

The Impact of the Presence of Others  
on a Respondent's Answers to Questions

Tom W. Smith

NORC  
University of Chicago

GSS Methodological Report No. 86

December, 1995

This research was done for the General Social Survey project directed by James A. Davis and Tom W. Smith. The project is supported by the National Science Foundation, Grant No. SES-9122462.



In order to insure privacy and reduce social desirability effects survey organizations usually instruct interviewers to try to interview respondents alone (Bradburn and Sudman, 1979). For example, the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) indicates the following:

The Need for Privacy. Social science research seeks accurate and complete answers to questions that sometimes are of a sensitive nature. A quiet area in which to conduct the interview is crucial. The presence of others may bias the answers. This sometimes requires tact and ingenuity to avoid an audience. The interviewer must inform the respondent that it is necessary to conduct the interview in private, in order to protect his/her confidentiality. Under ideal circumstances, the interview is conducted in a private room equipped with good lighting and a table on which to work. However, these things are often not available, so the interviewer will need to improvise, trying to stay as close as possible to the ideal.

Basic Interviewing Techniques, p. 6<sup>1</sup>

However, achieving the ideal of a private interview is rather difficult. In high-quality, national, in-person surveys conducted by the NORC, University of Chicago, and the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, a third person is present between 37 to 57% of the time (Table 1A). The level has been declining over time from 55-57% in 1966-1972 to 37% in 1994. This is primarily the result in a decline in household size.<sup>2</sup> Likewise, the percent with a spouse present fell from 32% in the 1960s to 18% in 1994 as the percent of adults who were married declined from 74.0% in 1972 to 60.4% in 1994.

When a survey deals with sensitive topics and the protocols reemphasize and strengthen the general admonition against the presence of others, the frequency of third parties can be reduced further. In NORC's 1975 Leisure Study and its 1992 National Health and Social Life Survey, stringent exclusion rules reduced the presence of spouses by about two-thirds (to 8-11% in 1975 and 6% in 1992) and cut the presence of third parties in general by almost

---

<sup>1</sup>NORC repeatedly emphasizes privacy and confidentiality in its training materials, but does not explicitly mention avoiding third parties elsewhere in the manuals. Individual projects may also add a specific caution about avoiding third parties (see below).

<sup>2</sup>According to the General Social Survey from 1972 to 1994 the % of households with only a single member increased from 9.5% to 25.4%. Likewise, the % with only a single adult increased from 12.1% in 1972 to 32.4% in 1994.

half (to 26% in 1975 and 21% in 1992).<sup>3</sup>

Spouses and children are by far the most frequently occurring third parties during interviews (Table 1B). Each are present during 18% of interviews. Other adult relatives are present only 3% of the time and adult non-relatives are around 5% of the time. Spouses are present about one-third of the time when the respondent is married (Table 1A).

Thus, third parties are a common enough occurrence to potentially have a serious impact on responses, if respondents actually provide different answers when others are present during an interview.

Past research on the problems and biases created by third parties during an interview is rather limited. First, there are relatively few studies. We are aware of less than 10 studies that empirically examine the actual impact of the presence of others on responses. (A number of other studies discuss the issue, but do not carry out any analysis of impacts.) Second, several studies focus on the presence of a spouse rather than of third parties in general. Aquilino (1993), which is the most thorough investigation of third-party effects, only looks at spouses as does Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, and Michaels (1994). Third, several studies rely on only bivariate comparisons without considering that households with third parties present might be systematically different from those without others present (Taietz, 1962; Silver, Abramson, and Anderson, 1986). In effect, they are treating the presence of others as a randomized, experimental effect, which it is certainly not (Aquilino, 1993).

---

<sup>3</sup>In the 1975 Leisure Study "Interviewers had been trained to get third parties out, if possible" (Bradburn and Sudman, 1979). For NHSLS, the "Interviewer Manual" instructed:

Establish and maintain privacy. Because of the sensitive nature of this interview, it is imperative that you interview the R alone. This will make it easier to create and control the atmosphere of professional comfort which you need.

It might be necessary for you to interview the respondent at another [sic] sight.... Also, if you are interrupted during the course of the interview, stop asking questions. This will often signal the respondent to reestablish privacy for you.

In addition the "Home Study Exercises for FI's Not Attending the Project Briefing" trained interviewers about how to handle the following scenario "You are doing the survey with a 19 year old young woman who lives at home. Her mother who answered the SSQ is very curious about her daughter's sexual activity and is in the nearby kitchen "working" but listening. Although [you] are supposedly in a private room, you suspect her presence is influencing your respondent's answers. What do you say and do?"

## Analysis

To examine the impact of the presence of others on the responses, we analyzed Sample B of the 1994 General Social Survey (GSS) which included an item on third parties (Table 1B). The 1994 GSS is a full-probability sample of adults living in households in the United States (Davis and Smith, 1994). Separate analyses will be conducted of the impact of the presence of spouses, of children (under 6 and 6+), and of others in general.

First, in looking at the impact of spouses we restricted analysis to married respondents. Four group of variables were examined: 1) questions about gender roles, including several that refer to the gendered roles of spouses and parents, 2) questions relating to marriage, 3) questions relating to sexual attitudes and behaviors, including two dealing with adultery, and 4) miscellaneous questions having to do with items that a) show gender differences, b) are sensitive to other reporting effects, and/or c) reflect indirectly on the respondent's marriage (Table 2). Except for one barely statistically significant relationship (which is explained away by demographic controls), none of the 15 variables in the Marriage, Sexual Matters, or Miscellaneous groups are affected by the presence of a spouse during the interview.

However, 5 of the 8 gender role items and 4 of the 5 not dealing with politics show statistically significant relationships. In each case (for both the statistically significant relationships and for the others) the presence of a spouse is associated with more support for traditional roles for women (e.g. that children suffer if their mother works or that women should help their husband's career rather than have a career of their own). Table 3 shows that this relationship prevails even when we examine it by the gender of the respondent and the labor force participation of the wife. In 29 of 32 comparisons (8 items \* 2 genders \* two labor force statuses for wife) the presence of a spouse is associated with more conservative attitudes. However, because of the small sample size only 5 of these 29 associations are statistically significant at the .05 level. Looking at the first column of figures, we see that in 7 of 8 comparisons a man with a wife who works outside the home is more likely to express a traditional response when his wife is present (in two cases the difference is statistically significant). Thus, in this case the presence of a wife who works outside the home is associated with a husband indicating more conservative attitudes towards gender roles (as does the presence of a spouse under the other conditions as well). However, rather than being counter-intuitive this specific relationship (as well as the general impact of the presence of a spouse on a respondent's attitudes on gender roles) is merely spurious.

This can be demonstrated if we make a scale of the four items having to do with domestic, gender roles (the last four items in Tables 2A and 3). The presence of a spouse during the interview is associated with this feminist scale with a regression coefficient of .148 (prob.=.0005; N=543). When controls are entered into this

model using variables similar to those that Aquilino (1993) has shown are predictive of spousal presence (years of education of respondent and spouse, age, gender, race, number of children, labor force status of respondent and spouse, and dwelling type), the coefficient is reduced to .035 and becomes statistically insignificant (prob.=.387). In addition, a model that adds religious affiliation and political ideology further reduces the coefficient to .013 (prob.=.734).

In sum, with proper controls for the differences in family and household structure and organization there is no evidence that the presence of a spouse influences responses.

Next, Table 4 examines the impact of young and older children on questions dealing with 1) child values, 2) sexual matters concerning youths, and 3) other items related to children. With no controls 3 of the 26 relationships are statistically significant. Controlling for the presence in the household of children in the two respective age ranges eliminates two of these relationships. The one statistically significant relationship is that in households with children 6 or older 42% said premarital sex was "always wrong" when a child 6 or older was present, but only 33% said "always wrong" with no such child present. This corresponded to a regression coefficient of .188 (prob.=.003). In various regression models controlling for variables like age, education, church attendance, political liberalism, race, gender, and marital status, this relationship was reduced to as low as .127, but remained statistically significant (prob.=.031). Earlier research (Smith, 1994) found that having a teenager in the household made respondents less approving of premarital sex. These results suggest that the effect is strengthened by the presence of the teenager during the interview. Both having teenagers and having a child 6+ present probably makes respondents think more in terms of premarital sex among young people in general and/or their child in particular rather than among unmarried adults and this makes respondents less permissive.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, Table 5 shows the impact of people in general on a respondent's answers. Two measures of the presence of others are used. The first indicates whether anyone else is present (ignoring number and type of person). The second indicates the number of people present (ignoring type of person). We compared these two measures by four groups of variables 1) sexual matters, 2) religious items, 3) personal evaluations, and 4) evaluations of people in general. For each measure 3 of the 13 associations were statistically significant. However, the results are not especially reinforcing since for only one measure (on the trustworthiness of people) are the associations statistically significant for both measures.

Of the five measures that showed a significant association

---

<sup>4</sup>When the GSS explicitly brings up teenage, premarital sexual activity in a follow-up question, "always wrong" increases from 26.0% for PREMARSX to 69.8% for TEENSEX.

with the presence of others based on the chi-squared statistic, only three showed statistically significant bivariate regression coefficients and with controls for household size, age, education, race, and marital status only self-reported health status showed a statistically significant association (Table 5B).

For this one remaining relationship when someone else was present people rated their health less positively (29% excellent) than when no one was around (34% excellent). While only marginally significant, this relationship also showed up for the number of people present (0=35% excellent, 1=31%, 2+=23.5%). The general model used in Table 5B failed to explain away this association. Other regression models were also tried to explain away the association of health ratings with the presence of others during the interview adding such variables as household income and gender, but the coefficient was not materially changed and always remained statistically significant.

### Discussion

Overall, the impact of third persons on survey responses are fairly rare and mostly small. Most apparent impacts of the presence of others turn out to be spurious, resulting from the fact that the presence of others is related both to major differences in household structure and organization and presumably to preference differentials on the part of respondents and the others. We found no statistically significant differences associated with the presence of spouses which is consistent with findings of (Bradburn and Sudman, 1979; Silver, Abramson, and Anderson, 1986; and Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, and Michaels, 1994). Aquilino (1993) does show spousal effects in 3 of 13 comparisons when a spouse was present for at least part of the interview and in 7 of 13 cases when the spouse was present during the whole interview. In part these differences may emerge because the Aquilino items were more closely related to marital matters than ours were overall. But none of our measures covering intimate, marriage-related matters (e.g. marital happiness, gender roles within a marriage) showed significant differences. In addition, it is noteworthy that for cases involving a spouse present during the whole interview Aquilino found all of his differences on self-completion items (7 of 10) rather than on items asked and answered out loud. This differs from our comparisons which included only a single self-completion item (EVSTRAY). Finally, the differences in statistically significant findings maybe partly result from the fact that Aquilino had a sample size of up to 6,882 married people compared to 849 in our study.

Our results on the impact of children and others in general showed two fairly isolated results. This is consistent with other research (Bradburn and Sudman, 1979 and Silver, Abramson, and Anderson, 1986). In general, we are lead to conclude with them that "survey data generally are immune to the presence of others" (Bradburn and Sudman, 1979) and "the tendency of many respondents to give the socially approved answer is not strongly affected by

the presence of others during the interview" (Silver, Abramson, and Anderson, 1986).

To the limited extent that third-party effect do occur, it is uncertain whether they increase or decrease measurement error. The assumption of most research is that they increase error by reducing privacy and increasing social desirability effects. But Weinberg (1983), based on many years supervising surveys - but no quantitative data, argues that the presence of both spouses is often beneficial since it promotes "better recall about facts and figures, the assumption being that 'two heads are better than one'." This idea is supported by a) the literature on proxy respondents which suggests that self-reports on non-sensitive factual items are more accurate than proxy reports (Smith, 1985; Blair, Menon, and Bickart, 1991) and b) the literature on fact checking that indicates that behavioral reports based on checking with other knowledgeable people or personal records (e.g. medical bills) are more accurate than unassisted reports (Bradburn and Sudman, 1979; Groves, 1989; Dutka and Frankel, 1991).

This notion is also supported by two findings of Aquilino. First, he noted that "On factual items, spouse presence appeared to be associated with an increased, rather than a decreased tendency to reveal sensitive information about the marital relationship...This research does not suggest that spouse presence always increases response bias." Second, since most or all of his significant relationships occur on self-completion items which the spouse is does not overhear, it is hard to credit self-presentation towards third parties as the main motivating factor. It would appear that the mere presence of the spouse affects some responses. This would probably be by altering cognitive processing by the respondent and this would be as likely to improve reporting as bias it.

The strongest argument for minimizing the presence of others is the growing survey literature that indicates that people give more accurate responses to sensitive question when self-completion and other privacy enhancing procedures as implemented (Tourangeau and Smith, 1995). Under this logic the presence of others should reduce truthful reports at least for sensitive matters. The fact that we detected little of this may mean that the addition of a personal intimate does not heighten self-presentation bias more than that created by the interviewer herself. Both our findings of few statistically significant effects and Aquilino findings of few or no statistically significant effects for spoken questions suggests that third parties may not typically increase social desirability effects.

To further our understanding of third-party effects a number of steps should be taken. First, more information is needed about the nature of the third party presence. Often all that is known is whether a person was physically present for some unspecified period during the interview and what type of person was present. Occasionally, it is recorded whether third parties were present for the whole interview or only part of the interview and if present for only a part during which sections the third party was present.



Beyond these facts it would be useful to have interviewers assess the degree of third-party involvement (e.g. ignored interview to actively influenced responses) and whether the respondent seemed to be affected by the presence of others. Second, none of the existing studies have examined whether certain types of respondents are more affected by the presence of others than other types of respondents. For example, does it vary by respondent's gender or educational level? Third, we need to know more about what type of questions are more or less susceptible to third-party effects. Aquilino's work suggests that questions that directly involve the third party are most influenced, while none of the existing research suggests that demographics are affected. Fourth, we need validation studies to know whether any detected effects increase or reduce measurement error. This may well interact with type of question. Based on current research we might expect some possible improvement in reports of non-sensitive, household-level behaviors and non-threatening, spousal characteristics (e.g. respectively on past vacations or spouse's job history). However, sensitive items about the respondent, the third party, or about their relationship might suffer from greater self-presentation bias. Validation studies such as the voting records checks used by Silver, Abramson, and Anderson (1986) can ascertain relative bias (see also Sudman and Bradburn, 1974). Fourth, more focus needs to be placed on understanding why effects occur. The prevailing social desirability argument must be seriously questioned in light a) the rarity of observed effects and b) Aquilino's finding that effects are more likely to occur on self-completion items than read aloud items.<sup>5</sup> Instead, cognitive theories that suggest that recall is influenced by the presence of others should be tested. Finally, the testing of theories of third party effects would be advanced by the use of experimental studies. In experiments the presence of a spouse, child, or other could be randomly assigned. For example, couples could be recruited for a survey and then interviewed under various randomized conditions (e.g. both individually and alone, each individually in the presence of the other, both simultaneously while together). This would eliminate the need for elaborate controls to explain away the non-experimental presence of others and allow a clearer testing of third-party effects. Likewise, items could be varied by mode of administration to separate sensitivity level from method. By following these research avenues we should be able to gain a more complete understanding of the frequency, nature, and cause of third-party effects.

---

<sup>5</sup>But we don't know if very intrusive third parties were looking over respondent's shoulders as the self-completion questionnaires were filled out. Also, since the most sensitive questions were placed on the self-completion forms we have mode and sensitivity confounded.

Table 1

Presence of Others During an Interview

A. Spouse and Anyone

	Spouse Present (Married)	Spouse Present (All)	Someone Present (All)	
NES, 1966	--	32%	56%	(1,279)
NES, 1968	--	32%	55%	(1,535)
NES, 1970	--	32%	57%	(1,490)
NES, 1972	--	31%	55%	(2,690)
Leisure Study, 1975 <sup>a</sup>	--	8-11%	26%	(1,172)
NES, 1976	--	23%	46%	(2,847)
NES, 1978	--	26%	51%	(2,290)
NES, 1980	--	24%	50%	(1,613)
NES, 1982	--	25%	45%	(1,416)
National Survey of Families and Households, 1987-88 <sup>b</sup>	36%	--	--	(6,882)
National Health and Social Life Survey, 1992 <sup>c</sup>	--	6%	21%	(3,432)
GSS, 1994 <sup>c</sup>	32%	18%	37%	(1,474)

<sup>a</sup>Percent present at start of interview. Percent present at anytime during interview would be higher, but "only a few third parties enter after the interview has begun" (Bradburn and Sudman, 1979, p. 138).

<sup>b</sup>Present for at least 15 minutes during interviews averaging 102 minutes.

<sup>c</sup>Spouse or partner.

Sources: NES (National Election Studies) - Silver, Abramson, and Anderson, 1986; Leisure Study - Bradburn and Sudman, 1979; National Survey of Families and Households - Aquilino, 1993; National Health and Social Life Survey - Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, and Michaels, 1994.

Table 1 (continued)

B. Types of Presences, 1994 GSS

Children under 6	12%
Older Children	7%
Spouse	18%
Other Relatives	3%
Other Adults	5%
No One	62.9%
One Person	27.9 <sup>a</sup>
Two Persons	6.5
Three-Four Persons	2.6

(1472)

<sup>a</sup>Strictly speaking this indicates that there was a person present in one of the categories listed above. We do not know if there are one or more than one person within a category (e.g. one child under 6 or 2+ children under 6). Thus, these are lower end estimates of the actual number of people present.

Wording: What other persons were present during the interview?  
CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.

- CHILDREN UNDER 6.....1
- OLDER CHILDREN.....2
- SPOUSE/PARTNER.....3
- OTHER RELATIVES.....4
- OTHER ADULTS.....5
- NO ONE.....6

Table 2

The Impact of the Presence of a Spouse on Responses  
(Among Married Respondents)

	Prob.
<b>A. Gender Roles</b>	
Men Should Run Country (FEHOME)	.039
Women Shouldn't Work (FEWORK)	.005
Vote for Woman for President (FEPRES)	.770
Men Emotionally Better for Politics (FEPOL)	.164
Working Mother, Warm/Secure with Children (FECHLD)	.005
Help Husband's Career (FEHELP)	.078
Mother Works, Preschoolers Suffer (FEPRESCH)	.008
Man should be Achiever Outside Home (FEFAM)	.000
<b>B. Marriage</b>	
Easier Divorce Laws (DIVLAW)	.385
Marital Happiness (HAPMAR)	.492
<b>C. Sexual Matters</b>	
Approve of Premarital Sex (PREMARSX)	.241
Approve of Extra-marital Sex (XMARSEX)	.536
Watch X-rated movie (XMOVIE)	.409
Engaged in Extra-marital Sex (EVSTRAY)	.867
<b>D. Miscellaneous</b>	
Afraid to Walk Alone at Night (FEAR)	.083
Attend Church (ATTEND)	.050
Refused Family Income (INCOME91)	.598
Ideal number of Children (CHLDIDEL)	.547
Hours Watching TV Daily (TVHOURS)	.742
Life Exciting/Dull (LIFE)	.346
Young People should 'Do Own Thing' (OWNTHING)	.533
Financial Satisfaction (SATFIN)	.119
Visit Bar (SOCBAR)	.217

N=546-849

Wordings: Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Women should take care of running their homes and leave running the country up to men. (FEHOME)  
Do you approve of a married woman earning money in business or industry if she has a husband capable of supporting her? (FEWORK)  
If your party nominated a woman for President, would you vote for her if she were qualified for the job? (FEPRES)

Table 2 (continued)

Tell me if you agree or disagree with this statement: Most men are better suited emotionally for politics than are most women. (FEPOL) Now I'm going to read several more statements. As I read each one, please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with it. A. A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work. (FECHLD) B. It is more important for a wife to help her husband's career than to have one herself. (FEHELP) C. A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works. (FEPRESCH) D. It is much better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside and the woman takes care of the home and family. (FEFAM)

Should divorce in this country be easier or more difficult to obtain than it is now? (DIVLAW)

Taking things altogether, how would you describe your marriage? Would you say that your marriage is very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy? (HAPMAR)

If a man and a woman have sex relations before marriage, do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all? (PREMARSEX)

What is your opinion about a married person having sexual relations with someone other than the marriage partner--is it always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all? (XMARSEX)

Have you seen an X-rated movie in the last year? (XMOVIE)

Have you ever had sex with someone other than your husband or wife while you were married? (EVSTRAY)

Is there any area around here, that is, within a mile--where you would be afraid to walk alone at night? (FEAR)

How often do you attend religious services? (ATTEND)

In which of these groups did your total family income, from all sources, fall last year --1993--before taxes, that is? (INCOME91)

What do you think is the ideal number of children for a family to have? (CHLDIDEL)

On the average day, about how many hours do you personally watch television? (TVHOURS)

In general, do you find life exciting, pretty routine, or dull? (LIFE)

Now I'm going to read you several statements. For each one please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly. It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don't like and to 'do their own thing.' (OWNTHING)

We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. So far as you and your family are concerned, would you say that you are pretty well satisfied with your present financial situation, more or less satisfied, or not satisfied at all? (SATFIN)

Would you use this card and tell me which answer comes closest to how often you do the following: Go to a bar or tavern? (SOCBAR)

Table 3

The Impact of the Presence of a Spouse on Responses  
by Gender and Wife's Labor Force Status

% Giving Traditional/Anti-feminist Response

Respondent's Gender Wife's Labor Force Status	Male	Male	Female	Female
	Worker	Home	Worker	Home
<b>Men Should Run Country</b>				
Spouse Present	10.5	26.2	13.1	33.3
Spouse Not Present	8.7	13.2	7.1	19.8
Prob.	.732	.150	.176	.291
N	135	76	206	70
<b>Women Shouldn't Work</b>				
Spouse Present	32.1	34.5	18.8	30.8
Spouse Not Present	11.7	12.2	17.9	26.9
Prob.	.004	.024	.875	.773
N	141	71	206	70
<b>Vote for Woman President</b>				
Spouse Present	7.1	12.7	4.0	23.1
Spouse Not Present	2.3	6.5	3.9	19.6
Prob.	.170	.355	.957	.773
N	140	76	207	68
<b>Men, Emotions, Politics</b>				
Spouse Present	16.5	49.2	16.1	30.8
Spouse Not Present	14.8	17.8	17.7	28.0
Prob.	.801	.004	.795	.838
N	134	74	203	68
<b>Working Mother and Children</b>				
Spouse Present	42.2	53.6	21.8	46.1
Spouse Not Present	32.0	45.3	20.9	32.1
Prob.	.292	.356	.070	.742
N	142	78	209	71
<b>Help Husband's Career</b>				
Spouse Present	13.6	47.8	20.2	41.7
Spouse Not Present	18.9	30.8	15.8	23.1
Prob.	.070	.203	.378	.141
N	136	71	207	69
<b>Mother Works, Preschoolers</b>				
Spouse Present	52.0	79.7	24.2	75.0
Spouse Not Present	45.2	54.7	27.5	36.8
Prob.	.690	.038	.929	.092
N	141	78	208	70
<b>Men Outside Achiever</b>				
Spouse Present	37.6	73.8	34.6	50.0
Spouse Not Present	17.7	60.2	24.1	41.7
Prob.	.030	.271	.231	.728
N	138	75	207	71

Table 4

The Impact of the Presence of Children  
on Questions Relating to Children

(Probability Level)

	Child Under 6		Child 6+	
	No Controls	Children in House	No Controls	Children in House
<b>Child Values</b>				
Obedience (OBEY)	.335	---	.155	---
Being Popular (POPULAR)	.112	---	.289	---
Think for Self (THNKSELF)	.065	---	.966	---
Work Hard (WORKHARD)	.310	---	.993	---
Help Others (HELPOTH)	.122	---	.421	---
Obey and Respect (OBRESPCT)	.441	---	.009	.237
Obey/Think (OBEYTHNK)	.781	---	.350	---
<b>Sexual Matters</b>				
Contraceptives for Teens (PILLOK)	.162	---	.481	---
Sex Education (SEXEDUC)	.707	---	.350	---
Premarital Sex (PREMARSX)	.348	---	.013	.009
Teenage Sex (TEENSEX)	.108	---	.144	---
<b>Other</b>				
Spank Children (SPANKING)	.041	.799	.175	---
Spend for Schools (NATEDUC)	.205	---	.053	---

N=938-1372 without controls for number of children in household.  
About 235 for children under 6 and 250 for children 6+.

Wordings: If you had to choose, which thing on this list would you pick as the most important for a child to learn to prepare him or her for life? To obey (OBEY)? To be well-liked or popular (POPULAR)? To think for himself or herself (THNKSELF)? To work hard (WORKHARD)? To help others when they need help (HELPOTH)?

Please respond to the following statements by saying whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with them: Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn (OBRESPCT).

Which of these would you say is most important in preparing children for life... To be Obedient. To think for themselves (OBEYTHNK).

Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that

Table 4 (continued)

methods of birth control should be available to teenagers between the ages of 14 and 16 if their parents do not approve? (PILLOK)  
Would you be for or against sex education in the public schools? (SEXEDUC)

If a man and a woman have sex relations before marriage, do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all? (PREMARSEX)

What if they are in their early teens, say 14 to 16 years old. In that case do you think sex relations before marriage are always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all? (TEENSEX)

Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that it is sometimes necessary to discipline a child with a good, hard spanking? (SPANKING)

We are faced with many problems in this country, none of which can be solved easily or inexpensively. I'm going to name some of these problems, and for each one I'd like you to tell me whether you think we're spending too much money on it, too little money, or about the right amount. Improving the nation's education system/ Education. (NATEDUCY and NATEDUC)



Table 5

Impact of the Presence of Others during the Interview

	Someone Else/ No One Present	Number of Others Present
(Probability Level)		
A. Relationships without Controls		
Sexual Items		
Approve of Extramarital Sex (XMARSEX)	.051	.216
Approve of Homosexual Sex (HOMOSEX)	.011	.057
Legalize Pornography (PORNLAW)	.685	.972
Religious Items		
Belief in Life After Death (POSTLIFE)	.881	.345
Attend Church (ATTEND)	.034	.238
Beliefs about God (GOD)	.489	.001
Personal Evaluations		
Happiness (HAPPY)	.193	.110
Excitement (LIFE)	.724	.166
Rating Health (HEALTH)	.053	.001
Fear of Crime (FEAR)	.677	.377
Evaluations of People		
Helpfulness (HELPFUL)	.261	.516
Fairness (FAIR)	.241	.488
Trustworthiness (TRUST)	.005	.016

Table 5 (continued)

B. Regression Analysis of Statistically Significant Differences Above (Standardized Coefficients/Probability Levels)

	Bivariate	With Controls <sup>a</sup>
HOMOSEX	-.098/.002	-.052/.103
ATTEND	-.033/.219	-.038/.169
GOD	.027/.319	.004/.877
HEALTH	.092/.004	.106/.001
TRUST	.071/.004	.053/.104

<sup>a</sup>Controls for household size, age, education, race, and marital status.

N=About 925-1,400

Wordings: What is your opinion about a married person having sexual relations with someone other than the marriage partner--is it always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all? (XMARSEX)

What about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex--do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all? (HOMOSEX)

Which of these statements comes closest to your feelings about pornography laws? There should be laws against the distribution of pornography whatever the age. There should be laws against the distribution of pornography to persons under 18. There should be no laws forbidding the distribution of pornography. (PORNLOW)

Do you believe there is a life after death? (POSTLIFE)

How often do you attend religious services? (ATTEND)

Please look at this card and tell me which statement comes closest to expressing what you believe about God. I don't believe in God. I don't know whether there is a God and I don't believe there is any way to find out. I don't believe in a personal God, but I do believe in a Higher Power of some kind. I find myself believing in God some of the time, but not at others. While I have doubts, I feel that I do believe in God. I know God really exists and I have no doubts about it. (GOD)

Is there any area around here, that is, within a mile--where you would be afraid to walk alone at night? (FEAR)

Taken all together, how would you say things are these days--would you say that you are very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy? (HAPPY)

In general, do you find life exciting, pretty routine, or dull? (LIFE)

Would you say your own health, in general, is excellent, good, fair, or poor? (HEALTH)

Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just liking out for themselves? (HELPFUL)

Table 5 (continued)

Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair? (FAIR)

Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people? (TRUST)

## References

- Aquilino, William S., "Spouse Presence during the Interview on Survey Responses Concerning Marriage," Public Opinion Quarterly, 57 (Fall, 1993), 358-376.
- Blair, Johnny; Menon, Geeta; and Bickart, Barbara, "Measurement Effects in Self vs. Proxy Response to Survey Questions: An Information-Processing Perspective" in Measurement Error in Surveys, edited by Paul P. Biemer, et al., New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1991.
- Bradburn, Norman M. and Sudman, Seymour, Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Casterline, John B. and Chidambaram, V.C., "The Presence of Others during the Interview and the Reporting of Contraceptive Knowledge and Use," in Survey Analysis for the Guidance of Family Planning Programs, edited by John A. Ross and Regina McNamara. Liege, Belgium: ORINDA, 1984.
- Davis, James A. and Smith, Tom W., General Social Survey, 1972-1994: Cumulative Codebook. Chicago: NORC, 1994.
- Dutka, Solomon and Frankel, Lester R., "Measurement Errors in Business Surveys," in Measurement Error in Surveys, edited by Paul P. Biemer, et al., New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1991.
- Groves, Robert M., Survey Errors and Survey Costs. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1989.
- Laumann, Edward O.; Gagnon, John N.; Michael, Robert T.; and Michaels, Stuart, The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Silver, Brian; Abramson, Paul R.; and Anderson, Barbara A., "The Presence of Others and Overreporting of Voting in American National Elections," Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (Summer, 1986), 228-239.
- Smith, Tom W., "An Analysis of the Accuracy of Spousal Reports," GSS Methodological Report No. 35. Chicago: NORC, 1985.
- Smith, Tom W., "Attitudes toward Sexual Permissiveness: Trends, Correlates, and Behavioral Connections," in Sexuality Across the Life Course, edited by Alice S. Rossi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Sudman, Seymour and Bradburn, Norman M., Response Effects in Surveys. Chicago: Aldine, 1974.

Taietz, Philip, "Conflicting Group Norms and the 'Third' Person in the Interview," American Journal of Sociology, 68 (July, 1962), 97-104.

Tourangeau, Roger and Smith, Tom W., "A Comparison of Three Modes of Data Collection," NORC Report, 1995.

Weinberg, Eve, "Data Collection: Planning and Management," in Handbook of Survey Research, edited by Peter H. Rossi, James D. Wright, and Andy B. Anderson. New York: Academic Press, 1983.