

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

**ONLINE SUPPLEMENT
to article in**

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2006, VOL. 71 (DECEMBER:1014–1039)

The Limitations of Stranger–Interviewers in Rural Kenya

Alexander A. Weinreb
Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Supplement A: Full Results for Table 3 (Model 2) Estimates

General Characteristics			Type of Interviewer						
			Female Stranger (Reference)	Female Acquaint.	Female Insider	Male Stranger	Male Acquaint.	Male Insider	
1	Age	OLS	918	28.91***	-1.6&	-3.5**	.17	1.54&	-.15
2	Been to school	logit	924	1.65***	.02	1.08*	-.36	-.13	-.36
3	Been to primary school	logit	803	2.07***	-.68*	.20	-.41	-.66*	-.58
4	Been to secondary school	logit	803	-2.14***	.69*	-.13	.48	.69*	.58
5	Speaks Kiswahili	logit	923	.036***	-.15	.80**	-.14	-.27	-.02
6	Speaks English	logit	922	-1.11***	-.03	-.62	-.12	-.10	-.15
7	Been to Nairobi	logit	923	.012***	.42&	-.69**	.19	.20	.04
8	Number times been to Nairobi	OLS	482	7.49***	-3.4*	-1.7	-2.6*	-2.3*	-3.1*
9	Number children ever born	OLS	924	4.73***	1.2**	.54	.50	.82*	.49
10	Number of coresident children	OLS	878	3.48***	.41	-.70*	.08	.27	.28
11	Number of deceased children	OLS	878	1.26***	.41*	.60**	.03	.07	-.01
12	Wants more children	logit	923	.323*	-.55*	-.93***	-.60**	-.69**	-.37
13	Ideal number of children	OLS	922	24.8***	-2.4	-11.1*	1.9	-3.7	-8.8*
14	Expects all sons to finish high school	logit	923	1.45***	.45	.63&	-.42	.11	.46
15	Likely that sons will complete high school	logit	659	.124	.81**	-.17	.16	.35	1.21***
16	Expects all daughters to finish high school	logit	923	1.38***	.40	.51	-.62*	.06	-.17
17	Likely that daughter will complete high school	logit	613	.227	.43	-.47	.30	.14	.92**
Number of effects significant at $\alpha=5\%$ level					7	8	3	5	4
Number of lines on which there is an insider–stranger effect					15/17				

(continued)

Supplement A. Continued

		Type of Interviewer								
		Type of model	N	Female Stranger (Reference)	Female Acquaint.	Female Insider	Male Stranger	Male Acquaint.	Male Insider	
18	HH has a radio	logit	924	.298&	.20	-.69**	.16	.42*	.36	
19	Radio purchased since 1997	logit	557	.483*	.32	.33	-.17	.17	.14	
20	HH has a bicycle	logit	924	-.867***	.28	-.64*	.04	.48*	-.07	
21	Bicycle purchased since 1997	logit	293	-.405	.25	.63	-.24	-.34	.22	
22	HH has a sofaset	logit	924	-1.31***	.13	.05	.07	.45	.24	
23	Sofaset purchased since 1997	logit	226	.111	-.67	.07	-.95*	-1.01*	-.95&	
24	HH has a metal roof	logit	924	-.675***	.56*	-.31	-.03	.62**	.24	
25	Metal roof purchased since 1997	logit	360	.105	.02	-.48	-.39	-.01	.72	
26	HH has a lantern	logit	923	.322*	.41&	-.71**	.01	.56*	.37	
27	Lantern purchased since 1997	logit	568	-.457*	-.40	-.92*	-.54&	-.18	.20	
28	HH has a plough	logit	924	-.811***	-.07	-.99**	-.09	.28	-.65*	
29	Plough purchased since 1997	logit	258	-1.56***	.33	.26	-.21	-.11	.12	
30	HH has a fishing net	logit	924	-2.33***	-.48	.35	-.29	.24	.97**	
31	Fishing net purchased since 1997	logit	94	1.39*	-1.39	.29	-.92	1.48&	-.34	
32	HH has a boat	logit	924	-3.00***	-.29	-.17	-.27	-.37	1.09*	
33	HH has a pit latrine	logit	924	.083	.12	-1.28***	-.41&	.29	-.52*	
34	Pit latrine purchased/built since 1997	logit	434	.693**	.10	.29	-.34	.19	-.96	
35	Number of cattle owned	OLS	924	2.17***	-.22	-1.02&	.05	.77	.17	
36	Number of goats owned	OLS	924	2.92	-.94	-1.13&	-.37	.48	.66	
37	Number of sheep owned	OLS	924	.887	-.32	-.41&	-.46*	-.30	-.53*	
38	Number of chickens owned	OLS	924	7.28	.19	-1.24	.27	.93	.98	
Number of effects significant at $\alpha=5\%$ level						1	6	2	5	5
Number of lines on which there is an insider–stranger effect						11/21				

(continued)

Supplement A. Continued

		Type of Interviewer							
		Type of model	N	Female		Male			
Earnings				Stranger (Reference)	Female Acquaint.	Female Insider	Stranger	Acquaint.	Insider
39	Earns a monthly salary	logit	924	−4.42***	1.32	1.68*	1.16	1.54*	1.32
40	Sells from the shamba	logit	924	.059	−.06	.45	−.18	−.13	−.52*
41	Amount earned from shamba last month	tobit	427	736***	355	−190	−8.00	491*	338
42	Works for someone else	logit	924	1.58***	.59*	−.86*	.34	−.02	−.00
43	Amount earned working for someone else last month	tobit	173	355*	272	324	−13.3	141	249
44	Sells fish	logit	924	−1.62***	−.12	−.36	−.02	−.02	.51&
45	Amount earned selling fish last month	tobit	155	1073***	−280	206	−617	−291	−468
46	Sells beer	logit	924	4.42***	1.13	.54	.58	−.21	.37
47	Has a small business	logit	924	.396*	−.04	.96***	.07	.09	.38
48	Amount earned from small business last month	tobit	382	783***	73	−323	296	503&	899**
49	Loan from income generating group	logit	924	−2.77***	−.53	−1.82&	−.85	−.12	.01
50	Money from “credit–merry–go–round”	logit	924	−1.01***	.17	1.07***	−.38	−.11	−.29
51	Amount from credit–merry–go–round”	tobit	252	731***	175	−293	325	508&	467
52	Relative sent money	logit	924	2.01***	.03	−.57	−.25	.02	.09
53	Amount relative sent	tobit	102	1060***	−225	−46	−199	140	−117
Number of effects significant at $\alpha=5\%$ level					1	4	0	2	2
Number of lines on which there is an insider–stranger effect					7/15				

(continued)

Supplement A. Continued

Family Planning (FP)		Type of model	N	Type of Interviewer					
				Female Stranger (Reference)	Female Acquaint.	Female Insider	Male Stranger	Male Acquaint.	Male Insider
54	Disagree with spouse about FP	logit	924	-1.49***	.28	.12	-.11	-.10	.21
55	Never talked to spouse about FP	logit	924	-.178	-.17	.61*	.09	-.46*	-.22
56	Ever used modern FP	logit	924	-1.17	.55*	.03	.29	.51*	.55*
57	Currently using modern FP	logit	280	.210	.09	.49	-.34	-.34	-.42
58	Knows of women secretly using FP	logit	924	.571***	-.01	-.79**	-.20	-.14	.41
59	Number of known secret users	OLS	565	2.67***	-.18	.49	.02	.28	-.15
60	Heard about vasectomy	logit	923	-.783***	.16	.09	-.20	.32	-.11
Number of effects significant at $\alpha=5\%$ level					1	2	0	2	1
Number of lines on which there is an insider-stranger effect					3/7				

(continued)

Supplement A. Continued

			Type of Interviewer						
Gender Attitudes			Female Stranger (Reference)	Female Acquaint.	Female Insider	Male Stranger	Male Acquaint.	Male Insider	
	Type of model	N							
A wife can leave her husband if:									
61	He disrespects her family	logit	924	-1.01***	.13	-.07	.40&	.54*	.24
62	He doesn't attend her family funerals	logit	924	-2.01***	-.67	-.57	.02	-.35	-.26
63	He doesn't support her financially	logit	924	-.623***	.51*	-.26	.21	.39&	.33
64	He beats their children frequently	logit	924	-1.20***	.11	-.52	-.44	-.29	-.26
65	He beats her frequently	logit	924	.623***	.44&	-.85**	-.01	.35	-.01
66	He drinks too much	logit	924	-.597***	.22	-.33	.09	.07	.02
67	He is sexually unfaithful	logit	922	.867***	-.03	.39	-.01	.05	-.02
68	She thinks he is infected with AIDS	logit	923	-.622***	.28	-.88**	.12	.35&	.30
A husband can leave his wife if:									
69	She disrespects his family	logit	924	-.226***	.08	-.66*	.22	.32	.73**
70	She neglects HH chores	logit	924	-.396***	.17	-.74**	-.08	.22	-.58*
71	She doesn't follow his orders	logit	924	.811***	.67*	-.91***	.34	.29	.04
72	She beats their children frequently	logit	924	-1.70***	.68*	-.48	-.18	.04	.13
73	She fights him frequently	logit	922	.435**	-.04	-1.22***	-.34	-.13	-.04
74	She drinks too much	logit	924	.571***	-.08	-1.04***	.19	.00	-.06
75	She is sexually unfaithful	logit	924	1.84***	.13	-1.75***	.35	.01	-.01
76	He thinks she is infected with AIDS	logit	923	-.470**	-.33	-.84**	.03	.32	.35
Needs to ask permission before going:									
77	To the clinic	logit	924	-1.45***	-.52	-.73&	-.44	-.29	-.46
78	To the market	logit	924	-2.01***	.27	-.57	-.25	.06	-.36
79	To visit someone else in the village	logit	924	-1.20***	-.99**	-.88*	-.74*	-1.04***	-.38
80	To visit someone outside the village	logit	924.	.984***	-.43&	.59&	.38	.04	-.17
Number of effects significant at $\alpha=5\%$ level					4	10	1	2	2
Number of lines on which there is an insider–stranger effect					12/20				

(continued)

Supplement A. Continued

		Type of Interviewer							
		Type of model	N	Female Stranger (Reference)	Female Acquaint.	Female Insider	Male Stranger	Male Acquaint.	Male Insider
81	FP Networks Number people talked to about family planning	OLS	924	4.59***	-.38	3.21***	.016	1.02&	1.81**
	Talked about FP with:								
82	Father	logit	924	-3.00***	.06	.07	-.13	-.09	-.64
83	Father-in-law	logit	923	-2.40***	.04	-.76	-.39	-1.11*	-.53
84	Mother	logit	924	-1.42***	-.44	-.39	-.15	-.36	.01
85	Mother-in-law	logit	806	-4.42***	.60	.96	1.00	.90	N/A
86	Brother	logit	924	-1.85***	-.35	.20	-.24	.03	.14
87	Other male relative	logit	923	-1.95***	-.51	-.47	-.14	.39	.60&
88	Sister	logit	924	-.78***	-.03	-.10	.03	.15	.20
89	Other female relative	logit	923	.036	-.21	1.00***	.38&	.35&	.74**
90	Sister in law	logit	923	-.130	.30	1.57***	-.05	-.15	-.06
91	Workmates	logit	922	-3.71***	.42	.97	.71	1.09&	.96
92	Brother in law	logit	923	-2.07***	-.13	-1.10&	.17	.08	-.20
93	Friends	logit	924	-.225	.05	.87**	.01	.42*	.92***
94	Community based distributor (CBD)	logit	924	-1.90***	.05	-.18	.22	.55&	.19
95	Nurses	logit	924	2.32***	.97	.84	.18	.03	.16
96	Teachers or their spouses	logit	924	-1.04***	-.13	-1.14	-.22	-.13	-.21
97	The local chief or his spouse	logit	924	-3.49***	.19	.32	.22	.27	-1.26
	Number of effects significant at $\alpha=5\%$ level				0	4	0	2	3
	Number of lines on which there is an insider-stranger effect			5/17					

(continued)

Supplement A. Continued

AIDS		Type of model	N	Type of Interviewer					
				Female Stranger (Reference)	Female Acquaint.	Female Insider	Male Stranger	Male Acquaint.	Male Insider
98	Used protection against AIDS at least once	logit	923	.420***	.07	-.17	-.15	.34	.30
99	Used abstinence to protect against AIDS	logit	384	-1.08***	.36	-.31	.18	.59&	-.69
100	Used sex only with spouse to protect against AIDS	logit	349	3.48***	-.57	N/A	.35	-.01	1.56&
101	Used condoms to protect against AIDS	logit	384	-1.74***	.60	-.63	.78&	.64	.76&
102	Talked to spouse about chance of catching AIDS	logit	923	.729***	-.01	-.77**	.05	.34	.52
103	Talked about AIDS protection with spouse	logit	923	-.954***	-.11	-.95***	-.10	.17	.51&
104	Comfortable suggesting using condoms with spouse	logit	922	-.675***	-.35	-1.39***	-.15	-.32	-.02
105	Thinks that spouse is probably not faithful	logit	922	-.347*	-.03	-.95**	.28	.23	.16
106	“Can't know” if spouse is faithful	logit	922	-1.04***	-.21	-.52	-.16	.07	-.02
107	Most likely to catch AIDS from:								
108	Spouse	logit	922	-.702***	.21	-.12	-.10	-.06	-.27
109	Other partner	logit	922	-2.66***	-.86	2.34***	.13	.48	.05
110	Best friend has had extra-marital sex in last year	logit	922	-.298&	-.02	.89**	.26	.32	.45
111	Best friend's # of non-marital sex partners (last year)	OLS	187	.197***	-.68*	-.16	-.27	-.48*	-.30
Number of effects significant at $\alpha=5\%$ level					1	6	0	1	0
Number of lines on which there is an insider-stranger effect					7/13				

(continued)

Supplement A. Continued

		Type of Interviewer								
		Type of model	N	Female Stranger (Reference)	Female Acquaint.	Female Insider	Male Stranger	Male Acquaint.	Male Insider	
AIDS Networks										
112	Number talked to about AIDS	OLS	923	7.06***	-1.64&	-.43	-.71	-1.49&	.12	
Talked about AIDS with:										
113	Father	logit	923	-2.48***	-.46	.31	-.41	-.31	-.62	
114	Father-in-law	logit	922	-2.07***	-.05	-1.09&	-.26	-.48	-1.27	
115	Mother	logit	923	-1.17***	-.56&	-.62&	-.51&	-.87**	-.41	
116	Mother-in-law	logit	922	-2.88***	.20	.31	-.39	-1.05&	-1.88&	
117	Brother	logit	923	-1.13***	-.20	-.50	.10	.07	-.02	
118	Other male relative	logit	922	-1.20***	.22	-.04	.19	.49*	.47&	
119	Sister	logit	923	-.546**	-.34	-.37	-.19	-.20	-.23	
120	Other female relative	logit	923	.347*	-.23	.62*	-.17	-.02	.42&	
121	Sister in law	logit	923	-.470**	.27	1.65***	.03	.22	.21	
122	Workmates	logit	922	-4.01***	1.34*	1.28&	1.55*	1.23&	.67	
123	Brother in law	logit	923	-1.42***	-.02	-.15	.21	.16	.06	
124	Friends	logit	922	-.107	-.18	.65*	-.19	.01	.30	
125	Community based distributor (CBD)	logit	922	-1.85***	-.71&	-1.61*	-.24	-.01	-.42	
126	Nurses	logit	922	-2.88***	-.22	-.58	-.08	-.17	-.12	
127	Teachers or their spouses	logit	922	-1.42***	.25	-.46	.15	-.05	.31	
Number of effects significant at $\alpha=5\%$ level						1	4	1	2	0
Number of lines on which there is an insider-stranger effect										7/15

Notes: Significantly different from predicted value for “female stranger” at: *** = .01 level; ** = .05 level; * = .10 level.

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT

to article in

American Sociological Review, 2006, Vol. 71 (December:1014–1039)

Supplement B. Assessing Selectivity

Steps were taken to explore the impact of two types of selectivity on the estimates. The first refers to the impact of survey attrition, whether associated with experiences in previous rounds of the survey, or with respondent's general preferences. The second refers to the effect of non-random interviewer assignment with respect to level of insidersness, that is, the extent to which insider-interviewers were more likely to know those with given characteristics.

In order to assess the effect of the first type of selectivity, the correlation between K2 to K3 attrition and any observed characteristics of the interview in K2 was estimated. The latter included length of the interview, interviewer's sex and interviewer's insidersness. There was no statistically significant correlation (even at the 10 percent level). Second, a set of parallel models was estimated using standard regression techniques and Heckman selection models, in which the latter used K2 variables correlated with survey attrition between K2 and K3. Where p , the correlation between the two Heckman equations' residuals u_1 and u_2 , was not equal to zero (Wald tests with significance levels set to 10 percent)—indicating support for estimating a Heckman model—Hausman specification tests were used to test for systematic differences among the coefficients (between the standard regression and the Heckman selection model; again at 10 percent level). In only one case were those tests positive, the estimates of response variability for “current use of contraception.” Partly because of this, but also because of the difficulty in identifying the trajectory of the social desirability bias with any certainty, final

validity-focused analysis does not include estimates for family-planning related variables.

A parallel set of models were also specified in order to check whether non-random interviewer assignment affected estimated response variability by interviewer's insidersness. As mentioned in the text, the K3 level of insidersness in the interviewer-respondent match is correlated with four K2 indicators of mobility and attitudes to family planning: can speak Kiswahili, has lived in Nairobi, has talked to her husband about family planning, and number of network partners with whom the respondent has spoken to about family planning. A preliminary regression of K3 level of insidersness on three of these K2 variables was specified (“lived in Nairobi” had no independent effect in combination with “speaks Kiswahili” so was dropped). The residual from that equation—defined as the “uncorrelated level of insidersness”—was used in a parallel series of bivariate regressions on the 11 variables listed in Table 3 (limiting the sample to those women interviewed in both K2 and K3). Subsequent Wald tests checked for differences in the value of the estimated coefficients in the two types of models, that is, one set using the observed level of insidersness as the independent variable, and the other using the residual “uncorrelated level of insidersness”. In no case was the difference significant, even at the $p < .25$ level. For ease of computation—primarily because it allows for the use of the whole K3 sample—the estimates discussed in the validity-focused analysis are therefore constructed using the observed K3 level of insidersness rather than this “uncorrelated” measure.