, access to the internet, and zip code.

Using these shared variables, we ran an OLS regression to “predict” the mean number of names per name-eliciting question for the 852 completed cases. The resulting equation explained about 10 percent of the variance.⁷ Using the model parameters, we estimated the *expected* mean number of names per question for the incomplete cases. We compared the estimates for web dropouts to estimates for FTF dropouts. Had the web-assigned dropouts differed from the FTF-dropouts in gender, age, and other ways associated with listing many names, the two estimates would have differed. They did not: The

⁴ The survey employed a short version of the “Big 5” personality test.

⁵ As in all analyses, we exclude the respondents recruited through Facebook.

⁶ These numbers exclude a few cases with missing data.

⁷ The predictors were age*, age-squared**, whether there was 21-30 year-old in the household, whether there was a 50-to-70 year-old in the household, the number of household members in the (would-be) respondent’s age bracket, being female***, internet access***, and eight dummy variables for zip code truncated to the first three digits** (where the asterisks indicate significance).

projected mean number names per question was 3.04 for the would-be web respondents and 3.01 for the would-be FTF respondents. (By the way, there was also no difference in the projections among the respondents who in the end completed the study—3.04 v. 3.0—another way of showing that the mode effect was not spurious, at least not spurious because of the selection associated with variables included in this model.)

Part G. Assessing Differential Effort as a Cause of Mode Differences

We assess the possibility that differences in effort between FTF and web respondents explain the differences in the number of alters they listed by examining three indicators of effort: time spent on the survey, willingness to answer optional questions, and a decline in the number of names listed as the survey proceeds.

Duration. The total time the survey took can reflect effort—how much respondents were willing to invest in the project. To be sure, duration reflects other factors as well, such as respondents’ comprehension, distraction, and verbosity. But time serves as one gauge of effort. The results are shown in the table below, top line. On average, web respondents spent 4.3 minutes more on the survey than FTF respondents did ($p < .05$). However, the variance was much higher for web respondents; they included more high-side outliers. Indeed, FTF cases could not have extreme outliers because einterviewers were instructed to just stop after two hours. When we control for outliers by trimming the 5th and 95th percentiles, the new results (line 2), show only a 1.2 minute difference. We conclude that (a) the web condition allowed for extremely long interviews, which the FTF condition did not; but (b) in general, there was no substantial difference in time spent between the two modes.

Answering Optional Questions. Another indicator of effort or commitment is whether a respondent is willing to answer optional questions, particularly ones that might open the door to yet more probing. We used three such questions: asking respondents an open-ended question about whether any *other* economic event had occurred to them in the past year (beyond those we had explicitly asked about); asking similarly about *another* life event that we had not specifically stipulated; and asking whether they had any health limitation that we had not specifically asked about. Answering yes to any of these required an additional answer and an explanation. The third to fifth lines in the table show, effectively, no difference by mode. Respondents who answered yes to these questions tended also to give more names, perhaps because both are indications of respondent effort, but that was unrelated to mode, suggesting that the mode effect on alter volume is not explained a mode effect on effort.

Measures of Respondent Effort by Mode.

	Face-to-Face (n=647)		Web (n=222)		Diff.	Test
	mean / percent	SD	mean / percent	SD		
Mn. time of survey (minutes)	60.3	15.6	64.7	26.7	4.3	*
Mn. time of survey, trimmed ^a	60.2	14.3	61.9	17.6	1.2	
Pct. offered other economic life event ^b	36.4		42.3		6.0	
Pct. offered any other life event ^c	34.6		33.1		-1.5	
Pct. offered additional health limitation ^d	25.2		28.8		3.6	

Notes: Mode effects significant at * $p < .05$. Statistical tests for means are based on two-way ANOVA with cohort sample as a crossed factor. Statistical tests for percentages are Fisher exact tests, also tested with cohort as a control.

a. “Trimmed” by re-setting all values under the 5th percentile (of both treatments pooled) to the value of the 5th percentile and similarly with values above the 95th percentile.

b. “In roughly the last year or so, have you had another important work or economic event happen to you, for good or bad?”

- c. "Are there any other important events, both good and bad, that have happened to you in the last year or so that we have not covered?" Note that in the 21-to-30 year-old sample, there is a significant ($p < .05$) difference: 33.1% in FTF and 17.9%.
- d. "Is there any other aspect of your health that limits your activity in some way that we haven't yet discussed?"

Waning of Effort. Perhaps the FTF-web difference emerged as all respondents realized how taxing the procedure is and the FTF respondents—assuming that their experience was more stressful and fatiguing—began curtailing names earlier than the web respondents did, thus producing the observed differences. We return to Part D in this supplement. The specific questions are listed in their order within the interview. One observes a drop in the mean number of names provided from the first to the fourth question, but then an increase back to about the initial level by the sixth question, closing finally with the lowest mean. More important, however, the FTF-web difference in names provided did not change systematically as the survey proceeded.

In our analysis of completion rates, we looked at differential dropout *after* the name-eliciting questions (see table in Section J). We can ask what percent of those respondents who answered the name-eliciting questions did not then complete the remainder of survey—perhaps because they were too worn out by the procedure—and whether there is a mode effect there. Among the young respondents, the proportion dropping out after the name-eliciting section was greater for *web* than for FTF respondents, 13 versus 2 percent. The gap was not as wide, 7 versus 4 percent, among the older respondents. However, if these differences in dropout rates indicate differential fatigue, they suggest that the web respondents were more fatigued by the name-eliciting section than were the FTF respondents. And yet they gave more names, contradicting a fatigue explanation of the mode effect. Giving many names may well have been fatiguing (and thus encouraging of stopping), but that mechanism would not explain why web respondents gave more names to start with.

Part H. Testing Whether Individual Interviewers Account for Mode Effect.

Simulated mean names per question elicited with different interviewer compositions (FTF only; n= 647).

Interviewer Cases Replaced	Mean # names per quest. in simulated FTF sample	Web (m=3.5) minus simulated FTF Difference	% change in difference from full sample
Without I. # 1	2.8	0.7	08%
Without I. # 2	2.8	0.7	04
Without I. # 3	3.0	0.5	-17
Without I. # 4	2.8	0.7	05
Without I. # 5	2.9	0.6	03
Without I. # 6	2.9	0.6	-01
Without I. # 7	3.1	0.4	-30
Without I. # 8	2.8	0.7	17
Without I. # 9	2.8	0.7	08
Without I. # 10	2.9	0.6	00
Without I. # 3 & #7	3.3	0.2	-59
All Interviewers (none dropped)	2.87	0.66	

* p<.05, ** p<.01, ***p<.001

Part I. Testing Implications of Mode/Interviewer Effects on Results.

Regressions of Total Number of Names, Number of Nonkin Names, and Mean Names per Question with and without Mode/Interviewer Style (n=868 unweighted respondents).

	Total N of Names		N of Nonkin		Mn. Names per Q.	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Constant	7.80***	8.67***	6.60***	7.31***	2.55***	3.05***
R is Male	-1.04***	-0.97***	-0.78**	-0.72**	-0.53***	-0.49***
Less than B.A. Degree	-1.72***	-1.80***	-1.78***	-1.81***	-0.38***	-0.41***
Older Age Cohort	0.87	0.75	0.53	0.45	0.22	0.17
R has Spouse or Rom. Partner	0.15	0.23	-0.62*	-0.58*	0.05	0.08
Mother Alive	0.41	0.31	0.07	0.12	0.16	0.12
Father Alive	0.93*	0.92*	0.54	0.50	0.27*	0.25*
N of Adult Children	0.33**	0.33**	-0.22	-0.22*	0.07*	0.07*
R Employed Full Time	0.54	0.46	0.42	0.37	0.26**	0.22**
N of Others in Household	0.92***	0.90***	0.20	0.18	0.12***	0.10***
R is Black	-0.89	-0.62	-1.16*	-.97*	-0.53***	-0.40**
R Has Chronic Health Issue	0.64*	0.58*	0.20	0.17	0.23**	0.21**
Method: Low-Prompting Int.		-1.95***		-1.46***		-1.01***
Method: High-Prompting Int.		0.39		0.02		0.03
Method: Web (Contrast)						
Change in R-squared		.06***		.03***		.16***
Adj. R-squared	.14***	.20***	.08***	.11***	.11***	.26***

Notes:

1. N of Nonkin excludes romantic partners (who are counted in the independent variable, "R. has Spouse or Rom. Partner").
2. Method: FTF Respondents are coded by how much prompting their interviewers did and contrasted against respondents on the web.
3. In regression for total names, N in household has almost automatic effect because all co-residents are listed among the network names.
4. OLS regression is used because the dependent variables are roughly distributed normally.

Significance: * p<.05, ** p<.01, ***p<.001.

Part J. Assessing Data Completion and Quality

Completion. Interviewers can presumably coax respondents into continuing a survey to the end; our data are partially consistent. We start with the people who answered the invitation to be part of the panel, began the screening process, and got as far as being randomly assigned to mode. We then track how far they got. The table below presents these data, divided by age cohort, because cohort strongly conditioned this process.

Young respondents were much less likely to continue on than were older respondents and young respondents displayed a mode difference: Many fewer of those assigned to the web condition continued on than of those assigned to the FTF condition, at each step in the process. Continuation rates differed little by mode assignment among the older respondents. Web interviews may be inferior in sustaining the commitment of reluctant—in this case, 20-something—subjects (see Kreuter et al, 2008, for similar findings).

Quality. There should be fewer mistakes in the FTF condition--"mistakes" in this context meaning, in particular, not adhering to instructions that each response to a name-eliciting question should be the names or initials of single individuals listed separately. Common errors were to list couples or groups, such as "Bill and Alice" or "my family," or to duplicate the same alter with a different name, such as listing "Bill" in a different question as "William." We identified that about 3 percent of names offered face-to-face versus about 13 percent of names listed on the web required correction or deletion. The audio recordings reveal interviewers indeed clarifying and correcting the listed names.

"Pagebacks." We are able to track for both FTF and web surveys the extent to which respondents or interviewers paged back during the survey or interview, presumably to correct an earlier answer. We interpret the number of page-backs as a measure of the effort to correct, perhaps make more comprehensive, the interview. Paging back was about twice as common in the FTF than online modes (means of 23 and 13 times; medians of 15 and 6 times). (As noted in the text, high-prompting interviewers engaged in more page backs than low-prompting ones [mns = 27.4 vs. 19.5, $p < .01$; difference in mean of logged pagebacks, $p < .001$].)

In all three of these quality assessments—completion, errors, and pageback efforts to be accurate—the FTF condition was clearly superior to the online condition.

[table on next page]

Completion of the Survey by *Intended (Assigned) Mode*, by Age Cohort.

	21-to-30 Year-Olds		50-to-70 Year-Olds	
Progress of Respondent from Initial Contact with the Research	Face-to-Face	Web	Face-to-Face	Web
N Who reached mode assignment	<u>224</u>	<u>151</u>	<u>624</u>	<u>210</u>
Pct. Who started the survey	65.2	43.0***	84.6	89.0
Pct. Answered name-eliciting quest's ^a	64.7	39.7*	83.8	86.7
Pct. Completed entire survey ^b	63.8	34.4***	80.8	81.0
Final N	<u>143</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>504</u>	<u>170</u>

Notes:

^a Before this section were about two dozen questions largely about marital status, family composition, employment, and residential mobility.

^b The remaining sections asked name-descriptor questions, questions asking for evaluations of the networks, and then batteries largely about health, life events, and sociodemographic background.

The difference between modes in self-selection in making this step is significant, by Fisher exact test, at:
 *** p<.001 or * p<.05

Part K. Prompting or Patience?: Between-Interviewer Differences.

In response to a reviewer's reasonable question that perhaps it was interviewer variation in *patience* to wait for respondents to offer up names rather than in prompting behavior that mattered, we took a closer look.

First, our direct observations from listening to 100 audio recordings is that prompting and patience tended to go together. However, between the two, we clearly observed more variation in probing and more consequential interviewee behavior from probes than from silences.

Second, we conducted a rough statistical analysis drawing from the data in Table 3, using the minutes spent in the main name-eliciting section as a rough index of patience. We looked at the associations across the nine interviewers (those with sufficient numbers of interviews) among the averages in the table. The best predictor of the average number of alters per question (and overall total) elicited across interviewers was their average rate of compliance with reading the written prompts, not by the time they spent in the name-eliciting section. (Time was best predicted by how many spontaneous, other sorts of prompts they offered.) One example of this pattern is that the least-probing interviewer, the one who also elicited the fewest names, took an average amount of time during the name-eliciting section. There was time-taking chatter going on, just not name-eliciting chatter.