



INTERNATIONAL
FOOD POLICY
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE

IFPRI Discussion Paper 01564

October 2016

**Using Cognitive Interviewing to Improve the
Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index
Survey Instruments**

Evidence from Bangladesh and Uganda

Hazel Malapit

Kathryn Sproule

Chiara Kovarik

Poverty, Health, and Nutrition Division

INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), established in 1975, provides evidence-based policy solutions to sustainably end hunger and malnutrition, and reduce poverty. The institute conducts research, communicates results, optimizes partnerships, and builds capacity to ensure sustainable food production, promote healthy food systems, improve markets and trade, transform agriculture, build resilience, and strengthen institutions and governance. Gender is considered in all of the institute's work. IFPRI collaborates with partners around the world, including development implementers, public institutions, the private sector, and farmers' organizations, to ensure that local, national, regional, and global food policies are based on evidence.

AUTHORS

Hazel Malapit is a research coordinator in the Poverty, Health, and Nutrition Division of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Washington, DC.

Kathryn Sproule was a research analyst in the Poverty, Health and Nutrition Division of IFPRI when this work was written.

Chiara Kovarik was a research analyst in the Poverty, Health and Nutrition Division of IFPRI when this work was written.

Notices

¹ IFPRI Discussion Papers contain preliminary material and research results and are circulated in order to stimulate discussion and critical comment. They have not been subject to a formal external review via IFPRI's Publications Review Committee. Any opinions stated herein are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily representative of or endorsed by the International Food Policy Research Institute.

² The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on the map(s) herein do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) or its partners and contributors.

³ This publication is available under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Copyright 2016 International Food Policy Research Institute. All rights reserved. Sections of this material may be reproduced for personal and not-for-profit use without the express written permission of but with acknowledgment to IFPRI. To reproduce the material contained herein for profit or commercial use requires express written permission. To obtain permission, contact ifpri-copyright@cgiar.org.

Contents

Abstract	v
Acknowledgments	vi
1. Introduction	1
2. Cognitive Interviewing: A Brief Overview	3
3. Methodology	4
4. Findings	7
5. Lessons Learned and Best Practices	14
6. Conclusion	16
Appendix A: WEAI 1.1 Cognitive Interview Questionnaire	17
Appendix B: WEAI 2.0 Cognitive Interview Questionnaire	17
References	35

Tables

2.1 Stages of cognition	3
3.1 Sample by household type	4
3.2 Respondent characteristics	5
4.1 Cognitive interview results: Production recall	7
4.2 Cognitive interview results: Autonomy	9
4.3 Cognitive interview results: Credit	10
4.4 Cognitive interview results: Speaking in public	11
4.5 Cognitive interview results: Time use	12

ABSTRACT

The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) is the first comprehensive and standardized survey-based measure to directly capture women's empowerment and inclusion in the agricultural sector. The WEAI was originally designed as a monitoring and evaluation tool for the US government's Feed the Future (FTF) initiative, which operates in 19 geographically and culturally diverse focus countries. As the FTF baseline surveys were rolled out in 2012 and 2013, many concerns around implementation of the WEAI survey module emerged and led to the development of a second version of the questionnaire that attempted to improve on the problematic sections. This process of redesigning the WEAI questionnaire used cognitive interviewing to assess whether the proposed revisions succeeded in resolving the aforementioned problems in the original WEAI.

The purpose of cognitive interviewing is to systematically identify and analyze sources of response error in surveys, and to use that information to improve the quality and accuracy of survey instruments. This paper describes the cognitive interviews undertaken in Bangladesh and Uganda in 2014 as part of the second round of pilots intended to refine the original version of the Women's Empowerment in Agricultural Index (WEAI). The WEAI is a survey-based tool that assesses gendered empowerment in agriculture. Baseline data were collected in 19 countries following the WEAI's launch in 2012, but implementers reported a number of problems, such as confusion among both respondents and enumerators regarding the meaning of abstract concepts in the autonomy sub-module and difficulties recalling the sequence and duration of activities in the time-use sub-module. In our cognitive interviews, we asked detailed follow-up questions such as, "Did you think this question was difficult, and if so, why?" and "Can you explain this term to me in your own words?" The results revealed potential problems with the survey questions and informed the revision of the WEAI, now called the Abbreviated WEAI (or A-WEAI), which has less potential for response errors.

Keywords: agriculture; Bangladesh; cognitive interviewing; cognitive testing; survey methodology; Uganda; women's empowerment; gender

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was undertaken as part of the CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions, and Markets (PIM), which is led by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and funded by CGIAR Fund Donors. This research was supported by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under Feed the Future, the US government's global hunger and food security initiative, through its partnership with IFPRI on the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index, USAID Grant Number EEM-G-00-04-00013-00. We thank the survey enumerators and other staff of Data Analysis and Technical Assistance Limited in Bangladesh, and Associates Research Trust in Uganda, for conducting the cognitive interviews and providing assistance with data cleaning. We would also like to thank Kiersten Johnson and Pablo Diego-Rosell for their invaluable advice regarding the cognitive testing process, Sabina Alkire for assistance in refining the autonomy vignettes, and Jessica Heckert and other seminar participants for providing helpful comments and suggestions. We are especially grateful to Ruth Meinzen-Dick, Agnes Quisumbing, Caren Grown, Emily Hogue, and Farzana Ramzan for guiding this effort and for providing invaluable feedback. This paper has not gone through IFPRI's standard peer-review process. The opinions expressed here belong to the authors, and do not necessarily reflect those of PIM, IFPRI, CGIAR, USAID, or the US government.

1. INTRODUCTION

Launched in 2012, the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) is the first comprehensive and standardized survey-based measure to directly capture women's empowerment and inclusion in the agricultural sector. The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), in collaboration with the Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative (OPHI) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), designed the WEAI as a monitoring and evaluation tool for the US government's Feed the Future (FTF) initiative, operating in 19 geographically and culturally diverse focus countries. The WEAI was piloted in Bangladesh, Guatemala, and Uganda in 2011 and was included as part of the baseline population-based surveys rolled out by FTF in its 19 focus countries.

The WEAI comprises two sub-indexes, one that measures how empowered women are within five domains (the 5DE), and the other that measures gender parity in empowerment within the household (the GPI) by comparing the score of the primary adult female to that of the primary adult male. The five domains of empowerment are production, resources, income, leadership, and time. Details about the WEAI's methodology, piloting, and validation are available in Alkire et al. (2013).¹

The implementation of the WEAI survey module, as a brand-new tool in a brand-new program, raised many concerns. For example, would the respondents interpret concepts relating to decision making, autonomy, and empowerment in similar enough ways to allow for cross-national comparisons? Would they report truthfully about the different types of production activities they participated in, what types of decisions were made, and who made them? Could they accurately recall all the different activities they engaged in the previous day, and report on both the sequence and duration of those activities? Although the version of the WEAI that was implemented in the population-based surveys included only those survey questions that worked well in the pilot districts in Bangladesh, Guatemala, and Uganda, applying these questions in new contexts was expected to result in other unforeseen implementation issues. Indeed, many of these concerns were borne out in the FTF baseline surveys in 2012 and 2013.

A learning event held in November 2013 among users of the WEAI revealed that time use, autonomy in production, and group membership were among the most problematic modules. Implementing partners reported that both respondents and enumerators found questions regarding motivations for decisions difficult to understand, and that in some contexts, speaking up in public was a politically sensitive issue that might result in unreliable responses. For the time-use sub-module, although the short recall period of 24 hours minimized difficulties with recall, the survey was still extremely time-consuming to administer and resulted in poor-quality data due to respondent fatigue.

To address these issues, IFPRI, OPHI, and USAID developed a second version of the questionnaire that included either new or revised survey questions for the problematic sections and was more streamlined and easier to administer. One specific suggestion from implementers of the WEAI was to use cognitive interviewing to ensure that the revised WEAI succeeded in resolving the aforementioned problems in the original WEAI. The purpose of cognitive interviewing is to systematically identify and correct problems with survey questions in order to ultimately improve the quality and accuracy of survey instruments (Willis 2005; Beatty and Willis 2007). The FTF Haiti team members used this approach as part of their baseline pretests, although they did not revise the WEAI survey based on their findings because they wished to maintain comparability with the rest of the FTF portfolio (Johnson and Diego-Rosell 2015).

Following the recommendation by Johnson and Diego-Rosell (2015), as part of the pretesting phase we administered draft survey questions from the revised WEAI while collecting additional information about the survey responses (Beatty and Willis 2007). This information was then used to evaluate the quality of the response or to help determine whether the question was generating the information we expected. To the extent possible, we used these findings to further refine the survey questions that were administered at the pilot sites.

¹ For more information on the WEAI, please see www.ifpri.org/topic/weai-resource-center.

We chose to conduct our pilots in the FTF zones in Bangladesh and Uganda because these are countries where the original WEAI pilots were administered and where IFPRI has had long-standing relationships with local partners who have prior experience collecting the WEAI data.² These countries are also geographically and culturally different from one another, which is useful when testing a tool that will be applied in many different contexts. Although the entire revised instrument was tested, we prioritized the sections on time use, autonomy in decision making, and group membership, as well as specific questions related to asset ownership and production decisions that were highlighted as problematic by FTF implementing partners.

In this paper, we describe the process of conducting cognitive interviews for the revised WEAI in Uganda and Bangladesh in June and July 2014, and how this process has informed the second version of the WEAI, now called the Abbreviated WEAI (A-WEAI).³ We begin with a brief overview of the methodology of cognitive interviewing, the different sources of response errors, and how cognitive interviewing can be used to discover and correct potential problems with survey questions. This is followed by a discussion of our sampling strategy and implementation approach. Next we present our findings, organized by WEAI domain, and the subsequent changes in the survey questions that resulted from these findings. Finally, we summarize the key lessons that we can take away from this process, which may be useful to others who are developing and testing standardized cross-national survey instruments.

² We did not conduct a second pilot in Guatemala because of budget constraints.

³ Throughout this paper we refer to several versions of the WEAI. The “WEAI” refers to the original version released in 2012. The “WEAI 1.1” refers to a slightly modified version that was created following feedback from the baseline surveys and remains comparable to the WEAI. In the WEAI 1.1, response codes were streamlined and enumeration instruction was revised for faster and more efficient administration. The “revised WEAI” refers to the version that was piloted in 2014 and that eventually resulted in the final Abbreviated WEAI (A-WEAI) version. For more detail on each of these versions, please see the versions table in the WEAI Resource Center: www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/Basic%20Page/weai_versions_table.pdf.

2. COGNITIVE INTERVIEWING: A BRIEF OVERVIEW

Cognitive interviewing (or cognitive testing) is an evidence-based, qualitative method for assessing whether survey questions are being understood by respondents in the way they were originally intended (Willis 2005). It is particularly useful when designing new survey questions, especially when these questions will be used cross-culturally or cross-linguistically (Willis and Miller 2011). Cognitive interviewing requires administering draft survey questions (in our case from the revised WEAI) while collecting additional information about the survey responses, which is then used to evaluate the quality of the responses or to help determine whether the questions are generating the expected information (Beatty and Willis 2007). In essence, it helps test the validity of survey questions by identifying the potential sources of response error and allowing researchers to devise solutions that will improve the quality and accuracy of survey instruments (Willis 2005).

The interview itself can comprise one or more of the following main techniques: asking the respondent to “think aloud” while formulating a response to a survey question, placing probing questions within the survey instrument (which may be asked immediately following the relevant question, retrospectively following the interview, or a combination of the two), and having the interviewer observe a respondent’s verbal and nonverbal cues (Willis 2005). To minimize the burden on the respondents, which tend to be highest in the “think aloud” technique, the WEAI cognitive interviews consisted primarily of scripted probes administered by survey enumerators with basic training in cognitive interviewing techniques, supplemented with interviewer observations of verbal and nonverbal cues.

Four stages of cognition are required for an accurate response to a survey question: comprehension, retrieval, judgment, and response (Tourangeau 1984; Willis 2005). Problems can occur during any of these stages (Table 2.1), leading to response error. Cognitive interviews can thus reveal at which stage in the process issues are likely to arise, and multiple iterations of testing can be used to create improved versions of survey questions. Since we already had specific feedback on which sections of the WEAI had performed poorly in the baselines and why, we used this information as a starting point in developing our cognitive instrument. Our intent was to use the findings from our cognitive interviews to help improve the validity of question responses and also decrease the time required to administer the survey, given that enumerators would have clearer and more precise questions to ask respondents.

Table 2.1 Stages of cognition

Cognitive stages	Cognitive stage definition	Problems	Causes
1. Comprehension	Respondent interprets the question	Respondent does not understand	Unknown terms, ambiguous concepts, long and overly complex questions
2. Retrieval	Respondent searches memory for relevant information	Respondent does not remember / does not know	Recall difficulty, questions assume respondent has information
3. Judgment	Respondent evaluates and/or estimates response	Respondent does not want to tell / cannot tell	Biased or sensitive questions, estimation difficulty
4. Response	Respondent provides information in the format requested	Respondent cannot respond in the format requested	Incomplete response options, multiple responses necessary

Source: Willis (2005).

3. METHODOLOGY

Sampling

The second WEAI pilot surveys were administered by Data Analysis and Technical Assistance in Bangladesh and by Associates Research Trust in Uganda, in the same FTF zone districts surveyed in the original WEAI pilots. The pilot sample was split between the two versions of the WEAI, the original (WEAI 1.1) and the revised version (WEAI 2.0).⁴ Because of budget constraints, we prioritized cognitive interviews for the revised version of the WEAI, which meant that the original questions were no longer cognitively tested, with the exception of those regarding autonomy. The autonomy sub-module had the most substantial revisions, which were guided by the feedback we had received on the FTF baselines. Thus, we decided to test both the original and the new autonomy questions to give us a sense of whether the revised questions indeed helped resolve the cognitive issues raised by users.

The cognitive interviews were conducted as part of the pretesting phase prior to fieldwork. In line with common practice, we aimed for a minimum of 15 interviews per language group⁵—four languages in Uganda and one in Bangladesh—and tried to ensure that the respondents were representative of our sample by interviewing men in dual-headed households, women in dual-headed households, and women in female-headed households. We also ensured that a variety of ages were represented and interviewed both younger and older men and women.

Table 3.1 shows the sample breakdown by household type. Because the Uganda FTF zone has four major language groups, we conducted interviews with a total of 60 respondents per round (120 total). Testing was conducted in the Jinja, Kiryandongo, and Mukono districts. Only one language is used in Bangladesh, so fewer interviews were required there. However, instead of interviewing only one respondent per household type, the Bangladesh team conducted cognitive interviews for both the primary male and primary female decision makers in the selected households, as is the standard protocol for the WEAI. This resulted in a much larger sample size for Bangladesh than the minimum requirement of 15 interviews per language group, totaling 70 respondents.⁶ Testing was conducted in the Manikgonj District, roughly a two-hour drive from Dhaka. Table 3.2 compares respondent characteristics by country and cognitive testing round.

Table 3.1 Sample by household type

	Bangladesh		Uganda	
	Round 1	Round 1	Round 2	Total
Revised WEAI module				
Men, dual-headed households	22	20	12	32
Women, dual-headed households	23	16	12	28
Women, female-headed households	7	16	8	24
Original autonomy questions				
Men, dual-headed households	8	0	8	8
Women, dual-headed households	8	6	12	20
Women, female-headed households	2	2	8	8
Total	70	60	60	120

Source: Authors' calculations.

⁴ The Bangladesh pilot dataset is available at www.ifpri.org/publication/womens-empowerment-agriculture-index-weai-pilot-ii-bangladesh. The Uganda pilot dataset is available at www.ifpri.org/publication/womens-empowerment-agriculture-index-weai-pilot-ii-uganda.

⁵ While there is no consensus regarding optimal sample size for cognitive interviews, common practice ranges from 5 to 15 interviews per language group (Beatty and Willis 2007). The goal is not to obtain sample sizes large enough to supply precision in statistical estimates, but rather to maximize variance among the respondent group by interviewing a variety of individuals who will be useful in informing decisions about if and how to modify questions (Willis 2005).

⁶ The Bangladesh field team viewed the cognitive testing exercise as a way for enumerators to learn more about the WEAI and practice conducting the WEAI interviews. This is why they chose to adhere to the WEAI protocol of interviewing two respondents per household, and instead of selecting a few enumerators to conduct the cognitive interviews, all the enumerators were asked to conduct the cognitive interviews. These decisions resulted in a sample size above the minimum 15 required per language group.

Table 3.2 Respondent characteristics

Variable	Bangladesh (%)	Uganda (%)	
	R1 (n=70)	R1 (n=60)	R2 (n=60)
Female	55.7	65	64.4
Age (years)	47.2	40	46.2
Age less than 35 years	17.1	45	41.7
Married	92.9	48.3	54.2
Highest education is less than primary, or no schooling	74.3	21.7	10.2
Female-headed household	13.7	26.7	25.4
Religion of household head	100.0 Muslim	86.5 Christian	90.3 Christian

Source: Authors' calculations.

We originally attempted two rounds of cognitive interviews in both countries, in order to observe whether any problems remained after adjustments were made to the survey questions following the first round. Unfortunately, due to the short spacing between the two rounds in Bangladesh (about one week, to ensure that both pretests were completed before the upcoming Ramadan), there was not enough time to make adjustments to the instrument. Although the Bangladesh field team implemented two rounds of cognitive interviews, they tested the same questionnaire in each round. Thus, for the purpose of this paper we treat both Bangladesh rounds as one and compare their pooled results to Uganda's first-round results.

In Uganda, the rounds were spaced about one month apart, allowing for a thorough analysis of the first round of data, which provided insights into how the questionnaire or enumerator manual could be improved for better understanding by respondents and interviewers in the second round. While field teams in both countries found the cognitive testing exercise useful, we recommend following the protocol Uganda used, allowing for a sufficient period of analysis and revision between the two rounds.

Instrument Design

Following the approach used by Johnson and Diego-Rosell (2015) in their cognitive testing of the WEAI in Haiti, for each question in the revised WEAI module and original autonomy sub-module we identified the stages in the cognitive process that were likely to break down and used scripted probing questions for each. Scripted probes are recommended for minimizing both enumerator error and respondent burden (Willis 2005), because this type of probing does not require expert WEAI knowledge and can be carried out by regular professional interviewers (Johnson and Diego-Rosell 2015). We relied primarily on five key probing questions, which enabled us to identify all four stages of cognitive breakdown (see the appendix for the cognitive interview questionnaire).

- **Comprehension:**
 - **Recall period:** What recall period did you include in your answer?
 - **Abstract terms/concepts:** Can you describe for me in your own words what the term [TERM] means?
- **Retrieval:** Many people find it difficult to recall [X]; how well do you remember [X]?
- **Judgment:** Do you think other people would find this question difficult? If so, why? Do you think other people would be reluctant or afraid to answer this question? If so, why?
- **Response:** Did you find this question easy or difficult? If difficult, why?

As in Johnson and Diego-Rosell (2015), the probing questions were asked after each sub-module of the WEAI questionnaire. This information was supplemented by enumerator observations of the verbal and nonverbal behavioral responses to each question, as well as any difficulties the respondent had with specific questions.

Analytical Approach

We used cognitive interviewing to answer the following research questions:

1. **Revised WEAI instrument:** Which survey questions did the respondents find difficult to answer and why? Are there any observed differences in the cognitive interview results between different household types?
 - Regarding questions that referred to a recall period, do respondents understand the time frame in the same way that it was originally intended? Can respondents recall what occurred during the time frame referenced?
 - Regarding questions that use abstract or unfamiliar terminology, can respondents understand these terms in the way they were originally intended? Can respondents paraphrase these terms in their own words?
2. **Autonomy sub-module:** Are there observed differences in the difficulty reported by respondents answering the original autonomy questions compared with the revised autonomy questions using vignettes?
3. **Round 2, revised WEAI instrument:** Have the cognitive problems identified in the first round improved in the second round of cognitive testing in Uganda?

Because our goal was to identify all potential problems with the questionnaire, we explored every survey question where any respondent cited difficulty in answering, incorrectly paraphrased terms, or cited an incorrect recall period. We analyzed the cognitive interview responses as well as direct feedback from the field teams to assess the main causes of the issues and develop solutions through modifying the wording of questions or providing more specific enumerator instructions such as offering culturally appropriate examples or defining terms explicitly. A comparison between the original and revised autonomy sub-modules, supplemented with feedback from the field teams, was used to assess which version of the autonomy questions was less likely to pose a cognitive risk. To the extent that significant differences exist between responses from different household types, we highlight those differences in the results. Findings from both the Bangladesh and Uganda cognitive interviews informed the revisions to the WEAI module, which was then subjected to a second round of cognitive testing in Uganda. Comparing the two rounds of cognitive interviews in Uganda allowed us to look at the extent to which the adjustments in the questionnaire resulted in improved responses to the cognitive probes.

4. FINDINGS

In this section we focus on the WEAI survey questions that presented the greatest difficulties for respondents, organized by domain. We discuss our findings on each topic in turn and highlight cases in which we observe significant differences between household types.

Production Domain: Recall Period for Production Activities

In the Uganda cognitive interviews, the most glaring recall comprehension issue came from the question that asks respondents about their participation in production activities in the past year (Table 4.1, Panel A). The question was originally formulated to be as general as possible, so that users who are implementing the survey in different countries can adapt the question to the agricultural cycle in their respective survey area to cover a full year. In the baselines, however, this was a source of confusion (Johnson and Diego-Rosell 2015). In the cognitive interviews, we used several probes (Table 4.1, Panel B) to assess whether the recall time frame specified in the question matched the same time frame that respondents gave in their answers. Although only 3.8 percent of respondents in Bangladesh and 6.4 percent of respondents in Uganda reported having difficulty with this question, a much higher proportion of respondents reported having difficulty remembering events of the past year: 11.9 percent in Bangladesh and 12.8 percent in Uganda (Table 4.1, Panel C). When asked how much time respondents included in their response, answers ranged anywhere from 3 to 12 months. In Uganda, 59.6 percent of first-round respondents either could not say what recall period they used or referred to a time frame other than 12 months.

Table 4.1 Cognitive interview results: Production recall

A. Draft form of survey question			
R1 WEAI 2.0 [G2.01]: “Did you yourself participate in [ACTIVITY] in the past 12 months (that is, during the last [one/two] cropping seasons)?”			
B. Probes			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earlier I asked you if you had participated in several activities in the past 12 months, that is, in the last (one/two) cropping seasons. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? [Q4] • What period of time did you include in your response? [Q6] • Many people find it difficult to recall activities done a long time ago. How well do you remember which agricultural activities you have participated in in the last 12 months? [Q7] 			
C. Results		Bangladesh	Uganda
		R1 (n=52)	R1 (n=47) R2 (n=32)
Reported difficulty with question [Q4]		3.8%	6.4% 3.2%
Incorrect or unknown period of time included in response [Q6]		NR	59.6% 30.8%
Reported difficulty remembering events of past year [Q7]		11.9%	12.8% 0.0%
D. Suggested revision			
R2 WEAI 2.0 [G2.01]: “Did you yourself participate in [ACTIVITY] in the past 12 months (that is, during the last [one/two] cropping seasons), <i>from [PRESENT MONTH] last year to [PRESENT MONTH] this year?</i> ”			

Source: Authors’ calculations.

To address this problem, we modified the question to, “Did you yourself participate in [ACTIVITY] in the past 12 months (that is, during the last [one/two] cropping seasons), **from [PRESENT MONTH] last year to [PRESENT MONTH] this year?**” In the second round of cognitive interviews in Uganda, this change reduced the recall error by half, with now only 30.8 percent of respondents either stating periods of less than one year or unable to respond. This problem appears to have been mitigated with a more clearly defined time frame.

Production Domain: Testing Alternative Autonomy Sub-modules

The original WEAI questions on autonomy ask about respondents' motivations for their actions. The aim of the questions is to assess the extent to which an individual's actions are motivated by his or her own values, by coercion, or by fear of others' disapproval (Alkire et al. 2013) (Table 4.2, Panel A). For example, "Regarding [ASPECT], I do what I do so others don't think poorly of me." Many WEAI users struggled to implement this section because the phrases were thought to be abstract and difficult to understand, which may also have contributed to inappropriate translations to local languages in the field. In Haiti, for example, Johnson and Diego-Rosell (2015) found that the term "think poorly" in the example above was particularly confusing for respondents because it had many different connotations in Haitian Creole, ranging from the intended meaning of "think poorly" to more forceful connotations such as "wishing bad things to other people" and "destroying someone."

To address this concern, we developed an alternative autonomy sub-module that uses short stories, or vignettes, to demonstrate each type of motivation (Table 4.2, Panel A). Instead of asking the respondents how true different statements on motivations are for them, we ask the respondents whether they are similar to the person described in the short hypothetical story. This approach is an attempt to make the concepts more concrete and easy to understand, and at the same time avoids the use of problematic phrases such as "get into trouble with someone" and "think poorly."

Following Johnson and Diego-Rosell (2015), in both versions we used probes that ask not only whether the respondent thought a question was difficult, but also whether he or she thought other people would find the question difficult (Table 4.2, Panel B). Inconsistencies between these answers can reveal problem areas, as a respondent may not admit to finding a question difficult to answer but would note that others might find it difficult. Consistent with what Johnson and Diego-Rosell (2015) found in Haiti, in both versions we found large discrepancies in the percentages of respondents who found the question difficult themselves versus how difficult they thought others would find it. The original autonomy questions did slightly better in Bangladesh, with 16.7 percent of respondents reporting difficulties themselves and 38.9 percent suggesting potential difficulties for others, compared with 17.3 percent and 48.8 percent, respectively, for the vignettes (Table 4.2, Panel C). However, the vignettes appeared to do better in Uganda, compared with the original questions. About half the Uganda first-round respondents reported difficulties with the original questions, compared with only 17 percent of respondents reporting difficulties with the vignettes (Table 4.2, Panel C). Three-quarters of the Uganda respondents also thought others might find the original questions difficult, whereas 53.2 percent of respondents thought that others would find the vignettes difficult (Table 4.2, Panel C). In Uganda, respondents cited comprehension issues, lack of experience regarding the situation described, and different approaches to decision making as the primary sources of difficulty. In Bangladesh, women in dual-adult households seemed to find these questions slightly more difficult than men in dual-adult households or women in single-adult households. This may be due to their lack of experience in making decisions about selling crops/products, because these tend to be activities or decisions more commonly handled by men. Although the respondents reported more difficulties with the original questions, the Uganda field team still found the original questions much easier to implement than the vignettes, which were more complicated to translate to local languages.

Overall, these mixed results made it difficult to draw strong conclusions. Respondents found the vignettes to be more difficult than the original questions in Bangladesh, and in Uganda they were harder to implement. However, the Uganda respondents appeared to find the vignettes easier to understand, given the lower incidence of reported difficulties. Also, the Bangladesh field team used a storytelling enumeration style in general, so the original questions were already implemented in a vignette-like fashion. Since the means of implementation of the two versions were more similar in Bangladesh, the main difference with the vignettes was the increased length, which might explain the higher reported difficulty in the cognitive interviews.

Taking all this information into account, including feedback we received from the field teams in the original FTF baselines, we opted to use the vignettes in the pilot surveys to allow for further analysis. Therefore, there were no changes in the survey questions between the two rounds, and both versions of the autonomy sub-module were tested in the second round of cognitive interviews in Uganda.

Table 4.2 Cognitive interview results: Autonomy

A. Draft form of survey questions			
Original WEAI 1.1 [Module G5(B)]: This set of questions is very important. I am going to give you some reasons why you act as you do in the aspects of household life I just mentioned. You might have several reasons for doing what you do and there is no right or wrong answer. Please tell me how true it would be to say: ... My actions in [ASPECT] are partly because I will get in trouble with someone if I act differently. Would you say that this is always true, somewhat true, not very true, or never true?			
Vignettes WEAI 2.0 [Module G4]: Now I am going to read you some stories about different farmers and their situations regarding different agricultural activities. This question format is different from the rest so take your time in answering. For each I will then ask you how much you are like or not like each of these people. We would like to know if you are completely different from them, similar to them, or somewhere in between. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. ... [PERSON'S NAME] can't grow other types of crops here for consumption and sale in market. Beans, sweet potato, and maize are the only crops that grow here. ... Are you like this person? Are you completely the same/different, or somewhat the same/different?			
B. Probes			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this question easy or difficult? [WEAI 1.1, Q5/9/13; WEAI 2.0, Q50/54/58/62] • Do you think some people may find this question difficult to answer? [WEAI 1.1, Q7/11/15; WEAI 2.0, Q52/56/60/64] 			
C. Results			
	Bangladesh	Uganda	
<i>Original WEAI 1.1</i>	R1 (n=18)	R1 (n=8)	R2 (n=28)
Reported difficulty with question	16.7%	50.0%	28.6%
Reported others would have difficulty with question	38.9%	75.0%	71.4%
<i>Vignettes WEAI 2.0</i>	R1 (n=52)	R1 (n=47)	R2 (n=31)
Reported difficulty with question	17.3%	17.0%	21.9%
Reported others would have difficulty with question	48.8%	53.2%	65.5%
D. Suggested revisions			
Round 2, WEAI 2.0: No change			
A-WEAI: Dropped because it took the longest time to administer among the sub-modules (23% of interview time)			

Source: Authors' calculations.

Note: Panel A shows only excerpts of the survey questions for illustrative purposes. The complete survey instruments and datasets are available from the WEAI Resource Center: www.ifpri.org/topic/weai-resource-center.

Surprisingly, the reported difficulty with the vignettes increased during the second round, while the reported difficulty with the original questions improved (Table 4.2, Panel C). However, this may be due to differences in the sample. Focusing only on the second-round results, we observe that the vignettes have a smaller proportion of respondents reporting difficulties, which suggests that comprehension may be better for the vignettes compared with the original questions. This supports the view that a storytelling approach is a promising mechanism for asking these types of abstract questions, although storytelling takes more time to implement than conventional survey questions.

Nevertheless, the proportion of respondents citing difficulty in this section is still very large, leaving much room for further refinement.⁷ Even with the improvements achieved by using vignettes, the autonomy section is still one of the most challenging parts of the WEAI to implement. Following the

⁷ The autonomy module is undergoing further testing and development as part of the Project WEAI (Pro-WEAI), which is developing a WEAI for project use under Phase 2 of the Gender, Agriculture, and Assets Project (GAAP2). See <http://gaap.ifpri.info/> for more information.

cognitive testing exercise, we used the vignettes in the WEAI 2.0 pilot surveys, which worked well in the field and captured more nuanced responses compared with the original autonomy questions. In the end, we recommended that the autonomy vignettes be dropped from the A-WEAI, in part because of the length of time it took to administer (around 23 percent of survey time).

Resource Domain: Sensitivity to Credit Questions

The resource domain of the WEAI involves relatively few implementation issues, having undergone extensive testing by IFPRI in its data collection efforts on intrahousehold allocation in recent years. Although credit was not flagged in our cognitive interviews as problematic, we found interesting gender differences in the degree of sensitivity to responding to these questions. Questions related to personal finances and financial decisions may be viewed as personal and sensitive, particularly if this information is not readily shared among household members, creating reluctance to respond truthfully (Table 4.3, Panel A). Thus, for the cognitive interview in the access-to-credit sub-module, we asked respondents, “Do you think other respondents being asked these questions would be embarrassed or reluctant to share information on household borrowing activities?” We find that, overall, respondents in Uganda are more likely to find these questions sensitive, compared to respondents in Bangladesh. In addition, we find gender differences: in Uganda, 66.7 percent of men and 60.8 percent of women report that other respondents will be reluctant to answer, while in Bangladesh, 38 percent of men and only 10.3 percent of women report sensitivity to this issue.

Some of the reasons cited by Ugandan men include “fear to be identified with debts,” “not want[ing] to share their information with others,” and embarrassment “for those who borrowed loans and used it in a wrong way.” Ugandan women also tended to cite general discomfort with speaking about money issues as well as embarrassment “because they failed to pay the loan” or “fear of their spouse,” and some noted that “spouses don’t always share with their household members after borrowing money.”⁸ Although we did not make any changes to the questions in this sub-module as a result of the cognitive interviews, these findings confirm the importance of conducting the WEAI interviews separately and privately for the male and female respondents.

Table 4.3 Cognitive interview results: Credit

A. Draft form of survey questions				
Access to credit [Module G3(B)]: Next I’d like to ask about your household’s experience with borrowing money or other items in the past 12 months.				
...Would you or anyone in your household be able to take a loan or borrow cash/in-kind from [SOURCE] if you wanted to?				
... Has anyone in your household taken any loans or borrowed cash/in-kind from [SOURCE] in the past 12 months?				
... Who made the decision to borrow from [SOURCE] most of the time?				
... Who makes the decision about what to do with the money/item borrowed from [SOURCE] most of the time?				
B. Probe				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you think other respondents being asked these questions would be embarrassed or reluctant to share information on household borrowing activities? [Q46] 				
C. Results				
	Bangladesh		Uganda	
	Men (n=21)	Women (n=29)	Men (n=27)	Women (n=51)
Think other respondents being asked these questions would be embarrassed or reluctant to share information on household borrowing activities [Q46]	38.1%	10.3%	66.7%	60.8%

Source: Authors’ calculations.

⁸ In the Bangladesh cognitive interviews, the response to this probe was coded as a Yes/No question and did not include verbatim responses, unlike in Uganda.

Leadership Domain: Use of Ambiguous Terms

Based on feedback from the WEAI baselines, we knew that the speaking-in-public sub-module was politically sensitive because of the examples that were originally given, such as building community infrastructure, ensuring proper payment of wages for public works programs, and protesting misbehavior of authorities or elected officials. In an attempt to move away from these politically sensitive issues, we tested a more general version of this question: “Do you feel comfortable speaking up in public about *any issue* that is important to you, your family, or your community?” In the cognitive interviews, we asked whether respondents found this question to be difficult, and, to assess whether the phrasing of “any issue” comes across as less political, we also asked respondents to describe in their own words what they thought was meant by “issues that are important to you, your family, or your community” (Table 4.4, Panel B).

In the first round of testing, we found that less than 10 percent of respondents found this question difficult to answer (Table 4.4, Panel C). However, we learned that in Uganda, the word “issue” translates to “problem” or “challenge” in local languages and thus has a more negative rather than neutral connotation. Not surprisingly, only 27.7 percent of respondents cited a definition of “issue” that included both positive and negative topics. Therefore, in order for people to include issues with both positive and negative connotations, *any issue* was changed to read *anything* (Table 4.4, Panel D). With this small change in wording, 62.5 percent of respondents gave a neutral definition of “issue” in the subsequent round of testing (Table 4.4, Panel C).

Table 4.4 Cognitive interview results: Speaking in public

A. Draft form of survey question			
R1 WEAI 2.0 [G6.01]: “Do you feel comfortable speaking up in public about <i>any issue</i> that is important to you, your family, or your community?”			
B. Probes			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earlier I asked you if you felt comfortable speaking in public about issues that are important to you, your family, or your community. How was this question? Was this question easy or difficult? [Q82] • Can you tell me in your own words what it means when I say “issues that are important to you, your family, or your community”? [Q84] 			
C. Results	Bangladesh		Uganda
	R1 (n=52)	R1 (n=47)	R2 (n=32)
Reported difficulty with question [Q82]	9.8%	8.5%	3.1%
Gave correct definition and/or examples of issues [Q84]	NR	27.7%	62.5%
D. Suggested revision			
R2 WEAI 2.0 [G6.01]: “Do you feel comfortable speaking up in public about <i>anything</i> that is important to you, your family, or your community?”			

Source: Authors’ calculations.

Time Domain: Testing Alternative Recall Periods

In the original WEAI, time use was collected using a 24-hour recall time diary, collecting up to two activities per time interval. This sub-module was often cited as problematic because it took substantial time to administer and may not be indicative of a usual day. We tested two alternatives in response to this concern. First, we used the same 24-hour recall sub-module but recorded only the primary activity for each time interval.⁹ Second, we tested an alternative seven-day recall sub-module. Instead of a full time

⁹ In our analysis of the original pilot data, dropping secondary activities did not significantly change the WEAI results.

diary, this is a stylized time-use module that collects information only on the activities that were relevant for calculating the WEAI workload indicator, which includes all types of paid and unpaid work, including domestic work and childcare. The purpose of testing the time-use section is to determine a best practice for quickly capturing an accurate depiction of a respondent’s time allocation. Table 4.5 shows the original form of the survey questions (Panel A) and the selected probes that we found most useful (Panel B).

During the first round, 23.5 percent of respondents in Bangladesh and 26.1 percent of respondents in Uganda reported that they had difficulty remembering their activities during the *past week*, as compared to 6 percent and 14.9 percent of the same respondents in Bangladesh and Uganda, respectively, when asked about how well they remembered their activities over the *past 24 hours* (Table 4.5, Panel C). As one might expect, these results suggest that respondents find it much easier to recall events that occurred in the past 24 hours than events that occurred in the past week. Although this can be taken as evidence against using the seven-day recall approach, we still opted to use this sub-module so as to be able to compare the differences in reported work time between the two types of recall periods. Consistent with the cognitive testing findings, we did find that the range of working time reported for the seven-day recall sub-module was much higher than with the 24-hour recall, which suggests higher measurement error. Ultimately, for the A-WEAI, we opted to keep the 24-hour recall sub-module rather than switching to seven-day recall in order to minimize the potential retrieval error.

Table 4.5 Cognitive interview results: Time use

A. Draft form of survey questions			
7-day recall [G5.01]: Now I'd like to ask you some questions regarding how you've spent your time over the last week and whether or not this was typical.			
... In the last 7 days, how much time in hours did you spend on [ACTIVITY]?			
... Did you spend a usual amount of time on [ACTIVITY] in the last 7 days?			
... Since the last week was not usual, within the last 6 months how much time do you usually spend on [ACTIVITY] per week?			
24-hour recall [G5.02]: Now I'd like to ask you about how you spent your time during the past 24 hours. We'll begin from yesterday morning and continue through to this morning. This will be a detailed accounting. I'm interested in everything you do (i.e., resting, eating, personal care, work inside and outside the home, caring for children, cooking, shopping, socializing, etc.), even if it doesn't take you much time.			
B. Probes			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many people find it difficult to recall how many hours they spent on certain activities in the last week. How well do you remember which specific activities you spent time on during the past week? [Q69] • Many people find it difficult to recall every activity done in a day. How well do you remember which specific activities you were doing at every time in the last 24 hours? [Q70] • Is your daily schedule always the same, or do your activities change from day to day? [Q72] 			
C. Results			
	Bangladesh	Uganda	
	R1 (n=51)	R1 (n=47)	R2 (n=32)
Reported difficulty remembering events/activities done during the past week [Q69]	23.5%	26.1%	6.3%
Reported difficulty remembering events/activities done during the past 24 hours [Q70]	6.0%	14.9%	0%
Reported schedule varies from day to day [Q72]	56.9%	63.8%	56.3%
D. Suggested revisions			
Round 2, WEAI 2.0: No change			
A-WEAI: To minimize measurement error due to retrieval difficulties, we use the 24-hour recall sub-module, collecting data on only primary (not secondary) activities to reduce complexity.			

Source: Authors' calculations.

We also found that in both Bangladesh and Uganda, over half of respondents said that their activities change from day to day. In Uganda, 16.7 percent of these respondents cite seasonality specifically as a reason for the change in their daily activity. Although we recognize that seasonality is an important aspect of time allocation in agriculture, this is something that ought to be addressed in the timing and frequency of surveys rather than in the rewording of survey questions.

Despite the findings from the first round, we still opted to use both versions of the time module in the pilot surveys, and therefore there were no changes in the survey questions between the two rounds. Nevertheless, during the second round in Uganda, we observed substantial improvement in the cognitive interviews (Panel C). Only 6.3 percent reported difficulty remembering how they had spent their time over the past week, and none reported difficulty with the 24-hour recall. Thus, differences in reported difficulty may be attributable either to better enumerator administration of the questionnaire, as field teams gain more experience in conducting the survey, and/or to a different respondent pool.

5. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

While we referred to published literature and consulted experts prior to conducting the cognitive interviews, our own experience taught us a number of lessons and confirmed some, but not all, of the best practice suggestions from the literature.

1. **Be explicit about the cognitive testing process.** Given that many local data firms commonly conduct what is referred to as pretesting prior to fieldwork, it is important to be clear and specific about the process for cognitive pretesting and how this differs from general pretesting.
2. **Be aware of multicountry challenges.** We encountered little guidance regarding the challenges of conducting cognitive testing in multiple countries. Our survey instrument was originally designed to assess women's empowerment in a methodologically consistent manner in 19 countries (and is now used more broadly), and thus we wanted to ensure that changes to questions in one country did not jeopardize respondent comprehension in another country. Although we wanted to conduct pretesting in at least one site in all the regions where FTF countries are located, budgetary considerations permitted covering only one site in Asia and one in East Africa. A related issue is reconciling feedback from a cognitive testing round between multiple countries. Fortunately, the Bangladesh team was always in agreement with the changes proposed by the Uganda team. However, disagreements between country teams would have made it difficult to modify the questionnaire. A final, though almost overlooked practical challenge, is coordinating the timing of pretesting between countries. We staggered our work in the two countries in the following manner to allow time for communication of results between the country teams: Bangladesh R1, Uganda R1, Bangladesh R2,¹⁰ Uganda R2. At least one week of time between rounds is necessary when collaborating across countries, especially in different time zones.
3. **Be strategic in the amount of information collected.** Our cognitive pretesting ended up using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, and we collected a great deal of information that needed to be analyzed in a short time period. We even voice recorded our interviews as recommended by experts (Willis 2005; Beatty and Willis 2007). In retrospect, recording the interviews was not necessary and placed an additional burden on the enumerators; we had neither the time nor the budget to pay for translation or analyze the recordings. Additionally, while recording enumerator observations was also a suggested best practice, our enumerators were generally better trained in collecting quantitative information and it was difficult for them to discern nonverbal observations that indicate confusion; the comments they wrote in this regard did not prove useful.
4. **Prioritize problematic sections.** One of the major reasons our team undertook cognitive testing was to scrutinize questionnaire modules that were identified as problematic during the baseline. We also wanted to test new and/or modified questions and assess how well respondents understood these as compared to the original questions. However, researchers with experience conducting cognitive testing suggested that we focus our questions on the sections deemed most problematic, while asking fewer questions in sections that had not experienced known problems to date. This worked well, as it allowed us to more fully understand where comprehension was breaking down in problematic questions and sections while still being able to flag problems in sections where we were unaware of cognition issues.

¹⁰ In this paper we report both rounds of cognitive interviews in Bangladesh as Round 1 because there was no change in the survey instrument between rounds.

- 5. Understand where to save and where to splurge.** Perhaps one of the most costly of the best practice suggestions is to use two enumerators per cognitive pretesting interview. One enumerator conducts the interview, while the other records nonverbal observations and manages the voice recorder. However, our budget allowed only one enumerator per interview, and given that the voice recordings and nonverbal observations did not prove useful, we recommend using only one enumerator per interview. That said, researchers should not skimp on training the enumerators. While all the enumerators we worked with had prior quantitative (and some qualitative) interviewing experience, none had formal cognitive interviewing training or experience. Thus, it was important to take the time to ensure that they understood the process and goals of the cognitive interviews. In Uganda this meant spending time in the field to train the enumerators on both the questionnaire and cognitive testing as well as administering the first round of cognitive testing; by the second round, the team had built capacity and was able to do the fieldwork independently. In hindsight, we can see that our enumerators needed more training in the methods of cognitive testing. While they did well in following the scripted interview questions, they struggled to observe more nuanced signs of respondent difficulty such as long silences, contradictions, hesitation or reluctance in answering a question, and other nonverbal cues.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we described how we used cognitive interviewing to guide the design of the second pilot surveys for the WEAI, which ultimately led to the final recommendations for the Abbreviated WEAI. Overall, we are convinced that cognitive interviewing added value to our fieldwork and directly contributed to reducing the potential for response error in our survey instruments. We recommend that all researchers implementing surveys adopt this method as part of their standard pretesting protocol, particularly for studies of highly complex and sensitive topics such as women's empowerment and gender issues.

Although the cognitive testing exercise was crucial to the redesign of the WEAI, we also learned that cognitive testing should not be the only consideration in making questionnaire design decisions (Willis 2005). For instance, the cognitive testing results provided inconsistent information that made it difficult to draw any strong conclusions about which version of the module on autonomy in decision making to use. Speaking directly with the field supervisors was most beneficial, as it allowed us to learn where they themselves had had difficulty with the questions and thus may have influenced the results we obtained.

APPENDIX A: WEAI 1.1 COGNITIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

MODULE G5B – MOTIVATION FOR DECISION MAKING

“Now I’m going to ask you some follow-up questions about the questions I just asked you.”

ITEMS FOR INTERVIEWER			
QNO.	Question	Response	Go To
Q1	General observations NOTE ANY UNUSUAL VERBAL OR NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS		
Q2	Did the respondent have any difficulties with any specific question?	Yes.....1 No.....2 →	Q4
	Which questions? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)	DESCRIBE DIFFICULTIES	
Q3	H5.03: My actions are partly because I will get in trouble with someone if I act differently. <input type="checkbox"/>		
	H5.04: I do what I do so others don't think poorly of me. <input type="checkbox"/>		
	H5.05: I do what I do because I personally think it is the right thing to do. <input type="checkbox"/>		
ASK RESPONDENT			
QNO.	Question	Response	Go To
Q4	Earlier I asked you if your actions in different activities are partly because you will get in trouble with someone if you act differently. How would you put this question into your own words?		
Q5	Is this question easy or difficult?	Easy.....1 → Difficult.....2	Q7
QNO.	Question	Response	Go To
Q6	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		

Q7	Do you think some people may find this question difficult to answer?	Yes1 No.....2	
Q8	Earlier I asked you if you do what you do regarding different activities so that others don't think poorly of you. How would you put this question in your own words?		
Q9	Is this question easy or difficult?	Easy.....1 → Difficult.....2	Q11
Q10	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q11	Do you think some people may find this question difficult to answer?	Yes.....1 No.....2	
Q12	Earlier I asked you if you do what you do because you feel it is the right thing to do. What does the right thing to do mean?		
Q13	Is this question easy or difficult?	Easy.....1 → Difficult.....2	Q15
Q14	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q15	Do you think some people may find this question difficult to answer?	Yes1 No.....2	

APPENDIX B: WEAI 2.0 COGNITIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

MODULE G2 – ROLE IN HOUSEHOLD DECISION MAKING AROUND PRODUCTION AND INCOME GENERATION

“Now I want you to reflect on the set of questions I have just asked you and I will ask you a few questions about them.”

ITEMS FOR INTERVIEWER			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q1	General Observations NOTE ANY UNUSUAL VERBAL OR NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS		
Q2	Did the respondent have any difficulties with any specific question?	Yes..... 1 No 2	→ Q4
Q3	Which questions? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)	DESCRIBE DIFFICULTIES	
	G2.01: Participation in activities <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G2.02: Who makes the decision <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G2.03: Input in making decisions <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G2.04: Extent of decision making <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G2.05: Input in the use of income <input type="checkbox"/>		
ASK RESPONDENT			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q4	Earlier I asked you if you had participated in several activities in the past 12 months, that is, in the last (one/two) cropping seasons. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to question G2.01)	Easy 1 Difficult 2	→ Q6
Q5	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q6	What period of time did you include in your response? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN; PROBE AS NECESSARY		

	<p>Many people find it difficult to recall activities done a long time ago. How well do you remember which agricultural activities you have participated in in the last 12 months?</p> <p>(refers to question G2.01)</p> <p>CODE AND WRITE RESPONSE DOWN; PROBE AS NECESSARY</p>	<p>Remember well 1</p> <p>Remember poorly 2</p> <p>VERBATIM:</p>	
Q8	<p>Earlier I asked you who normally takes the decision regarding aspects of household life. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult?</p> <p>(refers to question G2.02)</p>	<p>Easy 1</p> <p>Difficult 2</p>	<p>→ Q10</p>
Q9	<p>Why was it difficult?</p> <p>WRITE RESPONSE DOWN</p>		
Q10	<p>Earlier I asked you how much input you have in making decisions about several activities. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult?</p> <p>(refers to question G2.03)</p>	<p>Easy 1</p> <p>Difficult 2</p>	<p>→ Q12</p>
Q11	<p>Why was it difficult?</p> <p>WRITE RESPONSE DOWN</p>		
Q12	<p>Could you repeat the question in your own words?</p>		
Q13	<p>(FOR WOMEN ONLY) Do you think that any other women you know may be reluctant to answer this question?</p>	<p>Yes 1</p> <p>No 2</p> <p>Don't know 3</p>	<p>→ Q15</p>
Q14	<p>Why do you think they may be reluctant?</p> <p>WRITE RESPONSE DOWN</p>		
Q15	<p>Earlier I asked you to what extent you feel you can make personal decisions regarding these aspects of household life if you wanted to. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult?</p> <p>(refers to question G2.04)</p>	<p>Easy 1</p> <p>Difficult 2</p>	<p>→ Q17</p>
Q16	<p>Why was it difficult?</p> <p>WRITE RESPONSE DOWN</p>		

Q17	Could you repeat the question in your own words?		
Q18	(FOR WOMEN ONLY) Do you think that any other women you know may be reluctant to answer this question?	Yes..... 1 No 2 Don't know.....3	→ Q20
Q19	Why do you think they may be reluctant? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q20	Earlier I asked you how much input you have in decisions on the use of income generated from these activities. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to question G2.05)	Easy 1 Difficult 2	→ Q22
Q21	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q22	Could you repeat the question in your own words?		
Q23	(FOR WOMEN ONLY) Do you think that any other women you know may be reluctant to answer this question?	Yes..... 1 No 2 Don't know.....3	→ WEAI QX MODULE G3(A)
Q24	Why do you think they may be reluctant? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q25	What does the term "in-kind work" mean to you? (refers to Activity E)		

MODULE G3(A) – ACCESS TO PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL

“Now I want you to reflect on the set of questions I have just asked you and I will ask you a few questions about them.”

ITEMS FOR INTERVIEWER			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q26	General Observations NOTE ANY UNUSUAL VERBAL OR NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS		
Q27	Did the respondent have any difficulties with any specific question?	Yes..... 1 No 2	→ Q29
Q28	Which questions? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)	DESCRIBE DIFFICULTIES	
	G3.01: Household items owned <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G3.02: Individual ownership <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G3.03: Decision to sell, give away, etc. <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G3.04: Decide to purchase <input type="checkbox"/>		
ASK RESPONDENT			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q29	Earlier I asked you if anyone in your household currently has several items. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G3.01)	Easy..... 1 Difficult 2	→ Q31
Q30	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q31	Earlier I asked you if you own several items. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G3.02)	Easy..... 1 Difficult 2	→ Q33
Q32	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		

Q33	What does it mean to you if I ask you if you have something? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN (refers to G3.01)		
Q34	What does it mean to you if I ask you if you own something? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN (refers to G3.02)		
Q35	Earlier I asked you who can decide whether to sell, give away, mortgage, or rent out different items your household currently has. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G3.03)	Easy 1 Difficult.....2 →	WEAI QX MODULE G3(B)
Q36	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		

MODULE G3B – ACCESS TO CREDIT

“Now I want you to reflect on the set of questions I have just asked you and I will ask you a few questions about them.”

ITEMS FOR INTERVIEWER			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q37	General Observations NOTE ANY UNUSUAL VERBAL OR NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS		
Q38	Did the respondent have any difficulties with any specific question?	Yes..... 1 No 2 →	Q40
Q39	Which questions? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)	DESCRIBE DIFFICULTIES	
	G3.05: Anyone able to take loans <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G3.06: Anyone taken loans <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G3.07: Decision to borrow <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G3.08: Decision about what to do with loans <input type="checkbox"/>		
ASK RESPONDENT			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q40	Earlier I asked if you or anyone in your household would be able to take a loan / borrow cash or in-kind if you wanted to. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G3.05)	Easy 1 → Difficult 2	Q42
Q41	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q42	Earlier I asked you if anyone in your household had taken any loans or borrowed cash/in-kind from several sources in the past 12 months. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G3.06)	Easy 1 → Difficult 2	Q44
Q43	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		

Q44	<p>Do you think other people being asked this question would know if members of their household had taken loans?</p> <p>WRITE RESPONSE DOWN</p>		
Q45	<p>Many people find it difficult to recall things that happened a long time ago. How well do you remember the loans taken by anyone in the household in the last 12 months?</p> <p>(refers to all of Module G3(B))</p> <p>CODE AND WRITE RESPONSE DOWN; PROBE AS NECESSARY</p>	<p>Remember well 1</p> <p>Remember poorly..... 2</p> <p>VERBATIM:</p>	
Q46	<p>Do you think other respondents being asked these questions would be embarrassed or reluctant to share information on household borrowing activities?</p> <p>WRITE RESPONSE DOWN</p>	<p>→</p>	<p>WEAI QX MODULE G4</p>

MODULE G4 – MOTIVATION FOR DECISION MAKING

“Now I want you to reflect on the set of questions I have just asked you and I will ask you a few questions about them.”

ITEMS FOR INTERVIEWER			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q47	General Observations NOTE ANY UNUSUAL VERBAL OR NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS		
Q48	Did the respondent have any difficulties with any specific question?	Yes 1 No 2 →	Q50
Q49	Which questions? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)	DESCRIBE DIFFICULTIES	
	Doing only option available <input type="checkbox"/>		
	Doing what are told by others to do <input type="checkbox"/>		
	Doing something so others speak well of them <input type="checkbox"/>		
	Doing what they think is good and best <input type="checkbox"/>		
ASK RESPONDENT			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q50	Earlier I asked if you are like the people in the stories, doing the only option available. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G4.A1, G4.B1, G4.C1)	Easy..... 1 → Difficult..... 2	Q52
Q51	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q52	Do you think some people might find this question difficult to answer?	Yes 1 No..... 2 → Don't know..... 3	Q54

Q53	Why? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q54	Earlier I asked if you are like the people in the stories, doing what you are told by others to do. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G4.A2, G4.B2, G4.C2)	Easy.....1 → Difficult.....2	Q56
Q55	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q56	Do you think some people might find this question difficult to answer?	Yes1 No.....2 → Don't know.....3	Q58
Q57	Why? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q58	Earlier I asked if you are like the people in the stories, acting so that others speak well of you. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G4.A3, G4.B3, G4.C3)	Easy.....1 → Difficult.....2	Q60
Q59	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q60	Do you think some people might find this question difficult to answer?	Yes1 No.....2 → Don't know.....3	Q62
Q61	Why? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q62	Earlier I asked if you are like the people in the stories, acting according to what you think is good and best for the purpose. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G4.A4, G4.B4, G4.C4)	Easy.....1 → Difficult.....2	Q64

Q63	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q64	Do you think some people might find this question difficult to answer?	Yes1 No.....2 → Don't know.....3	WEAI QX MODULE G5
Q65	Why? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN	→	WEAI QX MODULE G5

MODULE G5 – TIME ALLOCATION

“Now I want you to reflect on the set of questions I have just asked you and I will ask you a few questions about them.”

ITEMS FOR INTERVIEWER			
QNO.	Question	Response	Go To
Q66	General observations Note any unusual verbal or nonverbal behaviors		
Q67	Did the respondent have any difficulties with any specific question?	Yes.....1 No.....2 →	Q69
	Which questions? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)	DESCRIBE DIFFICULTIES	
Q68	G5.01: Hours per week <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G5.02: 24-hour time log <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G5.03: Usual workload <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G5.04: Leisure <input type="checkbox"/>		
ASK RESPONDENT			
QNO.	Question	Response	Go To
Q69	Many people find it difficult to recall how many hours they spent on certain activities in the last week. How well do you remember which specific activities you spent time on during the past week? (refers to G5.01) CODE AND WRITE RESPONSE DOWN; PROBE AS NECESSARY	Remember well 1 Remember poorly 2 VERBATIM:	
Q70	Many people find it difficult to recall every activity done in a day. How well do you remember which specific activities you were doing at every time in the last 24 hours? (refers to G5.02) CODE AND WRITE RESPONSE DOWN; PROBE AS NECESSARY	Remember well 1 Remember poorly 2 VERBATIM:	

Q71	Often people do not know at what exact time of the day they did specific activities. They may have not checked the time, they may not have a watch or clock handy, or it may not be very important to them. How well do you know what time of the day it was when you were doing specific activities in the last 24 hours? (refers to G5.02) CODE AND WRITE RESPONSE DOWN; PROBE AS NECESSARY	Remember well 1 Remember poorly 2 VERBATIM:	
Q72	Is your daily schedule always the same, or do your activities change from day to day?	Always same schedule..... 1 → Change from day to day 2	Q74
Q73	How is your schedule different from day to day? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q74	Earlier I asked you if in the last 24 hours you worked more than usual, about the same as usual, or less than usual. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult to answer? (refers to G5.03)	Easy 1 → Difficult 2	Q76
Q75	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q76	Earlier I asked you how satisfied you are with your available time for leisure activities like visiting neighbors, watching TV, listening to the radio, seeing movies, or doing sports. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult to answer? (refers to G5.04)	Easy 1 → Difficult 2	Q78
Q77	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q78	Can you tell me in your own words what I mean by "leisure"? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN (refers to G5.04)	→	WEAI QX MODULE G6(A)

MODULE G6(A) – INDIVIDUAL LEADERSHIP AND INFLUENCE IN THE COMMUNITY

“Now I want you to reflect on the set of questions I have just asked you and I will ask you a few questions about them.”

ITEMS FOR INTERVIEWER			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q79	General Observations NOTE ANY UNUSUAL VERBAL OR NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS		
Q80	Did the respondent have any difficulties with any specific question?	Yes.....1 No.....2 →	Q82
Q81	Which questions? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)	DESCRIBE DIFFICULTIES	
	G6.01: Hypothetical speaking in public <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G6.02: Actual speaking in public <input type="checkbox"/>		
ASK RESPONDENT			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q82	Earlier I asked you if you felt comfortable speaking in public about issues that are important to you, your family, or your community. How was this question? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G6.01)	Easy 1 → Difficult.....2	Q84
Q83	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q84	Can you tell me in your own words what it means when I say “issues that are important to you, your family, or your community”? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q85	Earlier I asked if you had spoken up in public in the last three months on an issue that is important to you, your family, or your community. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G6.02)	Easy.....1 → Difficult.....2	Q87
Q86	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q87	Do you think other people would have difficulty with this question?	Yes.....1 No.....2 → Don't know.....3	WEAI QX MODULE G6(B)
Q88	Why would they have difficulty? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		WEAI QX MODULE G6(B)

MODULE G6(B) – GROUP MEMBERSHIP

“Now I want you to reflect on the set of questions I have just asked you and I will ask you a few questions about them.”

ITEMS FOR INTERVIEWER			
QNo.	Question	Response	Go To
Q89	General Observations NOTE ANY UNUSUAL VERBAL OR NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS		
Q90	Did the respondent have any difficulties with any specific question?	Yes.....1 No.....2 →	Q92
Q91	Which questions? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)	DESCRIBE DIFFICULTIES	
	G6.03: Identifying if the group exists in the community <input type="checkbox"/>		
	G6.04: Identifying if an active member <input type="checkbox"/>		
ASK RESPONDENT			
QNO.	Question	Response	Skip
Q92	Earlier I asked you if there were different groups in your community. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G6.03)	Easy 1 → Difficult.....2	Q94
Q93	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q94	Do you think some people might find this question difficult to answer?	Yes.....1 No.....2 → Don't know.....3	Q96
Q95	Why? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		

	Have you ever heard of [GROUP(s)], even if there are none in your community? (refers to G6.03)	CIRCLE ONE		
Q96	Agricultural / livestock / fisheries producers' group	Yes	No	
	Water users' group	Yes	No	
	Forest users' group	Yes	No	
	Credit or microfinance group	Yes	No	
	Mutual help or insurance group	Yes	No	
	Trade and business association	Yes	No	
	Civic group or charitable group	Yes	No	
	Religious group	Yes	No	
	Other groups	Yes	No	
	Q97	Earlier I asked you if you were an active member in different groups in your community. How was this question for you? Was this question easy or difficult? (refers to G6.04)	Easy 1 → Difficult..... 2	
Q98	Why was it difficult? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN			
Q99	Do you think some people might find this question difficult to answer?	Yes 1 → No..... 2 Don't know..... 3		Q101
Q100	Why? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN			
Q101	What does it mean for you to be an active member of a group? (refers to G6.04) WRITE RESPONSE DOWN			

RESPONDENT DEBRIEFING

(Allow respondent a brief break; then continue with the questions below.)

“Now I want you to reflect on the full interview I have just asked you and I will ask you a few questions about it.”

QNO.	Question	Response	Go To
Q102	What do you think about this interview? PROBE: Did you like it or not? PROBE: Was it easy or difficult?		
Q103	Did you feel comfortable during this interview?	Yes 1 → No 2	Q105
Q104	Why not? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
Q105	Do you think anyone you know may have trouble with this interview?	Yes.....1 No.....2 → Don't know.....3	End of interview
Q106	Why? WRITE RESPONSE DOWN		
End of interview. Please thank respondent for his or her time.			

REFERENCES

- Alkire, S., R. Meinzen-Dick, A. Peterman, A. Quisumbing, G. Seymour and A. Vaz. 2013. "The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index." *World Development* 52: 71–91.
- Beatty, P. C., and G. B. Willis. 2007. "Research Synthesis: The Practice of Cognitive Interviewing." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 71 (2): 287–311.
- Johnson, K. B., and P. Diego-Rosell. 2015. "Assessing the Cognitive Validity of the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index Instrument in the Haiti Multi-Sectoral Baseline Survey." *Survey Practice* 8 (3).
- Tourangeau, R. 1984. "Cognitive Sciences and Survey Methods." In *Cognitive Aspects of Survey Methodology: Building a Bridge between Disciplines*, edited by T. B. Jabine, M. L. Straf, and R. Tourangeau, 73–100. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Willis, G. B. 2005. *Cognitive Interviewing: A Tool for Improving Questionnaire Design*. London: Sage Publications.
- Willis, G. B., and K. Miller. 2011. "Cross-Cultural Cognitive Interviewing: Seeking Comparability and Enhancing Understanding." *Field Methods* 23 (4): 331–341.

RECENT IFPRI DISCUSSION PAPERS

For earlier discussion papers, please go to www.ifpri.org/publications/discussion_papers.
All discussion papers can be downloaded free of charge.

1563. *New modalities for managing drought risk in rainfed agriculture: Evidence from a discrete choice experiment in Odisha, India.* Patrick S. Ward and Simrin Makhija, 2016.
1562. *Using zero tillage to ameliorate yield losses from weather shocks: Evidence from panel data in Haryana, India.* Md. Tajuddin Khan, Avinash Kishore, Divya Pandey, and P. K. Joshi, 2016.
1561. *Limits to Green Revolution in rice in Africa: The case of Ghana.* Catherine Ragasa and Antony Chapoto, 2016.
1560. *Will China's demographic transition exacerbate its income inequality?: A CGE modeling with top-down microsimulation.* Xinxin Wang, Kevin Z. Chen, Sherman Robinson, and Zuhui Huang, 2016.
1559. *Comparing apples to apples: A new indicator of research and development investment intensity in agriculture.* Alejandro Nin-Pratt, 2016.
1558. *Have Chinese firms become smaller?: If so, why?* Qiming Yang, Xiaobo Zhang, and Wu Zhu, 2016.
1557. *Export competition issues after Nairobi: The recent World Trade Organization agreements and their implications for developing countries.* Eugenio Díaz-Bonilla and Jonathan Hepburn, 2016.
1556. *Adoption of food safety measures among Nepalese milk producers: Do smallholders benefit?* Anjani Kumar, Ganesh Thapa, P. K. Joshi, and Devesh Roy, 2016.
1555. *Making pulses affordable again: Policy options from the farm to retail in India.* P. K. Joshi, Avinash Kishore, and Devesh Roy, 2016.
1554. *Implications of slowing growth in emerging market economies for hunger and poverty in rural areas of developing countries.* David Laborde and Will Martin, 2016.
1553. *Impacts of CAADP on Africa's agricultural-led development.* Samuel Benin, 2016
1552. *Do beliefs about agricultural inputs counterfeiting: Correspond with actual rates of counterfeiting?* Maha Ashour, Lucy Billings, Daniel Gilligan, Jessica B. Hoel, and Naureen Karachiwalla, 2016.
1551. *Agricultural inputs policy under macroeconomic uncertainty: Applying the Kaleidoscope Model to Ghana's Fertilizer Subsidy Programme (2008–2015).* Danielle Resnick and David Mather, 2016.
1550. *Gender dimensions on farmers' preferences for direct-seeded rice with drum seeder in India.* Md. Tajuddin Khan, Avinash Kishore, and P. K. Joshi, 2016.
1549. *A farm-level perspective of the policy challenges for export diversification in Malawi: Example of the oilseeds and maize sectors.* Michael E. Johnson, Brent Edelman, and Cynthia Kazembe, 2016.
1548. *The distribution of power and household behavior: Evidence from Niger.* Fleur Wouterse, 2016.
1547. *Market integration and price transmission in Tajikistan's wheat markets: Rising like rockets but falling like feathers?* Jarilkasin Ilyasov, Linde Götz, Kamiljon Akramov, Paul Dorosh, and Thomas Glauben, 2016.
1546. *The economic value of seasonal forecasts: Stochastic economywide analysis for East Africa.* Joao Rodrigues, James Thurlow, Willem Landman, Claudia Ringler, Ricky Robertson, and Tingju Zhu, 2016.
1545. *Perceived land tenure security and rural transformation: Empirical evidence from Ghana.* Hosaena Ghebru, Huma Khan, and Isabel Lambrecht, 2016.
1544. *Global and regional pulse economies: Current trends and outlook.* P. K. Joshi and P. Parthasarathy Rao, 2016.
1543. *United States agricultural policy: Its evolution and impact.* Joseph W. Glauber and Anne Effland, 2016.
1542. *Roads to innovation: firm-level evidence from China.* Xu Wang, Xiaobo Zhang, Zhuan Xie, and Yiping Huang, 2016.
1541. *A systematic review of cross-country data initiatives on agricultural public expenditures in developing countries.* Richard Anson and Tewodaj Mogues, 2016.
1540. *Does female labor scarcity encourage innovation?: Evidence from China's gender imbalance.* Zhibo Tan and Xiaobo Zhang, 2016.

**INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY
RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

www.ifpri.org

IFPRI HEADQUARTERS

2033 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA
Tel.: +1-202-862-5600
Fax: +1-202-467-4439
Email: ifpri@cgiar.org