

STANDARDIZATION-IN-INTERACTION: THE SURVEY INTERVIEW

Douglas W. Maynard

Nora Cate Schaeffer

Department of Sociology

University of Wisconsin

Madison WI 53706

January 29, 2005

Forthcoming

In Paul Drew, Geoff Raymond, and Darin Weinberg (eds.)

Talking Research.

(London:Sage)

STANDARDIZATION-IN-INTERACTION: THE SURVEY INTERVIEW

The survey interview as a form of social scientific research is ubiquitous almost beyond comprehension. Its use spans disciplines (especially psychology, political science, and sociology), national boundaries, government and business organizations, public and private sectors, and so on. In addition to its information-gathering function, it is a tool for administering and governing society—in the U.S., for example, officials conduct the national census using a form of the survey interview, and the Current Population Survey, by which the government ascertains employment figures on a monthly basis, is a tool for forging economic policy. Most generally, the survey interview is a means for measuring demographic characteristics and aggregate attitudes and opinions in many societies and sub-societies around the world. Surveys do this in a systematic way: sampling a population and then using standardized measurement in order to estimate various characteristics of it.

Over the years both practitioners and critics of standardized surveys have considered how the fundamentally social nature of the interview affects the data. Critics have presented examples of the awkward, or even bizarre, interactions that sometimes occur in survey interviews as evidence that the resulting data cannot be valid. Practitioners (Kahn and Cannell 1957), on the other hand, view such individual incidents as resulting from unusual circumstances or badly-designed survey questions; they argue that adherence to rules of standardization improves the overall quality of the data in the aggregate, even if those rules seem to be awkward in some individual situations (Cannell, Lawson, and Hausser 1975). Indeed, the desire to improve data quality is the justification for the rather rigid-seeming survey instrument in the first place.

Whether one approaches the survey interview as critic or supporter, an intriguing question is how participants organize their interactive relations. This chapter examines what

happens in the talk between interviewer and respondent that enables the former to record codified answers from the latter on a computer for later aggregation with other such interactionally generated raw data. From quantities of "conversations with a purpose" (Bingham and Moore 1925; Schaeffer 1991), in other words, researchers are able to discern patterns and make inferences about the characteristics of whole populations. Our interest is in the "interactional substrate" (Maynard and Marlaire 1992)—the social organization in talk that makes "accountable" data gathering possible with whatever degree of standardization the process exhibits.

In this chapter, we first review the justification for standardization in the survey interview: we summarize recent debates, discuss different varieties of standardization, and consider the limits of standardization. By considering these limits, we draw attention to the role of tacit and commonsense knowledge in the conduct of the survey interview. Tacit knowledge is what Polanyi (1958:20) terms "an essential personal participation of the scientist even in the most exact operations of science." Personal or commonsense knowledge "co-operates" with formal or impersonal (standardized) judgments about how to act, just as tacit understandings combine with explicit rules and procedures and as "subsidiary" comprehension of how to do some task joins with more "focal" and instrumental awareness of the task. We subsequently argue for studying interaction in the survey interview using an approach we call analytic alternation. Because of the tension between the procedures for social measurement and the practices of ordinary talk, interviewers alternate between following the rules of standardization and using the tacit knowledge available to competent social actors who must solve problems that arise as their work tasks unfold. Analytic alternation means following the situated oscillations between formal rule following and the practices that interviewers enact in concert with survey

respondents to make standardized measurement happen even when it seems most threatened. In particular, we examine both (a) the interviewing sequences by which survey instruments are administered, and (b) instances of what we call post-sequence elaborations, when respondents, having provided a recordable answer to an interviewer, make some comment that retrospectively changes the quality of that answer. In some cases, these elaborations re-open interviewing sequences that appeared to have been closed. We trace the consequences of elaborations both for the interaction and for standardization and social measurement.

WHY STANDARDIZATION IN THE SURVEY INTERVIEW?

The varied practices that researchers refer to as "standardization" evolved in response to early studies that demonstrated how the behavior of interviewers affects error in survey estimates (Groves 1989:380-381; Hyman, Feldman, and Stember 1975[1954]:257). Interviewers were found to be highly variable in ratings they themselves made and in the number of responses obtained to open questions. Possible sources for such variability could be the expectations of interviewers—for example that respondents have consistent attitudes or that their attitudes would be associated with particular social characteristics (as when an interviewer expects that poor respondents would favor government programs to aid those with low incomes). Practices for expressing these expectations would include “probing,” the action whereby interviewers query respondents who have not provided an adequate answer to some interview question. When interviewers vary in the way that they ask questions or probe, this is known as *error*. If, however, interviewers share certain expectations and consistently ask questions or probe in ways that express them, this is known as constant error, or bias. Summarizing the effects of the interviewer on the distribution of answers, Hyman (1975[1954]:271) says, " ... the only reasonable answer seems to be that absolutely anything can happen." So, the rules of

standardization attempt to control the behavior of the interviewer. The goal is to reduce variable error by having interviewers behave in the same way and to reduce bias by restricting opportunities for the interviewer's expectations or opinions to intrude on the process by which the respondent's answer is generated, interpreted, or recorded.

Standardization works mainly to reduce interviewer variability. However, it does not *eliminate* the effect of interviewers on respondents. An interviewer who follows the rules of standardization might react to a respondent's ambiguous answer by repeating all the response categories, for example. From the point of view of standardization, this would be preferable to alternative behaviors such as using beliefs about the respondent's likely answer to choose which response categories to repeat. Accordingly, standardized repetition of response categories does influence how respondents express their answers, and, over the course of the interview, probably has the desirable outcome of training respondents to choose a category from among those offered rather than answering in other terms. This is clearly an effect of the interviewer on the individual respondent. Nevertheless, if standardization were comprehensive and perfectly implemented, we could say that the interviewer did not affect responses—in the very specific sense that the influence of any interviewer would be the same as that of any other interviewer. That is, in the best world of survey administration, interviewers are interchangeable.

CONCERNS ABOUT STANDARDIZATION

Standardizing the survey interview involves rules or principles that Fowler and Mangione (1990:35) codified in their well-known book on this topic. These principles are comprehensive and refined through many years of practice and observation:

1. Read questions as written.
2. Probe inadequate answers nondirectively.

3. Record answers without discretion.
4. Be interpersonally nonjudgmental regarding the substance of answers.

These principles are widely accepted by survey researchers, although specific practices derived from them can vary substantially, as researchers and staff charged with supervising field operations have derived their own specifications for training interviewers (Viterna and Maynard 2002).

Standardization is focused on reducing interviewer variability and thus on improving reliability, so that different interviewers act according to interviewing rules and obtain the same answers from similar respondents. However, standardization may neglect issues of validity (Hyman, Feldman, and Stember 1975[1954]:20-21). Critics like Cicourel (1963), Briggs (1986), Mishler (1986), and Suchman and Jordan (1990) argue that the rigidities of standardization lead to awkward interactions and inaccurate answering. For this reason, they propose allowing more natural or "recipient-designed" questions and more expression of respondents' lay understandings with respect to survey topics.

Despite the concerns from inside and outside the survey enterprise about reliability and validity, very little is known about how interviewers actually behave, how their behavior affects the answers given by respondents in the immediacy of the interaction, or how conversational practices from other sorts of talk (including what is often called "ordinary conversation") are used in standardized interviewing. This means that the survey interview is ripe for investigation and understanding as a form of talk-in-interaction. Consider Schegloff's (2002:156) remark about the survey interview as a measuring instrument:

Although an interview cannot in any case be like a thermometer . . . reliable exploitation even of a thermometer requires knowing the properties of mercury, the glass in which it

is encased, and so on, and incorporating these properties in the extraction of the desired information from the measurement device. It is by no means clear that we have such elementary understanding of the constitutive components of the survey interview . . . a more general inquiry into the features of the survey interview as an organized occasion of talk-in-interaction may help us think through in a thoroughly informed way how exactly to understand the methodological, epistemological, and theoretical features and status of the interview as a tool of inquiry.

Given the survey as an organized occasion of talk-in-interaction, *standardization-in-interaction* points to understanding and analyzing surveys as they are enacted through the tacit knowledge of both participants to the interview, performing in concert with one another, alternating between what is scripted for them to do and—when contingencies of asking or answering arise that the script doesn't cover—what their commonsense tells them to do. Historically, as Schaeffer (1991: 367) observes, the survey interview has been called a "conversation with a purpose," which recognizes that, although the interview depends upon conversational skills, it is not an "ordinary" conversation. As a form of talk-in-interaction that attempts to regulate both what the participants say and how they say it, the aim is to maintain a uniformity in asking and answering questions that aids in social measurement by minimizing error and bias. The degree of uniformity that participants achieve, however, is contingent upon the vicissitudes and contingencies of their actions and reactions to one another in and through talk. By the phrase *standardization-in-interaction*, we mean to capture the real but organized flow of such talk, including the speech practices and nonvocal behaviors of interviewer and respondent. Studying *standardization-in-interaction* contributes both to understanding the organization of interaction in the interview and improving the quality of data it produces.

ALTERNATION TO THE TACIT REALM

At any Computer-Aided Telephone Interviewing (CATI) Survey Research Center, it is possible to observe interviewers reading verbatim from the screen in front of them to their respondents, listening to respondents' answers, and entering into the computer the resultant codes or categories. The interviewers can appear to be operating in a strictly standardized or routine fashion, enacting what the survey instrument on their computer screen tells them to do as they talk, listen, and type. However, survey practitioners explicitly or implicitly recognize that interviewers inevitably must alternate between the rules of standardization and supplementing those rules with commonsense practices. At any unpredictable moment, interviewers will glance away from the screen, move their hands from the keyboard and gesture more or less expansively, producing talk that is neither scripted nor otherwise pre-designed, in order to handle some departure from the routine, with the aim of being able to return to that routine. For example, the interviewer may find it necessary to gesture while explaining something learned during training about the survey to a respondent. Although the gesturing is not something that the respondent sees, it might help the interviewer in articulating a point, or in emphasizing a significant piece of talk, or coordinating some other aspect of the verbal presentation. When done with the articulation, or emphasis, or coordination, the interviewer returns gaze and hands back to the computer and keyboard. For example, an interviewer calling back and trying to recruit or "convert" a call recipient who recently refused a request to participate may employ unwritten but familiar rhetorical devices and gesture in a way that enhances words or phrases by emphasizing certain speech particles (Maynard and Schaeffer 2002a). After obtaining the respondent's cooperation, it is possible for the interviewer to return to what is scripted on the computer screen, reading and speaking in a more standardized way. In short, interviewers momentarily alternate

from standardized, formal practice to the tacit realm and engage practices designed to provide for alternation again back to the formal realm. Analytic alternation is an inevitable aspect of standardization-in-interaction.

It may be that survey researchers, understandably emphasizing standardization so as to improve measurement and the quality of data, have neglected the essential pairing that occurs between the formal and the tacit, or between instructions and the alternate "lived work" and courses of action involved in implementing instructions (Garfinkel 1988; Garfinkel 2002; Lynch 2002). Early on, Garfinkel (1967:97-8) demonstrated how rules for coding require a variety of "ad hoc" procedures to make them work, and other ethnomethodologists have expanded the point (Lynch 1991; Zimmerman 1970). Most recently, sociologists have more fully appreciated that tacit and commonsense understandings are situated within "communities of work" embodying commitments of trust and mutual orientation (Collins 1985; Lave and Wenger 1991; Shapin 1994; Suchman 1987). In addition, studies of technology and social action are shedding light on, as Heath and Luff (2000:4) put it, "... the ways in which individuals, both alone and in concert with each other, use tools and technologies in the practical accomplishment of their daily work." Along these lines, Hak (2002) provides an enlightening study demonstrating the importance of ad hocing, tacit knowledge, and practical interpretation in the coding of CATI survey responses.

THE INTERVIEWING SEQUENCE

Some time ago, Schuman (1982:22) observed, " ... Surveys start from two of our most natural intellectual inclinations." Those two inclinations are to ask questions in order to obtain information and to sample in such a way as to have this information generally reflect a larger universe. As an example, consider how, at professional meetings, one participant might ask another whether there is a good nearby restaurant (Schuman 1982:22). Extending this example,

we can imagine how the restaurant seeker might decide that information from just one person would not be good enough, and that it would be better, therefore, to ask a few haphazardly if not entirely randomly chosen people. Therein lies the basis for the more systematic and analytic way of doing social measurement. In everyday life, participants have tacit knowledge enabling them to obtain information about worldly matters and to do so in relatively methodical ways that enhance the quality of this information.

One form in which tacit knowledge about how to gather information is exhibited in interaction is through the use of a generic "interviewing sequence" which unfolds in three turns: (1) question, (2) answer, and (3) acknowledgment.¹ To continue with Schuman's, (1982:22) illustration, the turns might be: (1) "Do you know of a good restaurant;" (2) "Yes try the Grille just two blocks down on the right side;" (3) "Okay, thanks!" (which contains a gratuity in addition to the acknowledgment). And we can observe this generic interviewing sequence at the very start of a formal survey interview. The parts of two interviewing sequences are indicated with arrows (number signs as at line 6 denote keystrokes), while the interviewer is indicated with "IV" and respondent with "R":

(1) AW01:A

```

1  IV:  1->  Oh kay: (.) a::nd >now we'll get started?< .hhh first
2          (.) how many persons live in your houseo:ld counting
3          all adults and children and including yourself.
4  R:    2->  four
5  IV:  3->  .hhhh okay(gh): a::[:nd? now we have some questions=
6          [##
7  IV:  =about government agencies. .hhh as you know:? every ten
8          year there is a census of the population of the
9          1-> United States. .hhh how confident are you: (.) that the
10         census bureau protects the privacy of personal information
11         about individuals and does not share it with other
12         government agencies. .hhh very confident (0.4) somewhat
13         (confident (0.5) not (too confident? (0.2) or not at all
14         (confident.
15         (1.0)
16  R:    Share it with what other governments?
17  IV:  (tch) .hh well the question doesn't specify: but (0.3) it
18         just says other government agen[cie]s

```

19 R: [oh]
 20 R: 2-> Probably very confident
 21 (0.5)
 22 IV: 3-> °Oh kay.° People have different ideas about what the census
 23 is used for ...

Not all survey questions appear in this three-part format, with an "okay" or other object in the third position. Often, a two-part question-answer sequence—which omits the third position—appears. For example, in extract (2), when the interviewer has a block of questions to ask about a single topic, she withholds the acknowledgment:

(2) AW01:B

1 IV: 1--> Okay our next questions have to do with government?
 2 .hhh on a scale of one to ten (.) where one means very
 3 ↑poo:r and ten means excellent °.hhh° >how would you
 4 rate the< job the president is doing.
 5 (1.4)
 6 R: 2--> Uh::m::: (0.9) six
 7 IV: 1--> .hhh and on the same one to ten scale? where one means
 8 very ↑poo:r and ten means excellent °'hh° >how would
 9 you rate< the job the congress is doing.
 10 (1.0)
 11 R: 2--> Uh::: (0.5) four
 12 IV: 1--> .hhh on the same one to ten scale where one means very
 13 ↑poor and ten means excellent (.) >how would you rate
 14 the job< the supreme court is doing?
 15 (0.8)
 16 R: 2--> Uh:m five
 17 IV: 1--> .hhh on the same one to ten scale where one means very
 18 poor and ten means excellent (.) >how would you rate the<
 19 job the military is doing?
 20 (0.9)
 21 R: 2--> Uh::m::: (1.3) eight(h)
 22 IV: 3--> Eight ↑okay please tell me whether you agree: or disagree:
 23 with each of the following statements? .hhh the first
 24 statement is (0.4) people like me don't have any say about
 25 what the government does.

Notice that at line 22, when the interviewer is done with the questions that ask the respondent to rate the president, congress, and supreme court, she repeats the respondent's answer ("eight"), and then produces the third turn acknowledgment, an "okay" that is dual in character—marking the end of one activity and the start of another (Beach, 1993). Here, it is accompanied by a polite request form ("please tell me") that also may project a forthcoming next question distinct from

the previous series. It could be said that interviewers have ways of signifying the boundaries of related questions, withholding third-turn acknowledgment when a subsequent question links to the topic of its predecessor, and producing such an acknowledgment when the next question does not. Thus, even when they read a script more or less verbatim, survey interviewers, in interaction with respondents, are engaged in performances that improvise on the script.

The Survey Interviewing Sequence: Questions and Answers

Questions and answers—the first two turns in an interviewing sequence—have interactional facets, only some of which have been investigated. That is, interaction-based research on the survey interview and the sequences it comprises is still in its infancy. The limited research that has been done is suggestive, however. For example, Schaeffer (1991:386-387), drawing on CA research about the projectable completion of turns at talk (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974), observes that many survey questions are vulnerable to interruption because they can be heard to implicate a response from the respondent before the scripted question or its response options have been completely read. A typical example is when interviewers ask respondents for their political party affiliation:

(3) AW01:364

```
1 IV:      Generally speak↑ing do you usually think of yourself as a
2          re↑publican (0.4) demo[crat      ] independent? Or=
3 R:              [republican]
4 IV:      =something else[:? re[publican? ]
5 R:              [      [republi  ]can
6 IV:              [#      [#
```

According to how this item was written, the interviewer is required to read the entire list of response options ("republican, democrat, or something else") before the respondent answers. However, in this instance, in overlap with the interviewer completing the list (line 2), the respondent produces an answer (line 3), thereby intersecting the full reading. Nevertheless, IV

continues with the list (lines 2-4), and then asks if R said "republican" (line 4), thereby retrieving that item from the overlap for confirmation, which R provides in line 5. Although the verification produced by IV would be judged directive by the strictest versions of standardization, it could have been awkward had the interviewer ignored the content of the respondent's interruption and attempted a re-reading of the list of choices. Often, in fact, when respondents answer prematurely, interviewers do modify their reading of questions or response options. Again, interviewing establishments may vary in how they implement standardization; and within establishments, interviewers may vary in how standardized they are. In circumstances where respondents can project completion of questioning turns, it appears that Dutch survey interviewers become more "conversational" while U.S. interviewers are stricter in following rules of standardization (Houtkoop-Steenstra 2000:Chapter 5).

Whereas respondents can interrupt standardized question asking, their answering is also vulnerable to interactional effects. Particularly when they display "uncertainty" (Maynard and Schaeffer 2002b:24-27), respondents may provide "occasions for intervention" (Schaeffer and Maynard 2002) on the part of interviewers. One such occasion occurs when, instead of using survey categories for their answers, respondents engage in "reporting," whereby they detail an activity without making the upshot explicit (Drew 1984). In excerpt (4), the respondent, when asked if he owns his own business or farm, does not produce an answer that is formatted in the proper response categories. Instead he begins with a particle "Weahh" (line 2) that sounds like a combination of "Well" and "Yeah." This particle suggests a mitigated agreement or acceptance of the presumption of the question. There is then a full "Well" and a report that he is in business with his sister.

(4) 008c0301, version C: 11

1 IV: Do you have your own business or farm?

2 R: Weahh, well I'm (.) in partnership with my sister in the shoe
3 repair business?
4 (1.5)
5 IV: O:kay so that would (.) uh qualify as your own business?
6 R: I guess so=
7 IV: =uh huh
8 (6.0)
9 IV: Now I'm going to ask a few questions about . . .

The particle "well" is known to preface disagreements or to provide for sequentially weak agreement or acceptance (Pomerantz 1984). Moreover, the answer at lines 2-3 follows a yes-no interrogative and, as a nonconforming answer, takes issue with premises of the prior turn (Raymond 2003). After a delay (line 4), the interviewer responds in the form of a probe that draws the upshot for the respondent to confirm (line 5). The respondent's reply (line 6) confirms the probe in a hedged way by saying it would be a "guess," and thereby it displays uncertainty; nevertheless, the interviewer acknowledges this answer (line 7), which completes the interviewing sequence. She also records the answer (line 8), and moves to the next set of questions (line 9).

In the survey interview, the use of a report implies that it is the interviewer's job to gather the upshot and map the report onto the proper response category (Moore 2004; Schaeffer and Maynard 1996; Schaeffer and Maynard 2002). In most versions of standardization, however, survey interviewers are required to avoid making even obvious inferences and resubmit answer categories to respondents (Schaeffer and Maynard 2002:272). When interviewers do propose an upshot, as in (4), it is often a directive probe that violates protocol. On the part of respondents and interviewers both, the proclivity to use ordinary conversational devices during the survey interview can intrude on standardization.

The Survey Interviewing Sequence: Third-Turn Acknowledgments or "Feedback"

Survey methodologists refer to the third turns of the interviewing sequence as "feedback." Depending on how it is produced, this turn has the potential to convey interviewers' evaluations or expectations rather than something more neutral. Acknowledgments or feedback include subtle forms of interviewer behavior as well as the more formal tokens that interviewers use after a respondent has produced an answer to a survey question.

In environments other than surveys, third turns perform various kinds of interactional work. For instance, following information-seeking question-answer sequences in conversational contexts, third turns register that the information is informative to the questioner. Turns in the excerpt below are labeled:

(5) Heritage 1984b: 285-286

```
S: 1--> .hh When do you get out. Christmas week or the week before
      Christmas.
      (0.3)
G: 2--> Uh::m two or three days before Ch[r]istmas.]
S: 3--> [Oh:, ]
```

The "Oh" in turn 3 indicates a "change of state" in the answer recipient's knowledge (Heritage 1984a). In educational settings, "instructional" sequences involve teachers asking "known information" questions, and providing evaluative feedback in the third turn:

(6) Mehan (1979:52-3)

```
T: 1--> ((Holding up card)) This is the long word. Who knows what
      It says?
S: 2--> Cafeteria.
T: 3--> Cafeteria, Audrey, good for you!
```

In contrast with conversational and educational settings, there are other institutional settings in which questioners withhold third turn responses of either variety (indicating a change of knowledge state or evaluation of an answer). Prominent are courtrooms (Atkinson and Drew

1979), job interviews (Button 1987), and news interviews (Clayman 1988; Heritage and Greatbatch 1991). These venues have in common that interviewers (attorneys or employers or newscasters, as the case may be) are soliciting answers for an overhearing or what we might call a lurking audience of some kind who may do their evaluations of interviewees and their answers at some distance from the interview itself.² By refraining from post-answer commentary, interviewers exhibit themselves as conduits for those answers to flow to those audiences—who are then in the position of supplying that commentary in another social context, such as a jury room, a recruitment committee, or a political meeting. For an obvious example, it is during their later deliberations that jurors, having observed attorneys interview witnesses in the courtroom, may discuss and evaluate witnesses' answers to the attorneys' questions. With survey interviews, it is the researchers who later evaluate answers as they incorporate the codified results of the survey into an aggregate analysis using the tools of statistical inference.

Still, important differences exist in the ways that potential third turns are fashioned for lurking evaluators. An informal or formal rule that forbids third-turns responses, as in news or courtroom environments, may be relatively easy to follow. More difficult are protocols under which the interviewers are permitted or even encouraged to produce third turn acknowledgments but are to refrain from evaluating the content of the answers they acknowledge. This creates a dilemma of being permitted to respond to second-turn answers but in restricted ways, and it characterizes not only the survey interview, but also educational testing interviews. Indeed, the protocols for tests such as the Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery may warn administrators, "Be careful that your pattern of [third-turn] comments does not indicate whether answers are correct or incorrect" (Mehan, Hertweck, and Meihls 1986:96-7). Administrators may produce "neutral" acknowledgments ("okay," "thank you," and the like) after a child has

answered a test item. Despite these protocols, research demonstrates that administrators sometimes alter their third-turn responses systematically—using "good" when an answer is correct, and "okay" when it is incorrect; they may also give encouraging nonvocal signals by smiling or nodding when a child's answer is right, and appearing more taciturn when it is wrong (Maynard and Marlaire 1992). Although such acknowledgments do not necessarily affect an individual answer, they may have a cumulative influence on the child's performance and at some point alter subsequent responses.

Extrapolating from research on educational testing, the concern that most survey centers have over third-turn "feedback" is no doubt well placed, and in fact survey researchers have long recognized that fine gradations in these responses potentially influence the answers of a respondent (Marquis, Cannell, and Laurent 1972). When survey practitioners first documented how interviewers follow respondents' answers with feedback, the impulse of survey researchers was to standardize that feedback. Controlled feedback (e.g., "thank you," "that information is helpful") is intended to reinforce thoughtful respondent behavior positively without appraising the answer. Although this is not a uniform finding (Miller and Cannell 1982), some experiments with controlled feedback suggest that it may improve the accuracy of reports (Cannell, Miller, and Oksenberg 1981), possibly because it teaches respondents what kinds of effort and answers the interviewer wants. However, survey centers are not in full agreement about what "controlled" feedback is exactly (Viterna and Maynard 2002). That is, practitioners agree on the principle that feedback should not evaluate the content of the answer, but differ in specifying the purpose of feedback—whether it should be used to provide reassurance, sustain motivation, praise the respondent's level of effort, or notice that the respondent's answer meets task requirements, etc.

Survey centers differ, as well, in defining the proper content of feedback and enumerating how frequently interviewers should provide it.

ELABORATIONS OCCURRING AFTER A POSSIBLY COMPLETE ANSWER³

Having examined the interviewing sequence and its elementary interactional features, we now turn our attention to a phenomenon that can create interactional and procedural difficulties during the interview. On occasion, after providing a codable answer or after an interviewing sequence is completed, respondents may produce more information or commentary. In effect, they are keeping the answering activity going after the point when it has, at least for the interviewer, been brought to conclusion for the purposes of the interviewing task at hand. We refer to post-answer or post-sequence turns of talk that are relevant to the previous question as "elaborations." These elaborations are like what Schegloff (1995) calls "post-expansion" items. Actually, the third turn of the interviewing sequence is one minimal type of post-expansion, meaning that it is delivered after the completion of the question-answer pair of turns and has closure of the sequence as its task. The kind of post-expansion that elaborations constitute, in Schegloff's (1995) terms, "post-completion musings" or "post-mortems." They somehow comment on the prior sequence in an "out-loud" fashion. In our data, some elaborations are unproblematic and not consequential for the interaction of the recorded survey answer. Others, however, can create troubles for the interactional trajectory of the interview. The prior sequence may be "re-opened" to deal with the trouble that the elaboration poses. Indeed, if the later talk conflicts with an already-chosen response, it also implicates problems of measurement.

The data on which this analysis is based are from two audiotaped collections of random-digit-dial telephone interviews: labor force participation questions in pretests for the redesign of the Current Population Survey (CPS) conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, and

interviews of public opinion conducted by the Letters and Science Survey Center (LSSC) at the University of Wisconsin. In the CPS interviews, the interviewer asks the respondent the same set of labor force questions about each adult member of the household. The LSSC interviews are divided into a number of different topics (taxes, government, economic expectations, etc.), and within each topic a particular question form is repeated for several items. Our purpose here is to illustrate in more detail what we mean by analytic alternation, and the variable effects that elaborations may have on recorded answers and quality of data.

Unproblematic Case of an Elaborated Answer: Achieving Rapport

Our first instance is one in which the respondent, after answering a question, invites and obtains laughter from the interviewer. R and IV then "laugh together" (Jefferson, Sacks, and Schegloff 1987) in a prototypical exhibit of achieving momentary rapport within the interview (Lavin and Maynard 2001).

(7) (112L02030)

```
1  IV:      O:kay ##      hh an: how would you rate the job the military
2           is doing
3           (2.8)
4  R:       Oh I think the military is doing very well hh probably:: (.) well
5           let's go with an eight
6  IV:      Oka:y=
7  R:       =There's always room for improvement right?=
8  IV:      =Yeah ehh heh [heh .hh hh YEAH heh .hh O:kay .hh]=
9  R:       [heh heh ehh heh heh heh .bh]=
10 IV:      =generally speaking do you usually think of yourself as:
11          a republican? a democrat an independent or: what.
```

R's answer to the survey question (lines 1-2) is an extended one, accounting for her forthcoming answer (line 4) before it arrives (line 5). Immediately after IV acknowledges this answer in line 6 with "Okay," R produces an idiomatic evaluation of her answer by commenting about "room for improvement" (line 7). With the tag-question "right?", she also asks for affirmation. At line 8, IV provides an affirmative response and begins to laugh. Subsequently, R (line 9) joins the

laughter and the two participants laugh together for several particles. In the midst of this, IV at line 8 produces another agreement token, and then bids to end the laughter and initiate the next question with an "O:kay" token; R's laughter stops after the "Okay" appears, as both parties draw inbreaths. Subsequently, IV issues the next interview item (lines 10-11), but the way that IV and R track each other during the laughter shows how the resolution of these elaborations is an interactional matter involving both interviewer and respondent contributions.

The respondent in excerpt 7 elaborates on her response in a way that both parties treat as humorous. Although some survey centers, in the interests of standardization, work to prohibit interviewer laughter, not all do (Lavin and Maynard 2001; Viterna and Maynard 2002), and this instance, at this survey center, is not problematic interactionally or for the proper conduct of the interview.

Unproblematic Case of an Elaborated Answer: Talk Beyond Keyboard Entry

Other kinds of elaborations also may be inconsequential, although interviewers may record answers so quickly during an elaboration that it may not yet be clear to the interviewer whether the elaboration is relevant to that coding operation. This is because, at the first point where a respondent's turn of talk contains evidence of a recordable answer, interviewers may key a code into the computer. Excerpt 8 shows how an interviewer treats an in-process answer:

(8) 211L1306

```

1  IV:      (U-) ((tch)) okay and do you think that during the next twelve
2           months it will be larger or smaller than during the past
3           twelve months:? or about the same.
4  R:      Oh bout the s::[ame] I guess
5  IV:      [ # ]
6  IV:      Okay hh an: what about interest rates: (.) uh do you think that
7           during the next twelve months interest rates will: go up? (.)
8           come down or: stay about the same as [they are now]
9  R:      [.hhhhh ]hhhhh hhhh
10 IV:      °well: let's see, they've gone down° they'll probly stay[:]=
11 IV:      [#]
12 R:      ='bout what they are now
13 IV:      Okay (0.2) ((tch)) .hh and in what state do you live . . .

```

As soon as R produces, in line 4, an utterance that is recognizably matched to one of the answer categories—i.e., just after IV hears "bout the s::."—she appears to enter a code for "about the same" on the keyboard (line 5). She waits until R completes the utterance with "I guess" before providing the third-turn "Okay" receipt (line 6) and reading the next question, but the answer has been mechanically recorded well before that.

Such "recognition-point" (Jefferson 1973) data entry also occurs at the end of R's next answering turn (lines 9-10). Near the completion of IV's question (lines 6-8), R begins her answer. Then, as soon as R says something that is hearable as one of the offered answers (i.e., when R has completed "they'll probly stay" in line 10), IV makes a keyboard entry (line 11). Given the capacity for turn projection, then, interviewers can and do treat the speech material following a codable answer as so much chaff. Stated differently, as soon as an answer can be recorded using the material in a respondent's turn-so-far, it often is. The interview progresses according to the CATI instrument without any obstacles. However, not everything that follows a codable answer in a respondent's turn is chaff, or is treated as such by the interviewer.

A Problematic Case: Sequential Implications of an Elaborated Answer

Some post-answer elaborations are very interactionally consequential in that they can affect the subsequent course of the interview. In a variety of ways, they can implicate alternation away from the instrument as an interviewer engages in tacit forms of handling the emergent material. Consider this:

(9) OI5C0403)

1 IV: Did you do work at all last week not counting work around the
2 house?
3 (0.4)
4 R: No: I run back and forth to the hospital
5 IV: h Alright (.) then is it correct that you did not have a job or
6 business from which you were temp'rally absent or layoff last

After IV's question (lines 1-2), R begins his turn in line 4 with a "No:," which provides an initial properly formatted survey response. If that were all of R's answer, it would be what Raymond (2003) calls a type-conforming one—grammatically fitted to the yes-no interrogative it follows. However, R's continuation beyond the "No:" develops a nonconforming response, which exhibits the inadequacy of and resists presuppositions in the question. This R proposes that a simple "no" to the question could allow for assumptions about his status "last week" as one who did not "do work." His nonconforming response provides an account for not working that possibly depicts himself as responsibly occupied nevertheless.

Of further significance in this excerpt, and consistent with Raymond's (2003:951-954) observations, the nonconforming response has sequential implications for the ensuing talk. These implications, in turn, are significant for the proper conduct of the survey. After receiving the R's nonconforming response, IV alters the wording of the next question. The scripted question is "Did you have a job or business from which . . . ". However, she changes the question, forming it, in survey terms as a "verification" question that incorporates an interpretation of the respondent's "no" answer, and asks for confirmation of a statement that R did not have a job (lines 5-7). In conversation analytic terms, the question *prefers* a confirming answer (Sacks 1987). For the survey, this means that the question she produces presents an inference based on R's previous answer and thus violates some versions of standardization. Nevertheless, this interviewer is showing conversational competence, in that producers of yes/no interrogatives (survey questions here) who receive nonconforming responses regularly work to deal with the resistance these responses display.

Another Problematic Case: Correcting the Interview's Trajectory

In our previous cases, a respondent's continuation past the production of a codable answer occurs within the same turn as the answer that the interviewer recorded. In excerpt 10 the pattern is slightly different. R, in line 4, provides a survey-formatted, type-conforming answer, which is complete and perfectly recordable for the interview. A silence follows (line 5), and when the interviewer resumes talking at line 6, she starts to ask the next question. However, at line 7, R interjects an elaboration to his previous answer, offering an account for the "nope" at line 4. This effectively deletes IV's initiation of the next question, connecting the lines 4 and line 7 utterances and assembling a nonconforming answer.

(10) 022C0505

1 IV: Last week (0.4) did you do any work at all include work for pay
2 or other types of compensation
3 (0.4)
4 R: Nope
5 (1.8)
6 IV: Last week=
7 R: =I'm on full disability for [Sosh] Security disability=
8 IV: [uhh]
9 R: =[cause] I've got asbestos in my lungs
10 IV: [uh-]
11 IV: Okay last week you're (a d-) okay you are disabled
12 R: [Yes]
13 IV: [Oka]:y hhh and (0.3) will your disability prevent you from
14 accepting . . .

This nonconforming answer turns out to be very interactionally and instrumentally significant. On the CATI screen, there are answer categories besides "Yes" and "No" for the question produced at lines 1-2. One of these, "No, disabled," is a blind category, which the interviewer does not use unless the respondent volunteers the relevant information. When it is used, and a "No, disabled" answer is entered in the computer, the CATI program skips to a different set of questions than those that appear after a simple entry of "No".

As R produces his announcement of the disability (line 7), IV acknowledges this additional information with "uh" (line 8), and produces another "uh" (line 10) as R completes his announcement (line 9). IV also backs up in the CATI program to change the previous answer to "No, disabled," asking for confirmation (line 11) and then, according to the program, initiating a different next question about whether R would be prevented from accepting a job (lines 13-14). In this case, unlike the previous example, the interviewer corrects the trajectory of the interview in a way that fits the protocols for standardization. Rather than altering the wording of the following question on her own, as IV did in excerpt 9, that is, this IV uses the R's elaboration to record the R's situation more accurately and to obtain computer-guided further questions.

Final Problematic Case: Ambiguous Answering

The next instance of elaboration is built into a single turn of talk. The construction of this turn is such that its ending appears to contradict what appears (to the interviewer) to be a codable answer in the beginning of the turn. The CATI screen for the question read at lines 1-3 in excerpt 11 offers the answer categories "go up," "go down," and "stay where they are now" (lines 2-3).

(11) (182L1004)

```

1  IV:      Mkat .hh .hh and then during the next twelve months do you think
2           prices in general will go up? go down? or stay where they are
3           now?
4           (2.1)
5  R:      They'll hold their: s:pot but they .hh they should be going down.
6           (0.4)
7  IV:      Nkat?
8           (0.6)
9  IV:      So:: do you wanta say they'll stay the same then:?
10          (0.6)
11 IV:      What you're saying?=
12 R:      n::Well they'll [stay          the          same-          ]
13 IV:      [Or do you think they'll be going] down
14          (0.6)
15 IV:      Okay # .hhhh and then how bout interest rates . . .

```

After a silence (line 4), R starts his turn with a component ("hold their: spot", line 5) that could be taken as equivalent to the "stay where they are" category. However, after a token of contrast

("but"), he continues with another component (" . . . should be going down") that has similarities to a different category. This implies an ambiguity: does R's "should be going down" indicate his opinion of what will happen or what ought to happen?

The interviewer's hesitations and actions indicate that *he* regards the R's turn as ambiguous. He lets a 0.4 second silence pass, then responds with a question-intoned marker of receipt ("Nkay?", line 7), which is itself "lax" and indefinite as to whether it is neutral and accepting of the prior turn, or possibly a complaining rejection of that turn (Jefferson 1978). Another pause follows (line 8), and then IV then begins a candidate reformulation or paraphrasing (line 9) that retrieves the initial part of line 5 for confirmation. This paraphrasing of a respondent's talk is a directive probe and is (as we have observed before) incorrect under most rules for standardized interviewing procedures. However, in conversation, repeating a portion of a prior turn for confirmation is a common device by which speakers ask for clarification.

Despite the probe, R still does not speak (line 10). IV probes again, in a more neutral manner this time (line 11), and as he reaches the end of his utterance and the tone goes up, R immediately initiates a turn of talk (line 12) that eventuates in an unambiguous answer ("stay the same"). Before R can speak the disambiguating part of his turn, IV continues his own prior turn and produces, in overlap, an alternative candidate answer (line 13). (This is not the original wording of the question, but the wording that the respondent offered in line 5.) Having received no apparent response to his suggestion of "stay the same," IV turns to the other interpretation of R's initial elaborated answer. After the overlap and completion of his own utterance, and a silence, IV produces a clear acknowledgment token and makes a keyboard entry (line 15). If we assume that IV has heard R's line 12 utterance, IV would register his answer as the "stay the

same" response option. In this extract, then, a respondent's elaboration results in an ambiguity to which the interviewer is attuned. In an effort to disambiguate the elaborated answer and register a code properly in the computer, and in a manner similar to that of the interviewer in excerpt 9, he acts as a competent practitioner conversationally even when violating protocols of standardization.

Elaborations and Their Consequences

Elaborations on answers to survey questions, we noted, expand the question answer and interviewing sequences they follow (Schegloff 1995). At times, interviewers treat talk after an already-produced answer as irrelevant to collecting and recording data in an interview. This may happen because at the first moment when interviewers hear a codable item in the respondents answering turn of talk, they may perform a keystroke to enter the item in the computer. At other times, elaborations of an answer significantly affect the course of the talk and what the interviewer does to register a code in the computer. As the talk develops to handle an elaboration, it may be done in a way that stays within protocols of standardization. However, because elaborations often mean that a previous answer is now incorrect or ambiguous, interviewers, as they alternate away from the CATI script, may be prompted to invoke their conversational competence—their generic knowledge of how to handle interactional mistakes—and break protocol inadvertently.

In practical terms, interviewers do manage to record answers to each item, and do so even when the answer is complicated by elaborations. Without further study of a quantitative and distributional kind, for example by coding to examine the relation of interactional variables to outcomes such as accuracy, it is not possible to determine whether post-answer elaborations affect the reliability and validity of the data collected. In their study of the accuracy of reports

about legal custody, Schaeffer and Dykema (forthcoming) found that elaborations occurred in approximately 1 to 14 percent of cases (across 6 items presented in two different orders). Although elaborations lowered the odds of reporting accurately, the effect was not statistically significant in predicting the accuracy of answers, except for lagged analyses wherein elaborations are associated with significantly lower odds of reporting accurately for joint legal custody and reports about dates of marriage. A study by Dijkstra and Ongena (2004) shows that elaborations⁴ are a fairly regular occurrence after initially adequate answers and but it is difficult to determine how they affect the overall validity and quality of the data. More research needs to be done to definitely answer whether and how much post-answer elaborations affect the quality of data.

CONCLUSION

The section of this chapter on elaborative talk demonstrates that respondents are not what Garfinkel (1967: 67) called "judgmental dopes." Much as a survey can prescribe what and how they should reply to items on an instrument, respondents exercise and display forms of reasoning to accompany what can appear to be just-now codable answers for the survey instrument. However, whereas from an interviewer's perspective, respondents may initially have offered a codable answer, interaction is temporally organized in a manner to allow for talk to emerge that clarifies the significance of the already-said (Garfinkel 1967: 41). Thus, sometimes despite the efforts of interviewers to mark a respondent's turn or turn-so-far in a way that will conclude an interviewing sequence, respondents may elaborate their answer and defy what turns out to be premature codification.

If respondents are not judgmental dopes, neither are interviewers. That is, their handling of elaborations is also a skillful endeavor not fully encompassed by protocols for standardization.

Sometimes, an interviewer's recording of an answer at a point of recognition in its production may make an elaboration irrelevant or redundant to the coding of an answer. At other times, elaborative talk appears to seduce interviewers into alternating away from CATI scripts so as to competently handle what the elaboration exhibits in relation to the original answer on which it is parasitic. Interviewers' alternation involves an invocation of tacit knowledge by which they may accomplish actions that diverge from the interviewing task per se but that build rapport or record answers efficiently. And when an elaboration contradicts its preceding answer, interviewers necessarily perform a correction and may have to alter the course of the interview altogether. That they may violate protocol in doing so is testament not to the inadequacies of survey interviewing but to interviewers' conversational and interactional skill as they work with respondents to accomplish the rather challenging tasks of social measurement the research instrument puts before them.

Standardization in survey research or any other realm is not guaranteed by its rules and procedures. Standardization has to be achieved according to the variegated circumstances that impinge on any attempt to follow those rules and procedures (Maynard and Schaeffer 2000). Because of this, at least for the survey interview, it is best to investigate attempts to enact the uniform asking and answering of questions as standardization-in-interaction. Such investigation means paying attention to turn-taking—i.e., the interviewing sequence—and the variety of practical ways that this sequence is implemented to accommodate the vagaries of tapping the social entities a survey measures. It also necessitates analysis of the interactional details by which interviewers and respondents fit the instrument with its codified questions and answers to the respondents' circumstances. Studying talk-in-interaction in the survey interview, in other words, is an invaluable way to do research on standardization-in-interaction, a phenomenon that

is endemic to many organizational settings. The interactional structures by which participants accomplish their tasks during the survey, attempting to facilitate good social measurement, are the site of actions whose pattern and organization are of immense importance for ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, survey design, data collection, and a variety of other theoretical, methodological, and empirical endeavors in the social sciences.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, J.M. and P. Drew. 1979. *Order in Court: The Organisation of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. London: Macmillan.
- Bingham, W. and B. Moore. 1925. *How to Interview*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Briggs, Charles L. 1986. *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Button, G. 1987. "Answers as interactional products: two sequential practices used in interviews." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50:160-171.
- Cannell, Charles F., S.A. Lawson, and D.L. Hausser. 1975. *A Technique for Evaluating Interviewer Performance*. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center of the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Cannell, Charles F., P.V. Miller, and Lois Oksenberg. 1981. "Research on Interviewing Techniques." Pp. 389-437 in *Sociological Methodology*, vol. 11, edited by S. Leinhardt. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cicourel, Aaron V. 1963. *Method and Measurement in Sociology*. New York: The Free Press.
- Clayman, S. 1988. "Displaying neutrality in television news interviews." *Social Problems* 35.
- Collins, Harry M. 1985. *Changing Order: Replication and Induction in Scientific Practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cradock, Robert M., Douglas W. Maynard, and Nora Cate Schaeffer. 1993. "Re-Opening Closed Questions: Elaborations on Categorical Answers in Standardized Interviews." Center for Demography and Ecology Working Paper 93-24. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

- Dijkstra, Wil and Yfke Ongena. 2004. "Question-Answer Sequences in Survey-Interviews."
Unpublished Manuscript. Department of Social Research Methodology, Free University:
Amsterdam.
- Drew, Paul. 1984. "Speakers' Reportings in Invitation Sequences." Pp. 152-164 in *Structures of Social Action*, edited by J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fowler, Jr., Floyd J. and Thomas W. Mangione. 1990. *Standardized Survey Interviewing: Minimizing Interviewer-Related Error*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- . 1988. "Evidence for Locally Produced, Naturally Accountable Phenomena of Order, Logic, Reason, Meaning, Method, etc. in and as of the Essential Quiddity of Immortal Ordinary Society (I of IV): An Announcement of Studies." *Sociological Theory* 6:103-109.
- . 2002. *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working Out Durkheim's Aphorism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. "Footing." in *Forms of Talk*, edited by E. Goffman. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Groves, Robert M. 1989. *Survey Errors and Survey Costs*. New York: John Wiley.
- Hak, Tony. 2002. "How Interviewers Make Coding Decisions." Pp. 449-469 in *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*, edited by D. W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N. C. Schaeffer, and H. van der Zouwen. New York: Wiley Interscience.
- Heath, Christian and Paul Luff. 2000. *Technology in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Heritage, John and David Greatbatch. 1991. "On the Institutional Character of Institutional Talk: The Case of News Interviews." Pp. 93-137 in *Talk and Social Structure*, edited by D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, Hanneke. 2000. *Interaction and the Standardized Survey Interview: The Living Questionnaire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyman, H.A., J. Feldman, and C. Stember. 1975[1954]. *Interviewing in Social Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1973. "A Case of Precision Timing in Ordinary Conversation: Overlapped Tag-Positioned Address Terms in Closing Sequences." *Semiotica* 9:47-96.
- . 1978. "What's In a 'Nyem'?" *Sociology* 12,No.1:135-139.
- Jefferson, Gail, Harvey Sacks, and Emanuel A. Schegloff. 1987. "Notes on Laughter in the Pursuit of Intimacy." Pp. 152-205 in *Talk and Social Organisation*, edited by G. Button and J. R. E. Lee. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Kahn, Robert L. and Charles F. Cannell. 1957. *The Dynamics of Interviewing: Theory, Technique, and Cases*. New York: Wiley.
- Lave, J. and E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lavin, Danielle and Douglas W. Maynard. 2001. "Standardization vs. Rapport: Respondent Laughter and Interviewer Reaction During Telephone Surveys." *American Sociological Review* 66:453-79.
- Lynch, Michael. 1991. "Method: Measurement — Ordinary and Scientific Measurement as Ethnomethodological Phenomena." Pp. 77-108 in *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*, vol. 77-108, edited by G. Button. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- . 2002. "The Living Text: Written Instructions and Situated Actions in Telephone Surveys." Pp. 125-150 in *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*, edited by D. W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N. C. Schaeffer, and H. van der Zouwen. New York: Wiley Interscience.
- Marquis, K.H., Charles F. Cannell, and A. Laurent. 1972. "Reporting Health Events in Household Interviews: Effects of Reinforcement, Question Length, and Reinterviews." in *Vital and Health Statistics: Data Evaluation and Methods Research Series 2, No. 45*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Maynard, Douglas W. and Courtney L. Marlaire. 1992. "Good Reasons for Bad Testing Performance: The Interactional Substrate of Educational Exams." *Qualitative Sociology* 15:177-202.
- Maynard, Douglas W. and Nora Cate Schaeffer. 2000. "Toward a Sociology of Social Scientific Knowledge: Survey Research and Ethnomethodology's Asymmetric Alternates." *Social Studies of Science* 30:323-370.
- . 2002a. "Refusal Conversion and Tailoring." Pp. 219-239 in *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*, edited by D. W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N. C. Schaeffer, and H. van der Zouwen. New York: Wiley Interscience.
- . 2002b. "Standardization and Its Discontents." Pp. 3-45 in *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*, edited by D. W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N. C. Schaeffer, and H. van der Zouwen. New York: Wiley Interscience.

- Mehan, Hugh, Alma Hertweck, and J. Lee Meihls. 1986. *Handicapping the Handicapped: Decision-Making in Students' Educational Careers*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Miller, P.V. and Charles F. Cannell. 1982. "A Study of Experimental Techniques for Telephone Interviewing." *Public Opinion quarterly* 46:250-269.
- Mishler, Elliot G. 1986. *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Moore, Robert J. 2004. "Managing Troubles in Answering Survey Questions: Respondents' Uses of Projective Reporting." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 67:50-69.
- Polanyi, Michael. 1958. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. "Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes." Pp. 57-101 in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raymond, Geoffrey. 2003. "Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/No Interrogatives and the Structure of Responding." *American Sociological Review* 68:939-967.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1987. "On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Sequences in Conversation." Pp. 54-69 in *Talk and Social Organisation*, edited by G. Button and J. R. E. Lee. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50:696-735.
- Schaeffer, Nora Cate. 1991. "Conversation With a Purpose--Or Conversation? Interaction in the Standardized Survey." Pp. 367-91 in *Measurement Errors in Surveys*, edited by P. P.

Biemer, R. M. Groves, L. E. Lyberg, N. A. Mathiowetz, and S. Sudman. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Schaeffer, Nora Cate and Jennifer L. Dykema. forthcoming. "Improving the Clarity of Closely Related Concepts: Distinguishing Legal and Physical Custody of Children." in *Questionnaire Development*, edited by S. Presser, J. Rothgeb, M. Couper, J. Lessler, E. Martin, J. Martin, and E. Singer. New York: Wiley Interscience.

Schaeffer, Nora Cate and Douglas W. Maynard. 1996. "From Paradigm to Prototype and Back Again: Interactive Aspects of 'Cognitive Processing' in Standardized Survey Interviews." Pp. 75-88 in *Answering Questions: Methodology for Determining Cognitive and Communicating Processes in Survey Research*, vol. 75-88, edited by N. Schwarz and S. Sudman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

—. 2002. "Occasions for Intervention: Interactional Resources for Comprehension in Standardized Survey Interviews." Pp. 261-280 in *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*, edited by D. W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N. C. Schaeffer, and H. van der Zouwen. New York: Wiley Interscience.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1995. "Sequence Organization." Unpublished Manuscript. Department of Sociology, University of California: Los Angeles.

—. 2002. "Survey Interviews as Talk-in-Interaction." Pp. 151-157 in *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*, edited by D. W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N. C. Schaeffer, and H. van der Zouwen. New York: Wiley Interscience.

- Schuman, Howard. 1982. "Artifacts Are in the Mind of the Beholder." *The American Sociologist* 17:21-28.
- Shapin, Steven. 1994. *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Suchman, Lucy. 1987. *Plans and Situated Actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suchman, Lucy and Brigitte Jordan. 1990. "Interactional Troubles in Face-to-Face Survey Interviews." *Journal of the American statistical Association* 85:232-241.
- Viterna, Jocelyn and Douglas W. Maynard. 2002. "How Uniform is Standardization? Variation Within and Across Survey Centers Regarding Protocols for Interviewing." Pp. 365-397 in *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*, edited by D. W. Maynard, H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, N. C. Schaeffer, and H. van der Zouwen. New York: Wiley Interscience.
- Zimmerman, Don H. 1970. "The Practicalities of Rule Use." Pp. 221-238 in *Understanding Everyday Life*, edited by J. Douglas. Chicago: Aldine.

NOTES

¹ For a discussion of the generic interviewing sequence, see Maynard and Schaeffer (Maynard and Schaeffer 2002b:15-16).

² See Houtkoop-Steenstra's (2000) consideration of "participant roles" and "footing" (Goffman 1981) in the survey interview. The interview implicates more than just an "interviewer" and "respondent," as interviewers exhibit themselves as "animators" or "relayers" of text that is designed by others, the "authors" or "formulators."

³ We are very grateful to Robert Cradock for collecting and helping in the preliminary analysis of post-answer elaborations, and this section draws upon an earlier collaborative paper (Cradock, Maynard, and Schaeffer 1993).

⁴ Their term for elaboration is "consideration."