How Respondents Report Their Health Status:

Cognitive Interviews of Self-Rated Health Across Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Age, and Socioeconomic Status

Dana Garbarski, Jennifer Dykema, Ken Croes, Tara Piche, Dorothy Edwards AAPOR 2015

1

Self-Rated Health (SRH)

- Global rating of health status
 - "Would you say your health in general is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?"
- Widely used to study health
- What underlies these ratings?
- SRH is a perception of one's health that includes
 - Health factors considered
 - Frameworks used to evaluate health
 - How health factors and components of the question are experienced, conceptualized, interpreted, and integrated

How Respondents Rate Their Health

- Prior research focuses on which health factors respondents consider
- Less known about how respondents take these health factors into account—the frameworks used to answer
- Also unclear how health factors and frameworks vary across social groups

3

Research Aims

- Mixed-methods analysis of cognitive interviews
- •Describe the processes respondents undertake when rating their health
 - 1) Which health factors respondents take into account
 - 2) How respondents take health factors into account
- Examine variation across social groups
 - Race/ethnicity
 - Gender
 - Age
 - Socioeconomic status (education)

Data

- 64 respondents, 9 interviewers
- Madison and Milwaukee areas
- Recruited through connections with racial/ethnic community leaders and in specific locations
 - E.g., churches, community centers, pow-wows
- Quota sample crossing four dimensions
 - Race/ethnicity (black, American Indian, Latino(a), white)
 - Gender
 - Age (30-55 years vs 56 years or more)
 - Education (high school or less vs some college or more)

Number of Completed Interviews by Respondent Characteristics									
	Male				Female				
	High School or Less		Some College or More		High School or Less		Some College or More		
	30-55 years	56+ years	30-55 years	56+ years	30-55 years	56+ years	30-55 years		Total
Black	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	16
American Indian	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	16
White	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	16
Latino/a	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	16
Total	7	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	64
									6

Excerpt from Interviewing Protocol

100. Would you say your health in general is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?

- EXCELLENT
- O VERY GOOD
- O GOOD
- FAIR
- POOR○ DON'T KNOW
- REFUSED

PROBE-1: What were you thinking about when you answered [ANSWER] for this question.

PROBE-1a: What else were you thinking about?

-

Mixed Methods Analytic Approach

- Coding process
 - Inductive and iterative qualitative approach
 - Bottom-up process of coding themes that emerge from the data
 - · Revise codes as data are added
 - Grounded theory, constant comparative method
- Analysis
 - · Quantification of codes
 - Unit of analysis is respondent
 - Percentage of respondents with at least one of a particular code
 - Explore differences across social groups

Results

(

Themes

- Types of health factors
- Valence of health factors
- Conditional health statements
- Time
- General health statements
- Response process statements

Types of Health Factors								
Factor	Percent Rs with one+ factor			Sex	Age	SES		
Health	70%							
condition								
Specific	41%	"I'm diabetic"			+0			
Nonspecific	36%	"my illnesses"			+0			
Absence	17%	"I have no medical conditions"			+y	+sc		
Health	41%	"I don't exercise," "trying to lose				+sc		
behavior		weight"						
Health care	25%	"I went to the doctor," "I don't		+m				
		go"						
Physical state	22%	"in good shape" "overweight"						
Comparative	19%	"compared to my husband"	-L					
Physical	14%	"body working," "ability to work,"	+w					
functioning		"lazy"						
Mental	8%	"depression," "I don't have			0+			
health		mental health issues"						
Age	6%	"I'm at an age…"		+m				
					11			

Themes

- Types of health factors
- Valence of health factors
- Conditional statements
- Time
- General health statements
- Response process statements

Valence

- In psychology
 - Refers to emotions
 - Degree of attraction or aversion individual feels toward specific objects or events
 - Positive, negative, ambivalent
- Our operational definition
 - Affective orientation to the health factor based on what it implies about the quality of current health status

13

14

Categories of Valence

Category	Example				
Positive	"I have no illnesses"				
Negative	"I have several illnesses"				
Neutral	"I'm about average"				
Ambivalent	"I only have two things that's not healthy about myself"				
Not discernible	"how I feel about my exercise"				

% Respondents with Valence by SRH

	Negative	Ambivalent/ Neutral	Positive	Not Discernible	N
Fair	100	17	25	25	12
Good	86	46	54	57	28
Very good	65	20	80	65	20
Excellent	50	0	100	25	4

15

Themes

- Types of health factors
- Valence of health factors
- Conditional health statements
- Time
- General health statements
- Response process statements

Conditional Health Statements

- Presence of one health factor depends on another
- 64% of respondents with at least one set

17

Conditional Health Statements

- Cascade (34%)
 - Presence of one health factor leads to the other
 - "if I didn't have those [health conditions], my health would be excellent"
 - Positive association with education
- Contrast (36%)
 - Presence of one health factor juxtaposed with another
 - "I do have some medical issues, but other than that, my health is really good"
 - · No differences among social groups

Summary

- Provides a more complete description of what underlies respondents' ratings of their general health status
 - Which health factors respondents take into account
 - · How respondents take health factors into account
 - Valence
 - Conditional health statements
 - Time
 - General health statements
 - Response process statements
 - How the health factors and frameworks used to rate health might vary across social groups

19

Thank you!

dgarbarski@luc.edu