

EXPANDED AND NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES

SANNE UNGER AND YFKE ONGENA

LYNN
UNIVERSITY



rijksuniversiteit
 groningen



INTRODUCTION

- Identify types of expanded and non-conforming responses
- Explain what these responses accomplish
- Continuum:
 - From minimally expanded answers
 - To turns without a type-conforming response

PARADIGMATIC SEQUENCE

IR: and eh I'd also like to ask some questions about the ↑other persons↑
first about your ↓husband= =how old is your husband↑=

IE: =.hh my husband is eh forty nine↓
(0.2)

IR: and e- what- is ↓his highest school Yeducation↑/

IE: ≤ .hhh f.HHH MTS:

IR: and did he com↓plete that education↑

IE: y↓es↑
(0.4)



TYPE-CONFORMING VS. NON-CONFORMING ANSWERS

- Type-conforming:
 - "Conform to the constraints embodied in the grammatical form" (Raymond, 2003)
- Non-conforming:
 - Most important cause for survey interviewers to deviate from their script (Ongena and Dijkstra, 2010)
 - Effect on validity of the survey data is unclear (Schaeffer and Dykema, 2011)



METHODS

- Several corpora of Dutch survey interviews (1995, 2002, and 2004)
- One corpus of survey interviews conducted in the US (2006)
- Topics ranged from education to health
- Audio recordings



ANALYSIS: QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE

- Qualitative:
 - Transcribed and analyzed using Conversation Analysis (Jefferson, 2004)
- Quantitative:
 - Coded responses using Sequence Viewer (Dijkstra 2016)



RESULTS

- Limited number of ways respondents deviate from the paradigmatic sequence

- Minimal expansions:

- Serial extras
- Uncertainty markers

- Full-blown expansions:

- Answer + post-expansion
- Pre-expansion + answer

- Non-conforming answers:

- Non-conforming answers (non-problematic)
- Non-conforming answers (problematic)

MINIMAL EXPANSIONS

Response
same

Series of related
questions

- Serial extras
- Uncertainty markers

Imprecision or
uncertainty

Otherwise well-
formatted
response

1 IR: and of the ↓Telegraaf how many of the last six issues↑
2 (0.7)
3 IE: → eh about two,
4 (0.8) ((tick tick))
5 IR: and of the Volkskrant↑
6 (0.8)
7 IE: → a↓bout three↑
8 (0.3)
9 IR: yes, .h
10 (.) ((tick))
11 IR: and of your regional ↓daily↓
12 IR: o↓pinion ↑magazines↑= =Elsevier and HP ↓de Tijd↑=
13 IE: b→ =m- no also not↑=
14 IR: =s↓ports magazines↑
15 (0.8)
16 no↑
17 youth and ↓juvenile magazines↑
18 also not,
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 IE: b→



FULL-BLOWN E

Displays how the answer should be

1 IR: =.hhh then a completely different ↑sub↓ject,= =do you ever ↑smoke
2 ↓even if that is ever so rarely↓

3 (.)

4 IE: → eh I ↓smoke yes↑

5 (0.8) ((tik))

6 IR: and then I'll now name a few ↓smoking articles↑=

1 IR: eh are you the owner of the house in which you live or is it rented↑=

2 IF: =iw vih it's a bought house↓ h

3 IR: and are you planning to move house in the next ↓twelve months↑=

4 IF: =no, wll be staying here↓ heh .h

okay↑ nowadays the terms modal

Modifies the terms of the question

Shows how the respondent arrived at the answer



	9	IR:	=.h and ↑ how many of the past six issues of the Telegraaf ↑ did you read
	10		
	11	IE: →	WELL ↑ most of the time eh I buy eh I'm not subscribed to it ↓ but if I'm in a supermarket ↓ or in town ↓ then on SATurdays I always buy the nicely thick newspaper for the ↓ weekend (.)
	15		did you do that- this Saturday as well ↑
	16		(0.2)
	17	IE:	.h Eh the pAst Saturday indeed- NNNoT ↓ =
	18	IR:	=so you did not read ↑ no Telegraaf for the whole week ↓ =
	19	IE:	= ↑ -no ↓ =
	20	IR:	=oka[y .h] how many of the past six issues of the
	4	IE:	=yes ↑ =
	5	IR:	=which way do you ↑ usually take ↓ part ↑
	6		(0.4)
	7	IE: →	eh just ↑ I get them myself from the post office,
	8		(.)
		IR:	↑ cash ↓ =
		IE:	=-yes- H=
	11	IR:	=and do you ever take part in the state lottery ↓ jackpot ↑

NON-C

Not one of the answer options

A description or reporting

■ Non-conform (non-problem)

■ Non-conforming answers (problematic)

Designed as dispreferred

Set up as contrast

NON-CONFORMING ANSWERS

- The influence of design:
 - Non-conforming answers designed as dispreferred turns
 - Delayed
 - Hesitations
 - Turn-initial “well”
 - Contain or imply a contrast

E::h H e-e-w (0.3) I do own a house
but e::h I don't live in an owned
house now


=.HH well until no:w it was rather bad,
(0.3) .klh (.) but eh I eh will mend my
ways




QUANTITATIVE STUDY

- Three data sets coded in Sequence Viewer
 - 36,352 Q-A sequences
 - Nearly 200,000 utterances
 - 12,556 instances of expansion
- Reliability of coding (Kappa = 0.81)

FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF EXPANSIONS



INTERVIEWER'S REACTION TO EXPANSIONS





CONCLUSIONS

- Ideal:
 - Type-conforming responses
 - Paradigmatic sequences
- Expanded responses
 - Limited ways to expand
 - Can be very minimal
 - No impact on Q-A sequence
 - Provide extra information
 - Address restrictive answer categories
 - Lead to sequence expansions

REFERENCES

- Blair, J., & Presser, S. (1992). An experimental comparison of alternative pretest techniques: A note on preliminary findings. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 32(2), RC2-RC5.
- Biemer, P.P. (2004). Modeling Measurement Error to Identify Flawed Questions. In S. Presser, J. Rothgeb, M. Couper, J. Lessler, E. Martin, J. Martin, and E. Singer (Eds.), *Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questionnaires* (pp. 225-246). New York, New York: Wiley.
- Clayman, S.E. (1993). Reformulating the question: a device for answering / not answering questions in news interviews and press conferences. *Text*, 13(2), 159-188.
- Clayman, S.E. (2001). Answers and evasions. *Language in Society*, 30, 403-442.
- Drew, P. (1984). Speakers' reportings in invitation sequence. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 129-151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dijkstra, W. (2002). Transcribing, Coding, and Analyzing Verbal Interactions in Survey Interviews. In D.W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N.C. Schaeffer and J. Van der Zouwen (Eds.), *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview* (pp. 401-426). New York: Wiley.
- Forsyth, B.H. and Lessler, J.T. (1991). Cognitive Laboratory Methods: A Taxonomy. in P. P. Biemer, R. M. Groves, L. e. Lysberg, N. A. Mathiowetz, and S. Sudman (Eds.), *Measurement Errors in Surveys* (pp. 393-418). New York: Wiley.
- Fowler, F. J., & Mangione, T. W. (1990). *Standardized survey interviewing; minimizing interviewer-related error*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fowler, F. J. (2011). Coding the behavior of interviewers and respondents to evaluate survey questions. In J. Madans, K. Miller & A. G. Maitland (Eds.), *Question evaluation methods: Contributing to the science of data quality* (pp. 7-22). New York, New York: Wiley.
- Haan, M., Ongena, Y. P., & Huiskes, M. (2013). Interviewer's question rewording: Not always a bad thing. In P. Winkler, N. Menold & R. Porst (Eds.), *Survey standardization and interviewers' deviations – impact, reasons, detection and prevention* (pp. 173-194). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang International Academic Publishers.
- Heritage, J. & Atkinson, J.M. (1984). Introduction. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holbrook, A. L., Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Telephone versus face-to-face interviewing of national probability samples with long questionnaires: Comparisons of respondent satisficing and social desirability response bias. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 67(1), 79-125.
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (2000). *Interaction and the standardized survey interview. The living questionnaire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. & van den Bergh, H. (2000). Effects of introductions in large-scale telephone survey interviews. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 28(3), 281-300.
- Jefferson, Gail (2004) [Glossary of transcript symbols with an Introduction](#). In G. H. Lerner (Ed.) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-23). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Maynard, D.W. and Schaeffer, N.C. (2013). Conversation Analysis and Interaction in Standardized Survey Interviews. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford, UK : Wiley-Blackwell.

REFERENCES

- Ongena, Y.P. (2009). *Helping respondents to format their answers: a question wording experiment in a telephone survey*. Paper presented at the 64th conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Hollywood, Florida.
- Ongena, Y.P. (2010). *Interviewer and respondent interaction in survey interviews: Empirical evidence from behavior coding studies and question wording experiments*. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Ongena, Y.P. & W. Dijkstra (2006). Methods of Behavior Coding of Survey Interviews. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 22, 419-451.
- Ongena, Y.P. & W. Dijkstra (2007) A Model of Cognitive Processes and Conversational Principles in Survey Interview Interaction. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, Special Issue on Cognitive Aspects of Survey Research*, 21(2), 145-163.
- Ongena, Y. P., & Dijkstra, W. (2010). Preventing mismatch answers in standardized survey interviews. *Quality and Quantity*, 44(4), 641-659. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11135-009-9227-x>
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Presser, S., Couper, M. P., Lessler, J. T., Martin, E., Martin, J., Rothgeb, J. M., et al. (2004). Methods for testing and evaluating survey questions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68(1), 109-130.
- Raymond, G. (2000). *The structure of responding: conforming and nonconforming responses to yes-no type interrogatives*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar And Social Organization: Yes/No Interrogatives And The Structure Of Responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68(6), 939-967. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/218827736?accountid=36334>
- Saris, W.E. and Gallhofer, I.N. (2007). *Design, Evaluation, and Analysis of Questionnaires for Survey Research*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Schaeffer, N. C., & Dykema, J. (2011). Response 1 to Fowler's chapter: Coding the behavior of interviewers and respondents to evaluate survey questions. In J. Madans, K. Miller & A. G. Maitland (Eds.), *Question evaluation methods: Contributing to the science of data quality* (pp. 23-40). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Schaeffer, N.C., Maynard, D.W. & Cradock, R. (1993). Negotiating certainty: uncertainty proposals and their disposal in standardized survey interviews. Unpublished manuscript, Discussion Paper 93-25, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Schaeffer, N.C. and Maynard, D.W. (2002). Occasions for Intervention: Interactional Resources for Comprehension in Standardized Survey Interviews. In D.W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N.C. Schaeffer, and J. Van der Zouwen (Eds.), *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview* (pp. 261-280). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (2013). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ten Have, P. (2007). *Understanding Qualitative Research and Ethnomethodology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Willis, G. (2005). *Cognitive interviewing. A tool for improving questionnaire design*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Yan, T., Kreuter, F., & Tourangeau, R. (2012). Evaluating survey questions: A comparison of methods. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 28(4), 503-529.