I am not going to provide an exhaustive view of the literature or focus on my own work, but I will talk about a few key studies of interviewing as illustration. I'll be making a few specific points about what we know, what we do not know, give some examples that illustrate one perspective for looking at interviewing, describe a recent project we have been involved in that illustrates some of the challenges we face in studying interviewing, and make some comments about future research about interviewing.

There are two different scripts that could be of concern when thinking about "deviations from the script:" question wording or principles of standardized interviewing. Although these are related, the second is more general and leads us to think about the core principles of standardized interviewing. Question wording or principles of standardized interviewing are different scripts that could be of concern when thinking about interviewing.

Developments from the Script

- Standardized Interviewing
- The selection of different respondents and interviewers
- Developments of different kinds (and their impact)
- Social and cognitive context for behavior in the survey
- "Interviewers?"
Because some researchers are very involved in research that uses the web or commercial media, it seems worth making a few comments about why one might guess the following about future studies:

1. In addition to the sorts of opinion or other studies we do now, there will be a stratum of research studies that will be very complex and demanding for both respondents and interviewers.
2. As the cost of reaching sample members increases, the researcher's point of view is also economically sensible for face-to-face interviews to become a more frequent procedure.

Looking at the changes in the studies that we have done in the last decade, we see that some measurement continues to be important in critical opinion studies, as with GSS surveys. Social security, blood spots, and other bodily fluids, and more complex measurements and tests. measuring weight and height, even pints and quarts, may involve different skills.

Why interviewers and interviewing?
This interactional model of the survey response process is a further development of that presented in Schaeffer and Dykema (2011). The model proposes that the main influences on the behavior of the interviewer – and her deviations from the script – are:

- **Training in interviewing practices of standardization**
- **Technology**, which has both a direct and an indirect effect on the interviewer's behavior. Technology, whether paper or some electronic technology – presents the script to the respondent.
- **The characteristics of the survey question** and the respondent's behavior in responding to it. The way the question is phrased and structured shapes and constrains the interviewer's behavior.
- **Interactional and conversational practices**, some of which may be made more or less relevant by characteristics of the question or the behavior of the respondent.
the interviewer in a way that is often incomplete, so that the interviewer must improvise using the principles of standardization. For example, a paper grid may allow the interviewer to have an overview of the structure of the task and also allow her to enter information that the respondent provides before the interviewer requests it (e.g., the ages of other members of the household). A CAPI instrument, on the other hand, may require that each piece of information be entered on a separate screen, and these constraints may in turn motivate the interviewer to reinforce that standardized order with the respondent. These intersect. There is a close relationship between interviewing practices and conversational practices. In many interviews, the interviewer and the respondent are in a way that is often incomplete, so that the interviewer must improvise using the principles of standardization. Some of these tensions may have only minor consequences for data quality. For example, interviewers routinely use “okay” both as a receipt for an answer and to announce an upcoming return to the script of the next question. Other tensions may be more consequential. For example, when cognitive assessments or knowledge questions are administered to respondents, the respondent’s knowledge that they are being tested may cause discomfort that leads to laughter, self-deprecating remarks by the respondent, or reassurance by the interviewer (Gathman, Maynard, and Schaeffer 2008). These social tensions are not provided for in the rules of standardization, and the improvisations by the interviewer may affect the respondent’s willingness to engage in further disclosures or their level of motivation.

Understanding better how conversational practices enter into the interaction between interviewer and respondent will help us understand better which behaviors might affect the quality of measurement and how to adapt our standardized interviewing practices to changing technologies and to maintaining the motivation of the respondent.

These intersect. There is a close relationship between the technology we use and interviewing practices and conversational practices. Thus, we could say that there is a close relationship between interviewing practices and conversational practices. In many interviews, the interviewer and the respondent are in a way that is often incomplete, so that the interviewer must improvise using the principles of standardization. Some of these tensions may have only minor consequences for data quality. For example, interviewers routinely use “okay” both as a receipt for an answer and to announce an upcoming return to the script of the next question. Other tensions may be more consequential. For example, when cognitive assessments or knowledge questions are administered to respondents, the respondent’s knowledge that they are being tested may cause discomfort that leads to laughter, self-deprecating remarks by the respondent, or reassurance by the interviewer (Gathman, Maynard, and Schaeffer 2008). These social tensions are not provided for in the rules of standardization, and the improvisations by the interviewer may affect the respondent’s willingness to engage in further disclosures or their level of motivation. Understanding better how conversational practices enter into the interaction between interviewer and respondent will help us understand better which behaviors might affect the quality of measurement and how to adapt our standardized interviewing practices to changing technologies and to maintaining the motivation of the respondent.

These intersect. There is a close relationship between the technology we use and interviewing practices and conversational practices. Thus, we could say that there is a close relationship between interviewing practices and conversational practices. In many interviews, the interviewer and the respondent are in a way that is often incomplete, so that the interviewer must improvise using the principles of standardization. Some of these tensions may have only minor consequences for data quality. For example, interviewers routinely use “okay” both as a receipt for an answer and to announce an upcoming return to the script of the next question. Other tensions may be more consequential. For example, when cognitive assessments or knowledge questions are administered to respondents, the respondent’s knowledge that they are being tested may cause discomfort that leads to laughter, self-deprecating remarks by the respondent, or reassurance by the interviewer (Gathman, Maynard, and Schaeffer 2008). These social tensions are not provided for in the rules of standardization, and the improvisations by the interviewer may affect the respondent’s willingness to engage in further disclosures or their level of motivation.
The way that technology, question characteristics, interviewing practices, and conversational practices might intersect might be easier to think of with a specific example. So I'm going to draw on an example of how interviews are conducted on the telephone. This is from work by Fuchs, Couper, and Hansen. The topic of study was variations in the design of grids. The table shows the proportion of cases in which respondents provided information for all members of the household at once, depending on the design of the instrument. The proportion of cases in which respondents provided information for all members of the household at once varied depending on the design of the instrument. The design was more frequent when a topical organization was used and less frequent when the grid was organized by persons. This is an example of how interviewers may engage in a conversational practice that might be related to the design of the instrument. The table shows the proportion of cases in which respondents provided information for all members of the household at once, depending on the design of the instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design of Instrument</th>
<th>Proportion of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topical Organization</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Organization</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the design of the instrument has a significant impact on the proportion of cases in which respondents provided information for all members of the household at once. This suggests that interviewers may engage in a conversational practice that is related to the design of the instrument. The design was more frequent when a topical organization was used and less frequent when the grid was organized by persons. This is an example of how interviewers may engage in a conversational practice that might be related to the design of the instrument. The table shows the proportion of cases in which respondents provided information for all members of the household at once, depending on the design of the instrument. The proportion of cases in which respondents provided information for all members of the household at once varied depending on the design of the instrument. The design was more frequent when a topical organization was used and less frequent when the grid was organized by persons. This is an example of how interviewers may engage in a conversational practice that is related to the design of the instrument. The table shows the proportion of cases in which respondents provided information for all members of the household at once, depending on the design of the instrument. The proportion of cases in which respondents provided information for all members of the household at once varied depending on the design of the instrument. The design was more frequent when a topical organization was used and less frequent when the grid was organized by persons.
The efficiency of the topical organization is evident here: the roster is completed most quickly using a grid organized by topic. Why? Because the respondent learns the question the first time, and then provides information without question being repeated. The respondent can also volunteer that a characteristic is the same for "all" members of the household. Notice that it appears that the wording of the questions were the same in both the item and grid format, but that the behavior of the interviewers and respondents were influenced by the implementation of the question on the interviewer's screen. There are main effects: Both grid and topic are faster, and grid+topic is fastest.

Why do interviewers deviate from the script – either the wording of the question or the practices of standardization? Why does a grid get answered differently than the item format? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does the respondent answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid? Why does it take longer to answer the question about repeated respondents who are the same when using a grid?
The range of interviewer behaviors is highly constrained. These are all standardized interviews and there are logframe interviews. Although these two studies suggest that the behavior of the interviewer does not affect interviewer variance, it is important to realize that these are all standardized interviewers and these are telephone interviews.

There are different sorts of deviations from question wording or practices of standardized interviewing. It is important to distinguish among them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of different kinds</th>
<th>Between conversational procedures and standardization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions of conversational procedures</td>
<td>Nearly identical agreement in 20% of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions of conversational procedures</td>
<td>Nearly identical agreement in 20% of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-representative follow-up</td>
<td>Nearly identical agreement in 20% of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Nearly identical agreement in 20% of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized interviewing, but not in-depth scripts</td>
<td>Nearly identical agreement in 20% of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly identical agreement in 20% of cases</td>
<td>Nearly identical agreement in 20% of cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next few slides summarize the results of studies that had either a record check or an estimate of reliability and that examined how the behavior of the interviewer was associated with those indexes of data quality. However, the results of these studies fail either a record check or a reliability test.
Based on the few available record-check studies, it appears that sometimes in interviews changes the question in a way that increases accuracy, sometimes in ways that decrease accuracy, and sometimes in a way that has no effect. Understanding what might account for these differences would require more detailed analyses of the actual recordings. These analyses are time consuming and have not been done. Understanding what might account for these differences would require more detailed analyses of the actual recordings. These analyses are time consuming and have not been done.
Behaviors of the interviewer other than question reading are also important. Interactions by the interviewer or the respondents’ answers and interactions that the interviewer might not be able to anticipate can also influence the accuracy of the responses. Some studies refer to “probing” and others to “follow-up.” When probing or follow-up occurs, it is almost always associated with lower reliability. The adequacy of the interviewer’s follow-up and the adequacy of follow-up are critical determinants of response quality. Probing is a difficult behavior to identify reliably. Some studies report that probing is associated with increased question answering and increased interview difficulty. Some studies also report that probing is associated with decreased reliability.的行为。
Taken together, these studies do not provide a basis for expecting the behavior of interviewers freed from the "straightjacket" of standardization to behave in ways that will automatically improve data quality overall, particularly in face-to-face interviews.

The importance of question design can be seen in this graph from a face-to-face study that was designed to allow the analysis to identify the proportion of cluster variance that was due to the interviewer. The graph plots the proportion of cluster variance due to the interviewer by an index of question characteristics that might be associated with interviewer variance: being sensitive, nonfactual, open, and difficult. The median for the measure is higher and values are more consistently higher when the type of item is more vulnerable to interviewer variance.

The graph displays the proportion of cluster variance due to the interviewer. The study results suggest that questions with a higher index of these characteristics are more likely to lead to interviewer variance.
These deviations from the script are in the service of improving comprehension.

This is standardized interviewing with additional training of respondents and ad lib provision of definitions.

These deviations from the script are in the service of improving comprehension.

The method of providing definitions has not been tested against other possible methods of providing definitions, some of which are discussed in the paper.

These deviations from the script are in the service of improving comprehension.

These deviations from the script are in the service of improving comprehension.

Techniques appeared to be effective in improving respondent understanding when respondents saw response cards.

Techniques appeared to be effective in improving respondent understanding when respondents were asked to follow-up ad lib.

Techniques appeared to be effective in improving respondent understanding when respondents saw response cards.

Techniques appeared to be effective in improving respondent understanding when respondents were asked to follow-up ad lib.

Techniques appeared to be effective in improving respondent understanding when respondents saw response cards.
The last sort of deviation from the script I will discuss here is feedback. Feedback has not received much study, but it is a step where conversational practices often intrude on standardization.

The interview was always to provide the interviewer with personal style and length of the feedback that the interviewer was allowed to provide. Feedback was recorded and used standardized data. The experiment reported by Dijkstra was face-to-face and used standardized data. The small number of interviewers in each style, respondents nested within interviewers, included a manipulation check. This was not done in the Dijkstra study, unlike many such experiments.
The most variable form of interviewing. To the extent that there is no script, deviations from the script are undefined.
Let's return to the question of deviations from the script. Perhaps we could have used visual displays for the respondent, but who have we learned about how to use them? We have used visual aids before, but perhaps not as successfully as we could have. A collaborative form of standardization that gives the respondent access to visual displays might, in principle, be able to learn from previous experience with visual aids. The flexibility to accommodate questions and adjust answers in real-time can make interviews more interactive and engaging. However, it is important to consider how to use visual displays effectively. Some common challenges are:

- respondents may not know how to use them
- difficult to keep interviews on track
- difficult to integrate into the process
- cumbersome visual displays can become confusing
- respondents may not be familiar with visual aids

We have used visual aids before, but perhaps not as successfully as we could have. We have used visual displays for the respondent, but what have we learned about how to use them effectively?
perhaps more of a collision than intersection!

Technology is used to provide a live, dynamic display to help respondents to review the interviewer’s entries.

Perhaps more of a collision than intersection!

collection environment
that control interviewee variability in a more flexible data
provide resources of standardization in the form of cues
consistent goals of reliability and validity
standardization and conservation of practices
identify sites of possible conflict between practices of
responding to how participants use the method
appropriate design and needs of interviewing
need for real interviewers and real respondents and devise
practices of interviewing
practices of the interview process

What else we need: interviewing practices
Every technology requires that we review and reinvent interviewing practices. When respondents provide information in variable form, interviewers need techniques for verifying answers as they are entered. In this case, we did not ask for gender but handled it by verification when the name was entered.

Note that we use "male" and "female" rather than "boy" or "girl." The requirement is that the interviewee is informing that "male" is "female" and that "female" is being informed. The choice is female or male? in that context.

Special case: Required immediate verification when entering gender.
Training interviewers to recognize and clarify potential ambiguities is quite daunting. Although many interviewing shops use verification as an authorized deviation from the script, the range of possible ambiguities is large, and many of them are not ambiguities in everyday talk. It is not clear which will be best for the quality of data. The range of possible ambiguities is large, and many of them are not ambiguities in everyday talk.
In this case – the last meal that was asked about – interviewers were authorized to use any of the parenthetical text in their verification.

Finally, dinner (in the past 30 days did any of the children eat dinner at daycare or afterschool in the last 30 days? Is this correct?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Dinner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Provided by Free Meal Program or Included in Daycare, School, or Afterschool

- Breakfast
- Lunch
- Dinner
- Snacks
- Meal at Daycare
- Meal at Afterschool

Special case: Parentheses indicate question text that is optional when verifying (continued)
We plan to investigate these interviews to determine how the technology is actually used, what conversational practices the participants recruit, and what techniques of interviewing are needed.
Deviations from standardization originate with the behavior of the respondent, which in turn deviates from the "paradigmatic" question-answer sequence because of:

- question design
- state uncertainty – not sure what their answer is
- task uncertainty – not sure how to fit their answer into the structure of the task

In the deviations from the paradigmatic question-answer sequence because of developments from standardization originate with the behavior of the respondent, which

---

Note: The text appears to be a list of behaviors observed during an interaction or interview, possibly with a focus on the respondent's actions during a conversation or questionnaire.
in the examples shown here.

standardized interviewing. It is also not clear that the quality of the data is harmed

behavior is governed by conversational practices rather than the rules of

interviewers to deal with such answers. But in the situation, the interviewers

what Hak calls "immediate coding." Some of these are probably appropriate. Some may not be.

Interviewers may not be aware that they are engaging in coding, and it is not clear how we should train

these are situations in which interviewers could continue to use but does not.

These are situations in which interviewers could continue to use but does not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Don't know&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Yes&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I don't know&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I don't&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I do&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From: 2002)
The challenge of training interviewers to identify a codable answer can be previewed by considering what has to be done to train coders to identify a codable answer.

Answer: The challenge of training interviewers to identify a codable answer can be previewed by considering what has to be done to train coders to identify a codable answer.

43 The challenge of training interviewers to identify a codable answer can be previewed by considering what has to be done to train coders to identify a codable answer.

44 The challenge of training interviewers to identify a codable answer can be previewed by considering what has to be done to train coders to identify a codable answer.
In this case, the interviewer does not engage in immediate coding but produces a leading probe. Most leading probes produced by interviewers are probably produced in situations like the one in which the respondents answer appears to indicate a direction (Moore and Maynard 2008). This is another example of the intrusion of conversational practices into the standardized interview.
In this example, the interviewer also produces a leading probe, but with less

 justification.
This interviewer probably goes too far in inferring the appropriate response category and produces a leading probe.
Research desiderata
Technology, instrument and question design, and interviewing practices are closely related and interact with conversational practices. When we implement inadequate studies, we live with the results for a long time.

Small-scale lab experiments as a site for intensive developmental studies of method.

For example, Schober & Conrad (1997) trained for respondents about the importance of asking questions.

Obtaining recordings of the method for later development.

Training interviewers.

Developing a conversational script.

Large-scale field experiments.

Methods for monitoring interviewers in production.

Role for single-method studies?

Development of details of method. Obtaining recordings of the method for later development.

For example, Schober & Conrad (1997) trained for respondents about the importance of asking questions. Obtaining recordings of the method for later development. Training interviewers. Methods for monitoring interviewers in production.

Role for single-method studies?

Large-scale field experiments.

Methods for monitoring interviewers in production.

Role for single-method studies?
Conducting comment

Interviewing practices

When information we collect may require innovations in
changing interviewee technologies and the varieties of the
conductible measurement

Then we can consider whether those solutions are

We see the problems they face and now they solve them

But by observing interviewees and respondents in action,

Because of the needs of measurement

Intervening is a connected and specialized interaction
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