

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN QUESTIONING TECHNIQUES
OF PROFESSIONAL AND NOVICE INTERVIEWERS

by

THELMA W. POOLE, B.A.

A THESIS

IN

COMMUNICATION STUDIES

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved

Chairperson of the Committee

Accepted

Dean of the Graduate School

May, 1996

AL
805
T3
1996
No. 57
C.2

ART 4500

© 1996 Thelma W. Poole

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Professor G. H. Morris for his dedication to this thesis, and for his encouragement and confidence. I am also very thankful to Professor Bolanle Olaniran and Professor Kurt Bruder for their helpful insight and constructive criticism.

In addition many thanks go to Barbi, Gloria, Mary and Judy in the graduate office for providing tissue to wipe my tears, making a few exceptions for me, for telephone calls of concern and for supportive conversations.

An old African Proverb says "It takes a whole village to raise a child." I am deeply indebted to Robert Sansom, king of the village, Lilia Hernandez, and Pat Nickell, watchers of the village, and Mary Llanas, teacher of the village. Without these people it would have taken forever to complete graduate school and this thesis. I must also thank an extended village whose prayers, and encouraging words are ever present in my life -- Thank you mom, dad, my dearest sister, Missie and my friend Holly Gates.

This thesis is dedicated to my son Drew.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Questions in Interviews	6
Prescriptions for Effective Questioning	11
Descriptions of Questioning Techniques Used by Interviewers	16
Research Problem	24
III. METHOD	27
Data	28
Discourse Analysis Procedures	29
Conversation Analysis Procedures	34
IV. DISCUSSION	37
Categorization of Problematic Question Types	37
Comparison of the Number of Problematic Questions	39
Categorization of Question Features	40
Comparison of the Number of Descriptive Features	41
Features of Supplemental Questions	42

Features of Third-turn Receipts	52
Features of Preliminaries	57
Conclusion	65
REFERENCES	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

From Socrates in ancient Greece to millions of game show viewers today, people have always been fascinated by and learned from the fine art of asking questions (Leeds, 1993). Questioning finds employment in everyday conversations and affects communication ability in powerful ways. A question is the most effective way to get communication started and is the most useful communication strategy in conversations. In ordinary conversation, we may introduce a topic by asking, "What do you think about such and such?" (Payne, 1979).

In daily interactions we often need information that helps us reach our behavioral goals. The most obvious way to gather that information is through questioning. Unfortunately, question asking can be a deceptively simple skill and is often used ineffectively:

We ask too many questions, often meaningless ones.
We ask questions that confuse...that interrupt...
We ask questions [that another] cannot possibly answer.
We even ask questions we do not want answers to, and consequently; we do not hear the answers when forthcoming. (Benjamin, 1981, p. 71)

Benjamin (1981) suggests that asking questions is not necessarily simple, yet questioning is central to the

process of inquiry. Acquiring skills in the art of asking questions is essential to effective communication in ordinary conversations.

Interviewers must also be skilled in the art of asking questions. Questions are a primary means of eliciting information in the interview process; consequently, there is extensive literature on questions in interviews. The literature explores guidelines for wording questions (Cantril, 1940), as well as the uses, effects, and phrasing of questions (Dohrenwend, 1965; Dohrenwend & Richardson, 1964; Payne, 1979; Richardson, 1960). The art of asking questions is so important to the individual who is learning how to conduct interviews that many textbooks devote whole chapters to providing information about questions (Stewart & Cash, 1994; Barone & Switzer, 1995; Donaghy, 1984).

The literature on questioning in interviews is also diverse, deriving from a variety of fields and exhibiting a variety of emphasis. The education field offers a pedagogical manual for strategic questioning in the classroom (Hyman, 1979). Questioning in employment interviews has received a considerable amount of attention in the business discipline (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Liden, Martin, & Parsons, 1993; Parsons & Liden, 1984). Likewise,

discourse researchers have begun to explore question formulation in broadcast interviews (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991; Harris, 1986; Gildersleeve, 1976).

Previous research has cut across occupational and professional boundaries in order to develop a general understanding of interviewer questions (Kearsley, 1976; Dillon, 1982). Whether the studies pertain to employment, news, appraisal, or medical interviews, the primary focus is usually the questioning by the interviewer of the interviewee. Often, such studies explore question types, such as open ended, closed ended, primary, and secondary questions.

Unfortunately, most interviewing literature is not grounded in empirical research nor conducted in naturalistic settings. Few prescriptions for using questions in interviews have been subjected to empirical test. Furthermore, recent empirical research into interviewing has practical implications that have not been articulated. In order to move toward a better understanding of effective questioning in interviews, this thesis explores how professionals and novices differ in their questioning techniques. Additionally, differences in how professionals and novices conform to textbook guidelines or prescriptions

are examined. Other differences between the questioning techniques of professionals and novices are investigated.

Two qualitative research methods are utilized. The first, discourse analysis, is used to identify questions in interviews and to examine the extent to which interviewing professionals and novices abide by textbook prescriptions for the process. The second method, conversation analysis, is used to produce finer-grained descriptions of how professionals and novices differ in questioning technique.

Subsequent chapters of this thesis unfold as follows: Chapter II addresses the literature pertaining to interviews in general, questions in interviews, prescriptions for how to use questions in interviews, and descriptions of questioning techniques that communicators have been shown to actually use. Chapter III addresses research methods, discourse analysis and conversation analysis, and how these methods are used to examine questions of professional and novice interviewers. Chapter IV concludes with a discussion section. The discussion section provides implications for interviewers, trainers and researchers of interviewing.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Many textbooks on interviewing are designed to provide principles and techniques for students interested in the practice of interviewing (Dillard & Reilly, 1988; Gottlieb, 1986; Donaghy, 1984). Attention is devoted to perceptions of the interviewee and interviewer (Stewart & Cash, 1994), to listening during the interview (Barone & Switzer, 1995), and to techniques for resolving interviewing problems (Metzler, 1977). A commonality among these manuals is the identification of types of interviews. Each text approaches the typology of interviews differently. However, most include the journalistic interview, the employment interview, and the counseling/medical interview. The typologies range in number from six (Dillard & Reilly, 1988) to seven or more (Gottlieb, 1986; Barone & Switzer, 1995; Stewart & Cash, 1994; Donaghy, 1984).

Most manuals include discussions about the beginning, the middle, and the end as phases of the interview process (Metzler, 1977; Stewart & Cash, 1994; Donaghy, 1984; Gottlieb, 1986). The beginning of the interview occurs when the interviewer and the interviewee meet and structure

their relationship. The middle phase is the exchange of questions and answers. The primary objective of the end phase of the interview is the conclusion which "draws together completed elements, and prepares for future action" (Dillard & Reilly, 1988, p. 71). Most of the questioning by the interviewer is supposed to occur during the middle segment of the interview.

The information presented here provides a context in which questions occur and are examined in this thesis. The following review addresses the literature pertaining to questions in interviews, and descriptions of questioning techniques that communicators actually use.

Questions in Interviews

Questions are integral to the success or failure of interviewing (Tengler & Jablin, 1983). The quality of the questions play a powerful role in determining the quality of answers. Barone and Switzer (1995) note that "poor questions elicit poor answers. Unclear questions elicit unclear answers. Focused questions elicit focused answers" (p. 86). Consequently, interviewers prepare questions in advance, and spend a considerable amount of time determining the "right" questions to ask the interviewee (Biagi, 1992).

The interviewing literature fails to utilize one definition of the term "question." One analyst of news interviews who provides a definition of questions maintains that it is useful to regard all interviewer utterances as elicitation of information, and, as such, to count them as questions (Harris, 1991). This suggest that utterances do not need to be in interrogative form in order to be considered questions. Another writer defines a question as meeting one or more of the following criteria:

- (1) It has interrogative distribution. The fact that an answer has occurred following an utterance can often be used to infer that a question elicited it.
- (2) It has interrogative syntax. Included here are inverted word orders from the declarative form, e.g., "Do you like it?" from "You do like it"; interrogative words such as what and why at the beginning of the utterance; and tags such as "isn't it" in "It's all right, isn't it?"
- (3) It has interrogative intonation, i.e., rising or high pitch at the end of the utterance.
- (4) It has interrogative gestures, i.e., gestures accompanying the utterance that indicate that it is a question. (Churchill, 1978, p. 29)

Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985) distinguish between three different types of questions that vary according to the type of reply expected. Those that require affirmative or negation are called yes-no questions. Those that typically require a reply from a range of replies are referred to as wh-questions. Wh-questions begin with what,

why, when, who, how and which. Alternative questions project answers from one of two or more options presented in the question.

The literature does provide an adequate amount of information about the types of questions available to the interviewer. Open-ended questions are broad (e.g., "Tell me about yourself," or "Tell me about your hobbies") and let the interviewee do most of the talking. Open-ended questions allow the respondent considerable latitude in determining the amount of information to give (Barone & Switzer, 1995; Stewart & Cash, 1994; Biagi, 1992). Open questions communicate trust and interest in the interviewee's judgment; they are easy to answer and pose no threat to the interviewee (Stewart & Cash, 1994). A disadvantage of open questions is that the interviewee determines the length and nature of answers. Therefore, lengthy, irrelevant, rambling answers can occur during the interview.

Closed-ended questions are restrictive and may supply the interviewee with the possible answer (Stewart & Cash, 1995). The interviewer can control answers with closed questions and ask for specific information (e.g., "Do you smoke?"). Closed questions often elicit answers that

contain too little information and require additional questions. Also, closed questions do not yield as understanding of why an interviewee has a particular attitude (Stewart & Cash, 1994).

Primary questions initiate new lines of questioning, or introduce topics (Wilson & Goodall, 1991; Barone & Switzer, 1995). Primary questions make sense if heard outside the interviewing context, and are usually prepared in advance of the interview. Primary questions may be either open or closed.

Similarly, secondary questions are open and closed questions, however, secondary questions attempt to elicit further information from the interviewee. Secondary questions are often called probing questions or follow up questions (e.g., "Tell me more about..." or "What did you have in mind when you said..."). Secondary questions are designed to motivate the interviewee to amplify or clarify when the interviewee does not respond, or the interviewees answers are incomplete, vague, or inaccurate (Donaghy, 1984; Stewart & Cash, 1994). Open-ended, closed-ended, and primary questions have been a major focus of writers in the area of interviewing. There is a substantial range of opinion about the appropriate use of questions in interviews

(Cantril, 1940; Downs & Wallace, 1965; Sheatsley, 1948; Williams, 1942; Axelrod, 1959). Some recommend ample use of secondary questions, others believe if interviewees talk freely and express themselves well, then the interviewer should not interrupt (Bell, 1925; Caplow, 1956).

Another opinion about how to structure and control interviews stems from the idea that an organized plan works best. Gallup (1947) was among the first to describe a plan for designing a series of questions. The quintamimensional design sequence was developed to determine the intensity of opinions and attitudes. The plan is essentially structured around the idea of asking the most general questions first. The first and second questions are designed to establish (a) whether or not the respondent has ever heard of the topic, and (b) whether the respondent has ever thought about it. The third question is designed to focus respondents' attention on a specific aspect of the topic. The fourth question seeks to learn the reasons why the respondent answered in a particular way, or why the respondent holds a particular view. The fifth question is designed to measure the intensity to which the respondent's opinions and views are held (Foddy, 1993).

These studies suggest the importance of questioning within the interview process. Still, with the exception of studies on open and closed questions (Dohrenwend, 1965), embedded questions (Hull, 1975), and leading questions (Richardson, 1960), very little research rooted in empirical evidence is available about the types of questions used in the interviewing process. There are, however, a number of prescriptions for how to use questions in interviews.

Prescriptions for Effective Questioning

Textbooks manuals on interviewing provide a thorough background for the novice. Many textbooks devote full chapters to questions and their uses (Stewart & Cash, 1994), the power of questions (Barone & Switzer, 1995), or asking and answering questions (Donaghy, 1984). These chapters also include a typology of questions, suggestions for framing questions, question sequences, and disadvantages of questions.

Killenberg and Anderson (1976) believe that students do not get enough training in the art of interviewing. Students often consider the interviewee as an object rather than a person, and many students fail to explore the potential for dialogue with the interviewee (Killenberg &

Anderson, 1976). Interviewers, especially novice's, can create problems in the interview. "Students often fail at interviewing because they are insensitive to, or unaware of some rather basic concepts of interpersonal communication-- that is, people talking with other people" (Killenberg & Anderson, 1976, p. 17). Students who need improvement usually falter in six areas. Students fail to:

1. explore the potential for dialogue in the interview context;
2. consider news sources as objects rather than people;
3. facilitate a proper supportive climate;
4. listen totally;
5. let the news source know why the interview is necessary;
6. utilize silence constructively.

The distinguishing characteristic of a good interviewer is the ability to respond to the interviewee (Hays & Mandel, 1970). Interviewing involves two people interacting, simultaneously sending and receiving messages. As the interview takes place, each sequence or movement that occurs between the interviewer and the interviewee, from the

beginning of the interview until its termination, is directly dependent upon what has happened before. This communicative environment, originally called sequential programming (Hays & Mandel, 1970), is termed conditional relevance in contemporary discourse research (Nofsinger, 1993).

Questions function as a way of gathering information, establishing rapport, providing a level of formality, maintaining directional control, and responding during interviews (Barone & Switzer, 1995). A question typology can encompass many types and subtypes of questions (Stewart & Cash, 1994). Yet, good questions allow interviewers to develop dialogue, and create a supportive climate during the interview, while poor questions undermine the goals of the interviewer (Barone & Switzer, 1995).

Interviewers are advised to avoid leading questions. Leading questions suggest a desired response from the interviewee. Questions that incorporate leading language are fairly obvious:

PM: Didn't she ask tough questions?

MM: Very tough.

PM: And didn't that bother you?

MM: I much prefer questions that are substantive, if they come from someone I have respect for.

Leading questions are designed to conform the interviewees answer with what the interviewer has suggested (Barone & Switzer, 1995). Leading questions should be avoided "unless you know what you're doing" (Stewart & Cash, 1994, p. 72), because they have potential for interview bias.

Three other prescriptions from the interviewing manuals worth mentioning pertain to double barreled questions, questions that are too long, questions that are too short, and combination questions. When the interviewer asks two questions at once (e.g., "What are your short-range and long-range plans?"), those questions are identified as double barreled questions (Donaghy, 1984; Barone & Switzer, 1995). Double barreled questions are to be avoided because the interviewee may have a problem deciding which question to answer, may become confused, or may remember one question and forget the other. The prescription for the interviewer in all situations is that each question should contain "one and only one inquiry" (Barone & Switzer, 1995).

Long questions are hard for the interviewee to comprehend because there is too much information to absorb at one time (Barone & Switzer, 1995). Similarly, questions that are too short omit necessary details that the

interviewee wants to hear, making the short question difficult to understand (Barone & Switzer, 1995).

Combination questions combine open questions with closed questions. The combination dilutes the effectiveness of the interaction (Barone & Switzer, 1995). "Tell me about your drive to Mexico. Did you run into bad weather?," is an example of a combination question. The open question, "Tell me about your drive to Mexico," combined with, "Did you run into bad weather?," a closed question, results in loss of information from the interviewee (Barone & Switzer, 1995). The prescription is for interviewers who begin with an open question, to continue asking open questions. Interviewers who begin with a closed question should continue with that wording, and "as always, an interviewer should ask only one question at a time" (Barone & Switzer, 1995, p. 112). The interviewer should verify comprehension, when in doubt, by paraphrasing the interviewee's statement. Paraphrasing will sometimes stimulate the interviewee and start a more analytical, more rewarding discussion (Campbell, 1993).

Although these prescriptions are offered as though they would assist anyone interested in becoming a better interviewer, they have seldom been studied to determine their usefulness. The above prescriptions are derived from

opinions of seasoned interviewers. The reports from these interviewers provide a model for novice interviewers to emulate. Recent research on questioning techniques that interviewers actually use may provide grounding missing in previous literature and may stimulate new understandings of the interview process.

Descriptions of Questioning Techniques Used by Interviewers

Recent studies in broadcast and fact-finding interviews have introduced new descriptions of interviewer activities, including questioning. These recent observations include building questions containing preliminaries, providing candidate answers within questions, using supplementary questions, and providing third-turn receipts.

Recently, Allwin (1991) examined the relationship between knowledge and social factors in question formulation. The study focused on the first turn of the "questioning dialogue." The first turn of a questioning dialogue in this study includes "at least one question, and often one or more preliminary statements" (Allwin, 1991, p. 170). Allwin's (1991) hypothesis states that the more interviewers know about the topic, the easier they can

generate hypotheses and, therefore, ask closed questions. Question formulation reflects interviewers' state of knowledge and their social strategies. Speakers can enhance politeness, if necessary, by combining persuasive preliminary statements, indirect and direct questions; or they can lessen politeness by combining harsh preliminary statements with direct or indirect questions. The Allwin (1991) study reveals that questions in the interview process can be intricate and sometimes strategic and are not as simple as asking a primary or open-ended question.

As may be evident from Allwin's (1991) reference to preliminaries, interviewers often ask questions that "lead up to" other questions. Jucker (1986) makes the distinction between prefaced and nonprefaced questions, where the former are usually prefaced by main clauses such as "Can I ask you" or "Can you explain." The prefatory talk is also labeled a "pre-pre," or a pre-sequence in conversation analysis studies (Schegloff, 1980; 1988/89). Ordinarily, interviewees wait until hearing both the preliminary and the question before answering. However, Schegloff (1988/89) identified a way that an interviewee might interject a premature answer. The interviewer can in essence, extend his speaking turn by using preliminary talk. During the

Bush/Rather interview, Rather used the technique of rushing into the start of the next unit.

001 Rather: hh Mister Vice President, tha:nk you for
002 being with us toni:ght, hh Donald
003 Gregg sti:ll serves as y'r tru:sted
004 advi#sor, =he w'z dee:ply involved in
005 running arms t'the Contras an'
006 he didn' inform you.=

Rather rushes into the start of next unit in line 004, marked by the "=" between "advisor" and "he w'z deeply involved." Rather's procedure in asking questions is two-fold. Rather introduces two claimable incompatible events or assertions, and then as seen below, challenges Bush to reconcile them.

007 Rather: = hhhh Now when President Rea:gan's,
008 (0.2)trusted advisor: Admiral
009 Poindexter: (0.6)failed to inform hi:m,
010 (0.8) the President-(0.2)fired'im.hh
011 (0.5)
012 Rather: Why is Mister Gregg still: () inside the
013 White House'n still a trusted advisor.=

At lines 002-010, Rather produces a preliminary to the question asked in line 012. In the preliminary, Rather makes two incompatible events or assertions. The first assertion is, "Donald Gregg sti:ll serves as y'r tru:sted

advisor, =he w'z dee:ply involved in running arms t'the
Contras an' he didn' inform you.= " The second assertion is,
"Now when President Rea:gan's, (0.2) trusted advisor:
Admiral Poindexter: (0.6) failed to inform hi:m, (0.8) the
President-(0.2) fired'im.hh." The two statements require
that Bush reconcile the assertions.

Greatbatch (1986b) has studied how interviewers may use
supplementary questions to pursue information that an
interviewee has declined to produce. Supplementary or
secondary questions may also be used to probe or counter the
statements made by an interviewee (Bull, 1994).

Supplementary questions are produced following a response to
a prior question, are addressed to the author of that
response, and are built off, or on to, the talk which
preceded them (Greatbatch, 1986b). An example of a
supplementary which takes up and deals with some aspect of a
prior response can be seen below:

RM: I'm not surprised about it because (.) er hh if
you're one of the ro:yals I mean part of the
responsibility is that when you make daft
statements they get enormous publicity.=

→ Int: =Why d'you say it's a daft statement.=

RM: =Oh I mean you can't...(continues)

Greatbatch (1986b) contends that the supplementary takes up and deals with an element of that response which precedes it, requesting that the interviewee provide grounds for that remarks are "daft statements." An example of a supplementary that advances the topic is displayed:

Int: Was it intentional not to call you?

BJ: hhh Well i- (.) I don't think it was Mali::gn=but it was intentional in the sense that he referred at the e:nd to the fact that I had put in a not asking to be calle:d, hh and couldn't be called.=So it obviously was intentional.=It wasn't hh an ove:rsight on his part.

Int: What sort of intention was it then.=What lay behind it.

BJ: I think that what he...(continues)

In the above example, the interviewer's supplementary question advances and develops the topical line of the spokesman's prior talk by requesting that he go on to specify the intention which "lay behind" the chairman's action. Although supplementary statements are used in questions that interviewers ask, this level of detail about using supplementary questions is not reached in the training manuals. Specifically, incorporating prior talk into supplementary questions is not considered.

In examining strategies for seeking information, Pomerantz (1988) found one strategy involves incorporating a candidate answer in a question. "Did you step out for a few minutes?, Are you going to be here for a while?", and "Was Tom home from school ill today?" (Pomerantz, 1988, p. 1) are examples of incorporating a candidate answer in a question, as opposed to asking open questions with no alternative answers proposed. One feature of offering a candidate answer is the provision, by the interviewer, of a model to the recipient as to what type of information will satisfy the interviewer's purpose. Another feature of offering a candidate answer is that the interviewer authors the candidate answer. The following is an interview between an assistant district attorney (ADA) and a suspect of a murder, in which the ADA incorporates a candidate answer in a query.

→ ADA: And have you been treated alright by the police?

Sus: Yes

→ ADA: Okay now I see that there::s a br::uise on your arm and it's pretty noticeable I want you jus if you can show it to the camera did is that in any way related to the police that bruise?

Sus: N::o

(Pomerantz, 1988, p. 16).

By incorporating a candidate answer, "treated alright," the ADA instructed the suspect as to what type of answer would be satisfactory. In addition, the ADA incorporated the account for the bruise, "Is that in any way related to the police that bruise?," in his candidate answer (Pomerantz, 1988). Providing a candidate answer is useful whenever a interviewer has reason to guide the interviewee to respond in a particular way. In addition, an interviewer providing a candidate answer can display being knowledgeable about the subject matter, or knowledgeable about the interviewee while seeking information (Pomerantz, 1988). However, an interviewer who wants to elicit independently produced information would not offer a candidate answer.

Interviews feature multi-unit turns, taken by interviewer and interviewees. In conversation analysis, the term "third turn" refers to a particular location in sequences of talk (Morris, Bruder, & Poole, 1995). The third turn is comprised of a turn after the first "pair-part" and the second pair-part of an adjacency pair (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). For example, in an interview, the interviewer's question can be the first pair-part and the interviewees answer can constitute the second pair-part

of an adjacency pair. The third turn, then, shows how the interviewer grapples with the answer he or she has received.

Morris, Bruder, and Poole (1995) identify "formulations," "okays," "continuers," and "assessments" as kinds of third turn receipts that interviewers exhibit in fact finding interviews. Formulations are used by interviewers as a means of checking accuracy of what the interviewee has said. Accurate formulations are confirmed; inaccurate ones are disconfirmed and then an alternative formulation is provided. Okays are used by interviewers to shut down a prior topic before introducing new ones. Continuers show the interviewers willingness for the interviewee to continue talking, while also acknowledging what they have been told. Assessments are used by interviewers to assess what has been said by the interviewee. Third turns assist interviewers in thier question asking, and show appreciation to the interviewee for what the interviewer is saying. Third turns are used to establish, maintain, control, and regain control during the interview.

Research into interviews occurring in naturalistic settings suggests several refinements to the prescriptions about asking questions. What is needed is a bridge between

the unfounded "shoulds" and "oughts" of the interviewing manuals and the complicated and detailed descriptions of recent conversation analytic investigations that explore preliminaries, candidate answers, supplementary statements, and third-turn receipts.

Research Problem

The extant interviewing literature has several problems. Descriptive research into the questioning techniques that interviewers actually use has not been incorporated into training manuals which draw heavily upon opinions reported decades ago (Downs & Wallace, 1965; Axelrod, 1959; Caplow, 1956; Sheatsley, 1948; Gallup, 1947; Williams, 1942; Cantril, 1940; Bell, 1925), rather than upon any foundation of empirical research.

Where empirical research has been done, studies have been performed in the laboratory setting. Thus, studies may not adequately address the nature of interviews as they occur naturally. Too much research examines the frequency of questions or types of questions used by interviewers without relating these frequencies to interview outcomes. An example is the use of "probing questions." The training textbooks assert that probing questions should be used,

however, direct observation of the effectiveness of probing questions is unavailable. Similarly, claims to identify the "best" question to ask (Biagi, 1992; Zuckerman, 1972), have been unsubstantiated. Few studies have investigated actual interviews to determine if these opinions hold true. Additionally, studies about questions used by professional interviewers is nonexistent. Logically, if interviewing prescriptions are valid, professional interviewers would abide by them more consistently than novices.

Therefore, this study examines how well professional and novice interviewer questions conform to interviewing prescriptions. It also seeks to develop a better understanding of differences between how professional and novices use questioning techniques, irrespective of their compliance with interview prescriptions. The specific research questions to be examined are:

RQ1: In what ways are questions asked by professional and novice interviewers consistent and inconsistent with main prescriptions of interviewing manuals and descriptive interviewing literature?

RQ2: How are the questioning strategies of professional interviewers different from those of novice interviewers?

These questions are addressed using methods of discourse and conversation analysis. These are explained in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The research questions require investigation into the consistency of professional and novice interviewers in following the prescriptions in interviewing technical literature, as well as key features of professional interviewer questioning strategies that are different from the activities of novices. The methods used to perform these analyses are the subject of this chapter.

Inquiry into questioning strategies utilizes transcripts and tape recordings of naturally occurring interviews and examines these recordings in two ways. First, a discourse analysis was performed to determine the consistency of professional and novice interviewers in following the prescriptions in the interviewing manuals and the descriptions from the broadcast and fact-finding interviews. This was followed by use of conversational analysis to delve more deeply into the differences in strategies used by professional and novice interviewers.

This chapter describes the methods used as follows: First, the collection of interviewing data is described, and the method used to select discourse units for analysis is

explained. Second, discourse analysis procedure is explained, followed by a description of conversation analysis (CA) method.

Data

Transcripts of interviews conducted by undergraduate students (novices) from a previous study (Morris, Bruder & Poole, 1995), were used. The transcripts were drawn from fact-finding interviews conducted by twelve different interviewers. A comparable set of professional interviews was compiled. For the purpose of this study professional interviewers were defined as interviewers who are employed in the radio and television industry who enjoy a large regional or national audience. Specifically included in the data are interviews from National Public Radio (NPR), Cable News Network (CNN), and Public Broadcast Station (PBS) conducted by ten different interviewers.

The analysis is confined to questions asked by interviewers taken from the middle of interviews where most questions are asked (Metzler, 1977; Donaghy, 1984; Gottlieb, 1986; Stewart & Cash, 1994). A total of fifty questions, answers and receipts of novice interviews were recorded and transcribed following the conventions developed by Jefferson

(1985). A total of fifty questions, answers, and receipts of professional interviewers were also audio recorded and transcribed following the conventions developed by Jefferson (1985). The data are 99 pages of interview transcripts totaling 270 minutes of interaction.

Discourse Analysis Procedures

Discourse analysis is a study of the organization of all forms of spoken interaction, formal and informal (Stubbs, 1983). Discourse analysis involves looking at naturalistic speech data, including interviews to determine how people manage everyday social and institutional activities.

Discourse analysis involves several steps before analysis. The analyst spends considerable time transcribing, coding, and reading data. Hence, for discourse analysts the success of a study is not dependent on sample size, the emphasis rests in the amount of data. Transcriptions are made of the data because the questions asked by the discourse analyst center primarily on the construction and function of talk. Researchers disagree on how detailed the transcription should be. For this study the data was transcribed following the conventions developed

by Jefferson (1985). Coding is the next step in discourse analysis. The goal of coding is to simplify messages into categorical instances derived from theory described in the literature. The goal is to categorize the data into inclusive units in order to aid in the analysis stage. In the analysis stage of discourse analysis, the researcher identifies the organizational features of the data.

A discourse analysis was performed to determine the consistency of professional and novice interviewers in following the prescriptions from the interviewing manuals and descriptive interviewing literature. The principal investigator analyzed each question to determine if the question contained the five problematic question types and the four descriptive question types, coding it into the categories below:

1. Loaded questions,
2. Leading questions,
3. Multiple questions,
4. Long questions,
5. Wordy questions,
6. Preliminaries,
7. Candidate answers,
8. Supplemental questions, and

9. Third-turn receipts.

From the prescriptive interviewing literature, four common rules pertaining to problematic questions emerged (Barone & Switzer, 1995; Stewart & Cash, 1994; Dillard & Reilly, 1988; Gottlieb, 1986; Donaghy, 1984). Interviewers are advised to avoid multiple questions (also identified as double barreled questions) because the interviewee may have a problem deciding which questions to answer and may become confused. When the interviewer asks more than one question before the interviewee answers, it is considered a multiple question. Loaded questions suggest to the interviewee the desired response, but also include emotionally charged words, name calling and entrapment. Interviewers are advised to avoid loaded questions because loaded questions may entrap the interviewee and cause the interviewee discomfort during the interview.

Leading questions are questions that suggest a desired response from the interviewee and may show interviewee bias. Leading questions are questions in which the interviewer suggest implicitly or explicitly the answer expected or desired. Interviewers are advised to avoid leading questions, because leading questions pressure the interviewee to answer in a way that conforms with what the

interviewer has suggested (Barone & Switzer, 1995). Long questions are questions that are not concise, often introduce two or more ideas and prefatory statements before the question. Interviewers are advised to avoid long questions because long questions are hard for the interviewee to comprehend (Barone & Switzer, 1995).

Wordy questions are questions asked by the interviewer that do not make use of concise statements or questions and do not introduce more than one idea. Interviewers are advised to avoid wordy questions because they dilute the effectiveness of the interaction (Barone & Switzer, 1995).

From the descriptive literature, four strategies emerged. Preliminaries are questions or statements that precede a direct question (Jucker, 1986; Schegloff, 1980). With candidate answers, interviewers author specific talk in the question that provides a model for the interviewee to use in the answer (Pomerantz, 1988). Researchers describe supplementaries as secondary questions built off, or on to the response of the interviewee to a prior question by the interviewer (Greatbatch, 1986b). Researchers describe third turn receipts as "anything an interviewer says after his or her question is complete and before the point at which a

next question commences" (Morris, Bruder & Poole, 1995, p. 7).

The principal investigator analyzed each question. Another analyst coded 40% of the data for purposes of checking reliability by counting the proportion of identical coding to total codings. A criterion of 70% is typical of discourse analysis research (Morris, Coursey & Thach, 1987) and was attained. (The actual proportion was 85%.) Based on the definition given for "long" questions, the secondary analyst associated "long" questions with "wordy" questions. Differences occurred in how the primary analyst and secondary analyst coded "long" questions. Where differences were discovered, they were negotiated for placement in the appropriate category. The analysts negotiated a better definition for "long" and "wordy" questions to help distinguish the two. Thus, long questions are questions that have prefatory statements and questions before the final question, and often introduce two or more ideas. Wordy questions are questions that have multiple starts for asking one question (e.g., "if I'm presenting this, could you tell me, could you describe, in your opinion, what would you say about what a day is like on your job"). The

previous differences in coding were then negotiated for proper categorical placement.

To answer the first research question, the proportion of questions in conformity with prescriptive literature and descriptive literature was calculated for both novices and professionals and these proportions were compared. Results pertaining to the particular prescriptions were noted. The likelihood that professionals and novices would abide by the prescriptions was assessed. Results pertaining to descriptive questioning strategies were noted. A description of how professionals and novices use descriptive questioning strategies was assessed. These are explained in the next chapter. For analysis of the descriptive questioning strategies, conversation analysis procedures were used. The method is described below.

Conversation Analysis Procedures

Conversation analysis uses micro-analysis to document the structures and patterns found in everyday talk. Three guiding assumptions of conversation analysis are: (a) interaction is structurally and sequentially organized; (b) talk is doubly contextual--each turn is shaped by the context to which the next turn will be oriented; and (c) no

order of detail can be dismissed, a priori, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant (Heritage, 1984, p. 241).

During [the conversation's] course, the parties, whether intentionally or not, implicitly display their understanding and analysis of what is happening as it happens...Conversation analyst represent the development of an analytic technology that capitalizes on this fact. (Heritage, 1988, pp. 128-129)

Conversation analyst procedures are similar to the stages of discourse analysis. They both utilize data from audio tape recordings, transcribed using transcription symbols. However, there are major differences between conversation analysis and discourse analysis in the analysis stage. In discourse analysis, the analysis stage consists of reading coded data. In conversation analysis, analysis develops as a result of using both the tapes and the transcripts simultaneously to document phenomena within the talk that demonstrate participants' methods of accomplishing things. Analysis of data focuses primarily on participant's moment-by-moment orientation to features of the interaction. Initial work with transcripts and recording centers on unmotivated listening. The inductive approach allows the conversational participants to reveal their methods through the particulars of their talk. A search is made for recurring patterns across many records of naturally

occurring conversation. In conversation analysis, there is no phase of coding; coding is ongoing. If an analyst codes an action as a "third-turn receipt," that counts as a provisional judgment to guide analysis, not as a category to hold fast (Hopper, 1989).

Conversation analysis was used to describe how interviewers accomplish questions, and to describe the differences in strategies used by professional and novice interviewers.

The same data used to determine categories of problematic question types were used for this analysis. Specifically, the descriptive questioning strategies earmarked during discourse analysis were analyzed further using conversation analysis. Exemplary cases of the descriptive questioning strategies of novice and professional interviewers were chosen and summaries of their characteristics were compiled. These are explained in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This study examined how well professional and novice interviewers' questions conform to interviewing prescriptions and explored the differences between professionals' and novices' use of questioning techniques. This chapter, first examine the extent to which questions asked by professional and novice interviewers are consistent with common prescriptions of interviewing manuals and descriptive interviewing literature. Next, it analyzes key differences between questions asked by professionals and novices. The final section addresses theoretical and practical implications of the research, limitations of the research, and suggestions for further research.

Categorization of Problematic Question Types

One objective of this research was to determine if novices and professionals generally abide by, or violate prescriptions for the interviewing process. To make this determination, all definitional concerns about question type were noted and categorized. The results are summarized in Table 4.1. As the table indicates, novices asked only six

leading questions (12%), six multiple questions (12%), and five wordy questions (10%). There were no loaded or long

Table 4.1 Categorization of Questions Types

Question types	Novices	Professionals
	Number/percentage	Number/percentage
<u>Problematic Questions</u>		
Loaded questions	0	2/4
Leading questions	6/12	10/20
Multiple questions	6/12	8/16
Wordy questions	5/10	2/4
Long questions	0	15/30
<u>Question Features</u>		
Supplemental questions	8/16	5/10
Preliminary questions	4/8	19/38
Candidate Answers	3/6	5/10
Third-turn receipts	32/64	11/22

questions asked novice interviewers. Overall, novices' questions are in conformity with interviewing prescriptions.

The number of professionals' questions in conformity with prescriptive literature was examined. Surprisingly, more problematic questions were found. There were two loaded and two wordy questions (4%), eight multiple questions (16%), ten leading questions (20%), and fifteen long questions (30%). Although the majority of professionals' questions do conform to prescriptions, a sizable number of their questions can be considered problematic.

Comparison of the Number of Problematic Questions

By comparing the number of problematic questions asked by novice interviewers with those asked by professional interviewers, conclusions can be drawn about the ratio of conformity to the prescriptive literature. Professional interviewers were more likely to violate interviewing prescriptions than novice interviewers in all categories except the wordy question category. Professionals were more likely to ask leading questions and long questions than novices. Novice interviewers' questions were more likely to be wordy.

The prescriptive literature advises interviewers to avoid loaded questions, leading questions, multiple

questions, wordy questions, and long questions and, generally speaking, both professionals and novices avoid using over thirty percent of problematic questions. The chief exception is long questions. The literature advises against long questions because long questions are hard for the interviewee to comprehend (Barone & Switzer, 1995). Professionals frequently do not follow the advice of the literature regarding long questions.

Categorization of Question Features

The categorization of question elements identified in the descriptive literature are also summarized in Table 4.1. The number of novices' questions in each category are, three candidate answers (6%), four preliminaries (8%), eight supplemental questions (14%), and thirty-two questions containing one or more third-turn receipts (64%). Professionals used five supplemental questions (10%), five candidate answers (10%), eleven third-turn receipts (22%), and nineteen preliminaries (38%).

Comparison of the Number of Descriptive Features

By comparing the proportion of these question elements asked by novice interviewers with those asked by professional interviewers, conclusions can be drawn about the use of preliminaries, candidate answers, supplemental questions and third-turn receipts. Professional interviewers were more likely to author preliminaries and candidate answers than novices interviewers. Novice interviewers used more supplementaries and third-turn receipts. The most dramatic differences are that professionals use preliminaries, whereas novices use third-turn receipts.

The analysis revealed that both professional and novice interviewers use only a small number of problematic questions while interviewing, yet professionals' and novices' questions are qualitatively quite different. Two of the most interesting questioning strategies suggested by the analysis of data are how interviewers manage their responsiveness to the interviewee and how interviewers introduce new questions to the interviewee. The descriptive literature suggests that third-turn receipts and supplemental questions are ways in which the interviewer

responds to what the interviewee is saying (Greatbatch, 1986b; Morris, Bruder & Poole, 1995). Novice interviewers responded to the interviewee using either supplementaries (14%) or third-turn receipts (64%) more than the professional interviewers. Conversely, professional interviewers use long questions (30%) and preliminaries (38%) more than novice interviewers.

A closer look at how interviewers display responsiveness and introduce new questions will help answer the second research question, which explores in more depth how questioning strategies of professional interviewers are different from those of novice interviewers. A conversation analysis of supplemental questions, third-turn receipts, and preliminaries provides a description of how interviewers accomplish these questioning strategies.

Features of Supplemental Questions

Three features of supplemental questions are that such questions are (1) produced following a response to a prior question, (2) addressed to the author of that response, and (3) built off, or on to, the talk which precedes them (Greatbatch, 1986b). Examples of supplemental questions which deal with an aspect of the prior response and are

produced following a response to a prior question are displayed in the following examples taken from novice and professional interviews. Features that distinguish novices' and professionals' supplemental questions are also discussed.

The first example of a supplemental question involves a novice interviewer asking the interviewee about the salary range for the people in the interviewee's profession.

1. (TTU, LF;25, 92)

→ 001 ER: >Okey< this is >gonna be kinduva< st^ra:nge
 002 question but (.6) what ^kinduv (1.7) wor
 003 ^couldyoo (1.0) gestimate what kindov
 004 saler<e:es> or salree range that peepel could
 005 lo:ok for (1.2) ·hhh whoove never been out
 006 there (.4) and know what (.6) whats beang
 007 asking ri (.4) asked rite now?=
 008 EE: =<Yowel> (1.2) <^wel:l> (.5) <^it probubly
 009 depends> on where you <whar> (.8) ·hh uhghmm
 010 (1.0) probubly in lubbuck (.8) >techsis
 011 yewesay< <they range from> (1.0) ohh twentee
 012 five dollers anower to:o (.8) ahhh (1.1)
 013 fortee dollers anower (.4)
 014 ER: >Uh huh<
 015 EE: (.8) Uuhh ^eightee dollers anower depending
 016 on how technickel<yewar>and whut (.7) whutall
 017 ya know is being asked of yewiz^zit(.9)>how?<
 018 (1.1) yew know whut sorduv u:hhh (.6) stuff
 019 yew ^doo (.9) whether yer werking for an
 020 agencee o:r (.9) °whatever° (.5)
 021 ER: <Ri:te> (.5)
 022 EE: But (.5) I troolee dont <k:now> (1.2) °rite
 023 now° (.6) (becos) but I wud think >I wud
 024 think< thats pritee well tha goin rate
 025 twentee fives on tha low side °and (.9)andah°
 026 ER: All ([tha])
 027 EE: [Ther] ah probly peepel en Lubbuck

028 charging ahundred fiftee dollers° (anower)
 029 (1.1) I am not wonuv them.°
 030 ER: ((laughs))
 031 EE: (Buttah)
 → 032 ER: So it usually goes on (.6) when yew gittah
 033 client? it goes onna oweree? (.4) oweree
 034 basis?
 035 EE: [<·hh ^Well] yew kan> (1.2) I thenk thatz tha
 036 hardist part of freelancing(.7) iz estimating
 037 what a job iz going to cost- ·hh <and> it
 038 all depends on how involvd in tha job yew
 039 want tah bee (.) if yew jus want to doo (.9)
 040 ahh the artwerk (1.4) <then yew ken> (.7)
 041 after yuv done thisa while yew ken pree well
 042 look at something and go °well its gonnah
 043 take me ya cuppel ouwers ta do so tha
 044 jobbelbee (1.0) ya know
 045 ER: Ri:te (.)

In 032, the interviewer begins a question that is conditioned by a previous question by the interviewer and an answer by the interviewee in line 001. The interviewer asks about the salary range of people in the business. This question is an open-ended question to which the interviewee could respond in a number of ways. Instead of producing a response that discusses monthly or weekly salary ranges, the interviewee provides a salary based on an hourly range. The interviewer asks a closed question in line 032 to clarify that the salary is not monthly, or weekly, but that it is hourly.

The second example of a supplemental question involves the novice interviewer asking for additional information about working as a freelancer or working for an agency.

2. (TTU, LF;26, 92)

001 ER: So it usually goes on (.6) when yew gittah
002 client? it goes onna oweree? (.4) oweree
003 [basis?]
004 EE: [<·hh ^Well] yew kan> (1.2) I think thatz tha
005 hardist part of freelancing(.7) iz estimating
006 what a job iz going to cost- ·hh <and> it
007 all depends on how involvd in tha job yew
008 want tah bee (.) if yew jus want to doo (.9)
009 ahh the artwerk (1.4) <then yew ken> (.7)
010 after yuv done thisa while yew ken pree well
011 look at something and go °well its gonnah
012 take me ya cuppel ouwers ta do so tha
013 jobbelbee (1.0) ya know°
014 ER: Ri:te (.)
015 EE: Two times whatever yer chargin per ower and
016 yew ken give the client that (.7) <o:hh>
017 (1.1) ya ^know that estimate? ((omitted
018 approximately 18 lines of EE response)) >Now<
→ 019 (.6)·hhh if yer werking <for> someoneelse(.7)
020 yer not gonna make (.9) °that kinuv money°
021 (.7) ah(.5) but yer also gonna know how much
022 money ye^war gonna make? (1.1) and <can> (.7)
023 plan better (.3)
024 ER: Pree much be garunteed=
025 EE: =Yyes (.5) yes (.4) becuz (1.1) <uhh> (.4) if
026 yer werking >foran ad agency or somethin<like
027 that theyr not gonna be pain <yew> the top
028 dollar that artists are ^geding becuz ^theyr
029 gonna be chargin top dollar (.8) so that they
030 make something off of yer (.8) yerwerk
031 ((omitted approximately 14 lines of EE
032 response)) But (.7) on the other hand if yer
033 gonna deal with the general public and yer
034 gonna advertise (1.1)<ahhh>(.8) you cant have
035 the phone ring at nine o'clock in the morning
036 and you answerit haf asleep and make no
037 °sense whatsoever°(.4)

038 ER: Ri:te (1.3)
 039 EE: <Itsa> (.4) itsalla matteruv >^yew know?<
 040 whachew wanto:o (.8) w[hachew wannah do]
 041 ER: [Whachew wannah d]o?
 → 042 (.6) ehem (.6) okay um (.9) say if theyve ye
 043 know choze not to go into freelancing but
 044 wanted to work for a company? (.5)
 045 EE: Ehem
 046 ER: <^What> (1.8) or ^who are the ideal companeez
 047 to go looking at (.) rite now?

The interviewee, starting in line 019, mentions working for an agency. However, the interviewee talks mostly about freelancing in the talk that leads up to the interviewer's question in line 041. In 041, the interviewer restarts the topic raised in line 019, of working for someone else instead of freelancing. The interviewer's question starts with "okay" along with the redirecting statement "Say if they've chosen not to go into freelancing," which closes down the talk about freelancing, but allows the interviewer to restart the topic of working for an agency.

The next example of a supplemental question involves a professional interviewer asking questions about anxiety that math students experience.

3. (MI:SM;15, TTU, 93)

001 ER: ·hhh Annuh student who is in ^klass: um
 002 feeling herself, feeling himself falling
 003 be^hind?
 004 EE: ^Thatz a littelmo:re,diffikult becuz
 005 there won izent in control of the

007 lerning=
 008 ER: =Thatz ^ri[te]
 009 EE: [Itzuh] a seekwens thet iz
 010 beeying prezentid by the kors of the
 → 011 teecher ·hhh but if I were a ^parent (.)
 012 and haduh chyeld in this state, I \wud
 013 not let it fester. ·hh
 014 I wud figyer outteh way teh orgunize a
 015 math ^klub ·hh or even myself however
 016 math ankshous I ^yam ·hh teh go back an
 017 revyew the mateeryul that the student is
 018 lerning, the child is lerning, teh help
 019 them. ·hh sumthing hasteh be dun
 020 immeedyutly, itzaz urgent az: a vyirus.
 021 ·hh I w(h)ud think on, innuh teenayjer
 022 becuz it >kood< make the diffrence ·hh
 023 between ahm kereer withuh ^high
 024 trajektry ·hh annah kereer thet is very
 025 dissapoyning.
 → 026 ER: ·hhh >eh eh huhm< hhh Yew menshunned the
 027 parents. this is hard for sum parentz, who r
 028 themselves letsay math ankshous or did at sum
 029 point themselves jussay (.6) I dont do this=
 030 EE: =OR who huv baught into a kulchural
 031 prejudis=
 032 ER: =Yes=
 033 EE: =Thet a normel and, soon teh bepopyuler,
 034 yung girl >yung ^daughter< ought teh
 035 be, math incompetent, aza syne of her
 036 femin^ninity. so we hafta ^root out
 037 these prejudissis uh in teechers uh who
 038 r <mo:re
 039 attuned> to the newer ideeyus about
 040 this, then parents=
 041 ER: =Mhem=
 042 EE: =And we hafta do it >rite away<.

The interviewer points out that the interviewee's response may need elaboration. The interviewee mentions parenting in

line 011. In line 026, the interviewer displays a prefatory statement that orients the interviewee back to the topic "parent," and prepares the interviewee for the question about to be asked. However, the interviewee begins to comment on the preliminary statement before the interviewer can ask a question. Schegloff (1988/89) notes that interruptions by the interviewee, like the one above, take place because the interviewee may recognize the prefatory talk as the end of a turn in a turn-taking sequence.

The next example of a supplemental question involves a professional interviewer discussing the issues affecting the Supreme Court.

4. (MI:NT;7, TTU, 87)

001 ER: ·hh Yer, opponents have sa[^]id, ina ritten
002 opinyuns ·hhh no matter whut the machooring
003 standard is? ·hh the baudy politik, sez it
004 [^]wants this punishment. so. ·hh [^]whoze
005 standard izit, other than y[^]o:rs that duzent
006 wantit. (.4)
007 EE: Well, uh they, hah hah, the yuh, anser to
008 thateh will haftoo uh wait en see.·hh this is
009 my idea uva where I think my: kolleagues of
010 the majoritee, uh, huv fallen into er.·hh and
011 just as those who wuh ·hh huv felt thet the
012 kort who rote plessy en, plessy en ferguson
013 had fallen inta er. ·hh it took brown versis
014 united staytes ·hh to agree that indeedit
015 [^]had. and I hope thet they will come anduh,
016 they'll beya- pinyun here that will agree:
017 thateh greg versis jorgyia also ·hh iza:yuh
018 kase in which my kolleagues huv fallen into
019 er. (.9)

→ 020 ER: Following that ^la:wjik, yew wu:d- of kors
021 erge yer kolleagues >whove dissendid for
022 example in the aborshun ^casis< to kontinyew
023 to dissend and kontinyew to [dissend]
024 EE: [>If they,] if
025 thatz, of korse if they wantoo, thatz egzakly
026 whut they< shud do, >absulootly, of korse
027 they shud.< (1.2)
028 ER: In the hopes that won day ^the:y'll win (.4)
029 EE: Oh >the um< (1.0) sertenly, hah hah, i(h)tz
030 ·hh itz no diffrent then my kayse from
031 ^theyrz (.8)
032 ER: ^If evrybody keeps ^hoping that it'll cha:nge
033 (.7)
034 EE: <Mhem> (.4)
035 ER: Then ^why wud they abey it ^now.

In the supplemental question above, the interviewer provides a continuation in line 020, "following that lawjik," of the interviewee's previous comments. Next, the interviewer asks a leading question that suggests to the interviewee the answer that is expected.

Professional and novice interview techniques for using supplemental questions are similar in that they both project a topical line of the preceding response and they deal with some aspect of that response. In contrast to that similarity, professional interviewers display what I call "reminder tokens" evident in both examples, line 026 of the first example and line 020 of the second example. Reminder tokens help prepare the interviewee for the question about

to be asked by the interviewer. They also provide the interviewee with a reminder of what was previously said and/or an affirmation concerning the continuation of a topic. In line 026, the reminder token, "you mentioned the parents," helps to order the response of the interviewee and also to remind the interviewee of a preceding comment that needs further elaboration. In line 020 of the second example, the reminder token, "following that logic," helps to specify and affirm the desired response of the interviewee.

Another difference in the professionals' use of supplemental questions is that they follow the reminder token with a statement, not a question. The statement following the reminder token provides specific information which the interviewer is seeking. For instance, in the third transcript example, the interviewee has been talking about organizing a math club and the difference a math club can make for a teenager. Within this talk the interviewee mentions the parent. The interviewer could have asked the interviewee a question about the careers of successful math students or the success of math clubs, but the interviewer appears to want to focus the next question on the parent who is math anxious. Thus, after the reminder token, the

interviewer provides a very specific statement about the desired topic.

→ 026 ER: ·hhh >eh eh huhm< hhh yew menshunned the
027 ^parents. this is ^hard for sum parentz,
028 who r themselves letsay math ankshous or
029 did at sum point themselves jussay (.6)
030 I dont do this=

In the fourth transcript example, the interviewer also provides a specific orientation for the interviewee. The interviewer could have asked specific information about the Gregg versus Georgia case. However, the interviewer seems to want affirmation and clarification of the Justice's opinion about his colleagues.

The standard in interviewing is for both interviewers and interviewees to take turns in talking. Often, the professionals are interrupted before they can ask a question. The interviewees recognize the end of a turn during the prefatory talk and start the response. The professionals use reminder tokens and the prefatory statements as a pretext of an everyday conversation between two people as opposed to a question/answer dialogue between interviewer and interviewee.

Novices also follow the turn-taking standard in interviewing. However, the novice interviewers use

supplemental questions in pre-interrogative form, but they lack reminder tokens.

Features of Third-turn Receipts

Third-turn receipts are used by interviewers in fact-finding interviews as a means of checking accuracy, moving to the next question on the interview schedule, acknowledging what has been heard, and assessing what has been said. Four types of third-turn receipts are (1) formulations, (2) okays, (3) continuers, and (4) assessments. In this research, third-turn receipts are defined as anything an interviewer says after the question is complete and before asking a new or supplemental question. Although formulations, okays, continuers and assessments occurred in novice interviews, assessments and continuers occurred more frequently. Examples of third-turns are displayed in the following examples of novice and professional interviews. Distinctive features of novice and professional third-turns are also discussed.

Two examples of third-turn receipts offered by novice interviewees and a discussion of these features follow. The first example involves a novice interviewer asking about the interviewee's job description.

5. (TTU, PF;2, 92)

001 ER: So do you uh .hh uh actually what
002 what is your gu job descriptio:n [Um]
003 EE: [I'm]
004 the >public relations manager<
→ 005 ER: Right
006 EE: I handle all the publicity and media
007 coverage for .hh language line services
→ 008 ER: Okay
009 EE: So um >and that would be< worldwide
010 ER: [Worldwide?]
011 EE: [Uh,] yeah. ((Cough)) as far as
012 talking to reporte:rs
→ 013 ER: Uhuh.
014 EE: And um, and creating an awareness
015 in the public for our services, cause we
016 not only have subscribers, which are
017 businesses .hh uh, but, we also have
018 individual users like you or myself who
019 .h wanna talk to somebody overseas and
020 can't do it so we (.) we also >cater to
021 those< people
→ 022 ER: Oh::kay (1.0) .hh wull uh so I guess you
023 would uh.hh I guess since you are going
024 to be out in the public you'd have to
025 know uh, or be a good public speaker

In this example, the interviewer provides a topic and specific direction for the interview. Formulations often begin with the word "so." They help the interviewee confirm or disconfirm the formulation asked by the interviewer (Morris, Bruder, & Poole, 1995). However, formulations are a means of checking accuracy and indicate what is to be addressed next, and in this case the word "so" is not a formulation. "Right," in line 005 is an assessment. Assessments are used by interviewers to assess what they

have been told by the interviewee. The question in line 022 starts with "okay." "Okay" serves as a precursor to the supplemental question, "I guess since you are going to be out in the public, you'd have to be a good speaker." One of the uses of "okay" is to close down further talk by the interviewee, and move on to another question (Morris, Bruder, & Poole, 1995).

The second example of a third-turn receipt involves a novice interviewing a mortician about selecting that particular career.

6. (TTU, MM;9, 92)

→ 001 ER: um hum So did you know growing up as a
002 kid that this is what you wanted to get
003 into?
004 EE: I always felt like(.) ((cough))this would
005 probably be where I would end up I toyed
006 with the idea of medical school uh (.5)um
007 (1.6) related fields but every time that
→ 008 um I've (.) started going in another
009 direction I was always pulled back tuh
010 this (.5) hh it was all my? doing and all
011 my choice (.5) that I came back into the
012 business becauz uh (1.0) uh my mother orf
013 often encouraged me into something ^else
014 hh
015 ER: Huhm
016 EE: For munny reasu:ns or whatever (.) and I
017 finely just said uh I couldn't be happy
018 doing anything except this

"Huhm" in line 015 is a continuer. A continuer is a third-turn receipt that interviewers use in fact-finding

interviews to acknowledge having heard what the interviewee has said (Morris, Bruder, & Poole, 1995 p. 10).

Two examples of third turn receipts in professional interviews and a discussion of the examples follow. The first example involves a professional interviewing a singer/musician.

7. (MI:SM;16,TTU,93)

001 ER: ·hhh >eh ehhuhm< yew menshunned the
002 ^parents. this is ^hard for sum parentz, who
003 themselves letsay math ankshous or did at sum
004 point themselves jussay (.6) I dont do this=
005 EE: =OR who huv baught into a kulchural prejudis=
006 ER: =yes=
007 EE: =thet a normel and, soon the be poppyuler,
008 \yung \girl >yung ^daughter< ought the be,
009 math incompetent, aza syne of her
010 femin^ninity. so we hafta ^root out these
011 prejudissis uh in teecheers uh whi r <mo:re
012 attuned to the newer ideeyus about this, then
013 parents=
→ 014 ER: =mhem=
015 EE: =and we hafta do it >rite away<.
016 ER: ·hh >dew< hhh(.9) if there wuzuh parent >eh<
017 in this sichuayshun who wuz s s sitting an
018 lissning an saying >eh< my daughter Soozie or
019 ^my son ^Bob ·hh iz \jus terning uhway from
020 mathmatiks, >de< dew yew challinj that parent
021 to do? anything in partikyuler

In line 014 "mhem" is a continuer. "Mhem" is described as a continuer because it shows the interviewers willingness for the interviewee to continue talking (Morris, Bruder, Poole, 1995). "Mhem" in this example functions as an opportunity

for the interviewer to display to the interviewee that what is being said is understood and the interviewee should continue talking. The next example of a third-turn receipt in professional interviews is "okay."

8. (MM:TB;45, TTU, 95)

→ 001 ER: Okay now you guys and gal(0.1)are going
002 to be the as I call you the cyber
003 leaders. you don't have to like this.
004 I'm sure none of you have
005 ever considered yourself as leaders you
006 considered yourselves as experts and
007 information systems software you
008 building ah ah bulletin board system a
009 network in the Caribe:an but do you know
010 you're going to be called on to defi:ne
011 the lives of for the rest of us black
012 white female male polka dot green are
013 you aware see change

In this example "okay" closes down the previous topic and starts the new topic of "cyber-leaders."

Both novices and professionals use of third-turn receipts conform to the findings of a study about third-turns (Morris, Bruder & Poole, 1995). Third-turn receipts are often used by interviewers as a means of checking accuracy, moving to the next question on the interview schedule, acknowledging what has been heard, and assessing what has been said. In the examples above, the third-turns are normally used by novice and professionals to either move to the next question or to acknowledge what has been said.

Features of Preliminaries

Preliminaries are statements or questions that precede a direct question. Preliminaries involve talk that "leads up to" a question, and are "prefatory talk to something else" (Schegloff, 1988/89, p. 220). Three features of this kind of talk are that (1) it relates to the interviewer's opinion, (2) it relates to what the interviewee has said, (3) and it relate to speech acts required of the interviewee (e.g., "Can you tell us...") (Jucker, 1986). Examples of preliminaries in which statements precede a question are displayed in the following examples of novice and professional interviews. Features of novice and professional's preliminaries are also discussed.

Two examples of preliminaries in novice interviews follow. The first example is of a novice interviewing a TCBY employee. The preliminary starts in line 001 and continues through line 003.

9. (TTU, HL;5, 92)
001 ER: Well, living close to Brenham, Texas we
002 in Houston are big fans of Blue Bell ice
003 cream. Are they a big competitor, even
004 though they're considered ice cream to
005 yogurt? ·hhh (0.6)
006 ER: Would [you cons]sider
007 EE: [I don't] I don't puh perceive uh
008 Blue Bell as a competitor for TCBY, ·hh
009 primarily becuz the ice cream

010 ER: Right

The question, "Are they a big competitor," is preceded by the interviewer expressing his/her opinion about the people in Houston ("we in Houston") being fans of Blue Bell ice cream. The preliminary in this case is the statement, "Well, living close to Brenham, Texas we in Houston are big fans of Blue Bell ice cream." This is an opinion of the interviewer. It works to lead up to the question in line 003, "Are they a big competitor"

The next example is of a novice interviewing someone in a position to hire new employees. The preliminary starts in line 001 and continues through line 008.

9. (TTU, MB;48, 92)

001 ER: Okay, if ahm presenting this interviewe
002 to my,uh, komunikashuns thirty three
003 0 nine class. what kinduv advice could
004 you give me thet I could give ta them
005 (.9) in trying to find uh,a uh good
006 pozishun for themself. (1.6) >like whut
007 could? whut kynah advice could you give<
008 me ta tell ma classmates like things the
009 always remember when ahm interviewing
010 forah pozishun?
011 (1.7)
012 EE: U:m, (2.0) >I think itz important to< um
013 (1.2)
014 first of all, I mean, when yer lookin
015 ferah job is ta havah real good idea of
016 whuchew like to do ((omitted
017 approximately 10 lines of EE response))
018 um, (1.8) an:nah (1.3) pt >when yew, if
019 yew really do find a company thet yew
020 rilly wannah werk for, uh, persoo it, uh
021 very aggressively. dont just think becuz
022 yew sub- submitted a rezemey an an

023 they sent yew a rejekshun letter, thet
024 theyr not gonna hyer yew (.6) keep
025 tryin< becuz uh (1.6) cuz persistence
026 duz pays off. (2.6)

The preliminary in this case qualifies or prefaces a question. It should not be confused with a pre-sequence (Schegloff, 1988/89) described in conversation analysis studies. The talk, "if ahm presenting this interviewe to my,uh, komunikashuns thirty three 0 nine class. what kinduv advice could you give me thet I could give ta them (.9) in trying to find uh,a uh good pozishun for themself," is a question that the interviewer uses to request that the interviewee not only give information about finding a job, but is also a indication that this information be valuable to a group of people. The question fragment, "what kind of advice could you give me," is preceded by talk that specifies to whom the response should be directed. This preliminary is what Jucker (1986) identifies as a speech act required of the interviewee(p. 103).

Two examples of preliminaries in professional interviews follow below. The first example is of a professional asking an interviewee about the origination of the AIDS Memorial Quilt. The preliminary starts in line 001 and continues through line 013.

9. (MI:SM;12, TTU, 92)

001 ER: ·hh in Farebanks when the qwilt wuz here
002 ther were, oh, one thousand en thirtee
003 won: ·hh panels, um, an ther skwares >de
004 de de de< in which they were soed
005 together, ·hh it filled the karulson
006 senter which is thir[tee] five
007 EE: [hmm]
008 ER: thousand skware feet and the wa:lls
009 around the perimeter of the areena ·hh
010 in itz la:rjest form. when it will be,
011 layd out, I understand in the fall of
012 nineteen ninetee too. ·hh eh- it will be
013 layd in washington dee cee. ^whutz the
014 areeyuh, that it will fill. (.6)
015 EE: It will be: (.9) over, it'll be about
016 fifteen ti:mes whut wuz, displayed, he
017 here. (1.3) it will kuver (1.1) pt ye
018 know I dont have the egzact ·hh numbers
019 becuz theyr still coming in=
020 ER: =mm=
020 EE: =An the deadline izunt until ·hh a late
021 awgust. ·hh pt but we will kuver
022 >prabubly<
023 twentee akers of land in washington dee
024 cee, kuvering the nashunal mall, the
025 ellipse, the washington monyument
026 groundz. (1.0)

The question, "whutz the areeyuh, that it will fill," is preceded by a preliminary that functions as a history telling and what I call "a statement of apprising" the interviewee and possibly the radio audience. The statement of history, provides information about the quilt being in Fairbanks, about the number of panels, squares and space the

quilt covered in the center. The statement of appraisal is about the quilt being "laid out" in Washington, D.C.

The next example is of a professional interviewing a Supreme Court Justice. The preliminary starts in line 001 and ends in line 011.

11. (MI:DS;4, TTU, 93)
001 ER: When yewuh? joynded the kort, pt being
002 referred to along with Justis Burger as
003 wonuvtha Minnesota Twins? pt ·hhh and
004 yew were why:dlee expectid to vo\te ·hh
005 and think the way Justis Burger did. ·hh
006 and ^maybe forawyel or maybe peepel
007 didunt notis ·h maybe you ^were
008 sumwhat konservative. if I may say so:,
009 ^you, have, evol:vd, maybe the word is
010 machoored. an awfull lot since that
011 time, do you? fee:l, yerself? that you
012 huv changed? (1.1)
013 EE: ·hhh I dont think I've, I've changed. I
014 think: perhaps I have matoored an grown
015 an ·hhh after all when one is here, he
016 hastoo develop a konstitushunal
017 filawsuffee. ·hhh in the lower kortis I
018 think we have all kyndsuv non
019 konstitushunal isshevs >seh<
020 konstitushunal ones come along an we kun
021 always say those fellows down there in
022 Washington kan tayke karuv those things
023 ·hhh anduh I think as, as one devalops
024 his konstitushunal filawsuffee iteh his
025 approach to the fourth, fifth, sixth
026 amendments or >anything else that you
027 thinkov<ah, ·hh maybe this huz caused
028 the appearance of greater libralizm on
029 my part ·hh than before. (.)

The question, Do you feel that you have changed, is preceded by a preliminary that functions as a statement of history telling along with a statement of opinion telling. The statement of history is about the Justice first joining the Court and expectations for the Justice's voting patterns. The statement of opinion is about the Justice maturing over time. This opinion is indicated by the interviewer's comment, "if I may say so."

The noticeable difference in how novices and professionals use preliminaries is that professionals use preliminary statements to display the relevance of the next question to the previous interviewee response. The preliminary statements used by professionals are conjunctive because they act as a transition to the next question. They are also disjunctive because they don't contain words from the previous response. The following transcript is the same transcript above of a professional's use of a preliminary; however, this example includes the previous talk before the preliminary.

(MI:SM;11, TTU, 92)

001 ER: ·hhhh cleev,befor we leev tha mateeryul
002 >qwilt< and weil return to it in this
003 ower,but befor we leev it- to talk about
004 these other very important things .hhh
005 >eh< tell peepel about the panels, these

006 are about [the size]
007 EE: [mhem]
008 ER: uv a grave
009 EE: ·hhh yes, I wannid, when I^first startid
010 thinking about this, I wuz standingatthe
011 korner of kastro and market street in san
012 fransisco, which is the senter of the gay
013 commyoonity. ·hhh and I whennigh wuz thinking
014 about those first thousand peepel who had
015 dyed, I realized that the vast majority of
016 them hed lived and ^dyed ·hhh within a ten
017 block ^raydiyus of wher I wuz standing ·hhh
018 but ther wuz no evidens ·hh pt I wantid
019 evidens, an so I thought >well< each panel
020 shud be three feet by six feet, which is
021 approximutly the size uva grave, approximutly
022 >the< ·hh the amount of space ontha grou:nd
023 thadah body- wud ^okyoopie ·hh pt so each,
024 qwilt, panel, iz three feet by six feet ·hh
025 and haz the nayme uv won persun ·hhh ahh >wuh
026 eh< sumtimes peepel put more than won nayme
027 on, if ther wuzah kupel that dyed they'll put
028 the both naymes on, if ther were ·hh brutherz
029 er sisterz who dyed. ((omitted approximately
030 25 seconds of EE response)) that skware is the
031 basik bilding yoonit of the qwilt. ·hh pt and
032 those twelve by twelve skwares r then ·hh
033 hemmed with >hevee dutee kanvas< and
034 grommetted with metal i-lets pt so they ken be
035 linked together ·hh enabelling us to do a
036 display in- in any: ·h size venue we ken do it
037 inuh high skool jim, a church, synago:g uh ·hh
038 wherever, trayne stashuns: we do a big display
039 in the san fransisco airport evry joon ·hh
040 ER: ·hh in farebanks when the qwilt wuz here ther
041 were, oh, one thousand en thirtee won: ·hh
042 panels, um, an ther skwares >de de de de< in
043 which they were soed together, ·hh it filled
044 the karulson senter which is thir[tee] five
045 EE: [hmm]
046 ER: thousand skware feet and the wa:lls around the

047 perimeter of the areena ·hh in itz la:rjest
 048 form. when it will be, layd out, I understand
 049 in the fall of nineteen ninetee too. ·hh eh-
 050 it will be layd in washington dee cee. ^whutz
 051 the areeyuh, thet it will fill.
 052 EE: it will be: (.9) over, it'll be about fifteen
 053 ti:mes whut wuz, displayed, he here. (1.3) it
 054 will kuver (1.1) pt ye know I dont have the
 055 egzact ·hh numbers becuz theyr still coming
 056 in=
 057 ER: =mm=
 058 EE: =an the deadline izunt until ·hh a late
 059 awgust. ·hh pt but we will kuver >prabubly<
 060 twentee akers of land in washington dee cee,
 061 kuvering the nashunal mall, the ellipse, the
 062 washington monyument groundz. (1.0)
 063 ER: ·hh >eh em< becuz peepel in r awdiyens may
 064 want to know, they ken still make a ^panel
 065 before that >eh eh< ^time and send it to thuh
 066 naymes prajekt in ^san fransisco?

In the example above, the interviewee is apparently discussing the topic of building the quilt starting with line 032. The interviewee discusses the size of the panels, and the convenience of linking eyelet, so the quilt can be displayed in any size area. The interviewer changes the topic of quilts from building, to size of quilt in line 040. The preliminary builds a tie to the next question, instead of supplementing what the interviewee has said. The preliminary used in the example above does not have any obvious features of the previous response by the interviewee.

Preliminary statements often fail to follow-up what the interviewee has said to any degree. Professionals announce the relevance of the question they intend to ask. In order to establish coherence, professionals use preliminary statements.

Conclusion

This study explored professional and novice interviewers' questions because questions are the primary means of eliciting information during the interview (Barone & Switzer, 1996; Stewart & Cash, 1994; Dillard & Reilly, 1988). However, this study reveals that interviewers use supplemental questions, third-turn receipts and preliminary statements to elicit information during the interview. The extant interviewing literature is not grounded in empirical research, however, recent studies in broadcast and fact-finding interviews have introduces new descriptions of interviewer activities. This study was designed to provide a better understanding of questioning in interviews and to explore how professionals and novices conform to textbook prescriptions and guidelines stemming from interviewing literature. Additionally, this study sought to describe the

differences between the questioning techniques of professional and novices.

This study reveals that professionals are more likely to violate interviewing prescriptions than novice interviewers. Although the majority of professionals' questions do conform with prescriptions, a sizable number of their questions are problematic. Professionals were more likely to ask leading questions and long questions than novices.

Overall, novice interviewers questions were in conformity with interviewing prescriptions. I found that professional interviewers were more likely to ask preliminaries and candidate answers than novice interviewers, and novice interviewers asked more supplemental questions and third-turn receipts. The most dramatic difference was that professionals use preliminaries, whereas novices use third-turn receipts.

A closer look at the supplemental questions used by both professionals and novices revealed that interviewers use supplemental questions to project a topical line of the preceding response and the supplemental question deals with some aspect of the response. Often the words used by the interviewee in the response are repeated by the interviewer

in the supplemental question. Also, professional interviewers displayed reminder tokens to help prepare the interviewee for the question about to be asked by the interviewer. The reminder token also helps orient the interviewee to what was previously said and affirms the continuation of a topic. Another difference in the professionals' use of supplemental questions is that they follow the reminder token with a statement, not a question. The statement provides specific information which the interviewer is seeking.

Although third-turn receipts are found in both novice and professional interviewers, novice interviewers used third-turn receipts forty-two percent more than professional interviewers. This is interesting because the use of third-turn receipts during an interview are characteristic of ordinary conversation. I suspect that the editing process in the professional interviews may eliminate at least some third-turn receipts that occur. However, it could be that, over time, professionals have learned to eliminate receipts because they know they would be edited out later.

Preliminaries used by professionals and novices in the interviews were similar. The novice interviewers did not use preliminaries very often but, when they did, the

preliminary provided an opinion or identified the desired response from the interviewee. In contrast, use of preliminaries by professionals often functioned as a statement of appraisal and/or history telling.

These findings have implications for interviewing textbooks and instructors of interviewing. If interviewing prescriptions are valid, professional interviewers would abide by them more consistently than novices. However, this is not the case. The professionals were more likely to violate the recommendations made in textbooks on interviewing. Professionals asked long questions, even though textbooks recommend against them. Professionals also failed to ask many secondary questions, even though the use of secondary or probing questions is recommended for eliciting additional information (Barone & Switzer, 1995).

Many students seeking employment as professional interviewers rely on interviewing textbooks. Textbooks should be expanded to include the characteristics of both professional and novice interviewers. Contrary to textbook prescriptions, this study suggest that professional interviewers use long questions. Textbooks suggest that long questions confuse the interviewee. Long questions in this study are preliminary questions designed to apprise the

interviewee and supplemental questions designed to help the interviewee respond.

The interviewing literature suggests that interviewers should try to create a comfortable environment, treat the interviewee as a person and explore potential dialogue (Killenberg & Anderson, 1976). However, the literature fails to tell us how to accomplish this. This study suggests that interviewers already know how to create a comfortable atmosphere and explore dialogue during an interview, using supplemental questions, preliminary questions and third-turn receipts. Until these characteristics are included in textbooks, instructors will need to supplement textbooks with information about responsiveness during the interview. If the interviewer wants to be responsive to the interviewee, the interviewer should use preliminary statements, supplemental questions and third turn receipts.

Interviewers should use preliminary statements. Preliminary statements are used by the interviewer to display the relevance of the next question. Preliminary statements act as transitions to the next question. This techniques proved very useful for enhancing conversation between interviewer and interviewee. Interviewers should ask

supplemental questions. Since the supplemental questions deal with some aspect of the interviewees response, the use of supplemental questions help project a topical line of conversation during the interview. Also, supplemental questions should contain reminder tokens to help orient the interviewer to what was previously said and help keep the interview conversational. Interviewers should also use third-turn receipts. Third-turn receipts closely resemble ordinary conversation. Third-turn receipts are used to check accuracy and acknowledge what has been said.

This study is significant for those interested in the relationship between interpersonal communication and interviewing. There is more to interviewing than asking questions (Moris & Bruder, 1995). Textbooks have overlooked two important suggestions provided in descriptive research. We know that in interviewing, utterances do not need to be in interrogative form to be considered a question (Harris, 1991). Interviewer utterances are sometimes third-turn receipts and supplemental questions that interviewees respond to by providing additional information. We also know that professional interviewers make preliminary statements which serve as questions during the interview because they require an answer or acknowledgment from the

interviewee. However, the textbooks do not explain or recommend this questioning strategy, nor have researchers looked at this relationship. Scholars of interviewing should first acknowledge that both professional and novice interviewers are skilled speakers. Second, they should focus on the interaction as it is contributed to by both parties and report their techniques for interaction using conversation analysis. Only then can we know how interviewers collaborate with interviewees to accomplish the relationship between interpersonal communication and interviewing.

This study is significant for those researchers who provide prescriptions for interviewing, saying that interviewing takes place when two people engage in conversation (Hays & Mandel, 1970). They say that novice interviewers are insensitive to basic concepts of interpersonal communication, and that they do not understand how to treat the interview as a conversation--as "people talking with people" (Killenberg & Anderson, 1976, p. 17). They recommend treating the interviewee as a person, not an object. After reading available texts and research about interviewing, one may ask, "How do interviewer questions involve the interviewee in a dialogue, rather than a

monologue?" This study shows that novice interviewers' use of third-turn receipts during the interview displays characteristics of ordinary conversation. In fact, novice interviewers often seem to do a much better job of having a conversation with the interviewee than the professional interviewers. Professionals follow the question/answer, turn-taking protocol of interviewing more closely. Very seldom do professionals use third-turn receipts. This information was not available until now because most researchers were not focusing on the novice interviewer in naturalistic settings.

Zuckerman (1972) alluded to the "best" question an interviewer could ask (p. 170). The best question requires two techniques. First, the question should be preceded by "bridging remarks," and second, conversational "links" should be given between apparently discontinuous parts of the conversation (Zuckerman, 1972, p. 170). This study revealed three important ways interviewers can accomplish this bridging function: supplemental questions, receipts and preliminaries.

We are already familiar with questioning as a way to gather information. What we have not before understood is how interviewers converse in the interpersonal relationship

that exists between interviewer and interviewee. This study points to elements of the interviewing process that need further investigation and refinement. In the future more research should be done to help articulate how preliminaries serve as bridging remarks and how third-turn receipts provide conversational links in an interview. In addition, the discoveries about professional interviewer questioning and responses can help students become masterful interviewers. Such research may be challenging but the results will be compelling and useful.

REFERENCES

- Adams, K. L. (1981). Questions and answers adjacency pair in a performance appraisal interview. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 9, 72-84.
- Allwinn, S. (1991). Seeking information: Contextual influences on question formulation. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 10, 169-183.
- Arvey, R., & Campion, J. (1984). Person perception in the employment interview. In M. Cook (ed.), Issues in person perception. London: Methuen.
- Axelrod, M., & Cannell, C. F. (1959). A research note on an attempt to predict interviewer effectiveness. Public Opinion Quarterly, 23, 571-576.
- Barone, J. T. & Switzer, J. Y. (1995). Interviewing art and skill. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bell, E. P. (1925). The interview. Journalism Bulletin, 1, 13-18.
- Benjamin, A. (1981). The helping interview. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Biagi, S. (1992). Interviews that work. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Bolinger, D. (1978). Yes-no questions are not alternative questions. In H. Hiz (Ed.), Questions (pp. 87-105). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: D. Reidel.
- Brady, J. (1977). The television news interview. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bull, P. (1994). On identifying questions, replies, and non-replies in political interviews. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 13, 115-131.
- Button, G. (1987b). Answers as interactional products: Two sequential practices used in interviews. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50, 160-71.

- Button, G. & Casey, N. (1984). Generating topic: The use of topic initial elicitors. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures of Social Action: Studies in conversation analysis (pp. 167-90). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, J. (1993). The interview: Giving to get. Folio, 22, 31-32.
- Cannell, C. F. (1975). A technique for evaluating interviewer performance. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Cantril, H. (1940). Experiments in the wording of questions. Public Opinion Quarterly, 4, 330-332.
- Caplow, T. (1956). The dynamics of information interviewing. American Journal of Sociology, 62, 165-171.
- Carey, G., & Hawkes, C. (1994). Research. Good questions. Nursing Times, 90, 40.
- Churchill, L. (1978). Questioning strategies in sociolinguistics. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Clayman, S. & Whalen, J. (1988/9). When the medium becomes the message: The case of the Rather-Bush encounter. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 22, 241-72.
- Collard, A. F. (1975). Sharpening interviewing skills. Journal of Systems Management, 26, 6-10.
- Dana, N. F., Dana, T. M., Kelsay, K. L., Thomas, D., & Tippins, D. J. (1992). Qualitative interviewing and the art of questioning: Promises, possibilities, problems, and pitfalls. Paper presented at the Qualitative Research in education Conference, Athens, Georgia.
- Dillard, J. M. & Reilly, R. R. (1988). Systematic interviewing: Communication skills for professional effectiveness. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing.
- Dillon, J. T. (1982). The multidisciplinary study of questioning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 147-165.

- Dohrenwend, B. S. (1965). Some effects of open and closed questions on the respondents answers. Human Organization, 24, 175-184.
- Dohrenwend, B. S., & Richardson, S. A. (1964). A use for leading questions in research interviewing. Human Organization, 23, 76-77.
- Donaghy, W. C. (1984). The interview: Skills and applications. Salem, WI: Sheffield Publishing.
- Downs, C. W. (1972). A content analysis of twenty selection interviews. Personnel Administration and Public Personnel Review, 25.
- Downs, H. & Wallace, M. (1965). The craft of interviewing. Television Quarterly, 4-10.
- Foddy, W. H. (1994). Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: Theory and practice in social research. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gallup, G. (1947). The quintamensional plan of question design. Public Opinion Quarterly, 11, 385.
- Gildersleeve, T. R. (1976). Conducting better interviews. Journal of Systems Management, 27, 24-28.
- Gottlieb, M. R. (1986). Interview. White Plains, NY: Longman Inc.
- Greatbatch, D. (1986a). Aspects of topical organization in news interviews: The use of agenda shifting procedures by interviewees. Media, Culture and Society, 8, 441-55.
- Greatbatch, D. (1986b). Some standard uses of supplementary questions in news interviews. In J. Wilson, & B. Crow (Eds.), Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics, vol. VIII. (pp. 86-123). Jordanstown: University of Ulster.
- Guest, L. (1954). A new training method for opinion interviews. Public Opinion Quarterly, 18, 287-299.

- Harris, M. M. (1989). Reconsidering the employment interview: A review of recent literature and suggestions for future research. Personnel Psychology, 42, 691-725.
- Harris, S. (1986). Interviewers' questions in broadcast interviews. In J. Wilson & B. Crow (Eds.), Belfast working papers in language and linguistics, vol. VIII. (pp. 50-85). Jordanstown: University of Ulster.
- Hawes, L. C. (1972). The effects of interviewer style on patterns of dyadic communication. Communication Monographs, 39, 114-123.
- Hawes, L. C. & Foley, J. M. (1973). A Markov analysis of interview communication. Communication Monographs, 40, 208-219.
- Hays, E. R., & Mandel, J. E. (1970). Interviewing: A definition and description. Central States Speech Journal, 21, 126-129.
- Heritage, J. (1984b). A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of its sequential placement. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), Handbook of discourse analysis, vol. III: Discourse and dialogue (pp. 95-119). London: Academic Press.
- Heritage, J. & Greatbatch, D. (1991). On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (Eds.), Talk and social structure (pp. 93-137). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hopper, R. (1992). Telephone conversation. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1995). Meeting both ends. Between standardization and recipient design in telephone survey interviews. In P. ten Have and G. Psathas (Eds.), Situated Order: Studies in the Social organization of Talk and Embodied Activities. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- Hull, R. D. (1975). A semantics for superficial and embedded questions in natural language. In E. L. Keenan (Ed.), Formal semantics of natural language (pp. 35-45). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, C. M. (1994). Supportive communication in physician-patient interviews: The case of the missing assessment. Paper presented at Speech Communication Association Conference, New Orleans.
- Jones, S. E. (1969). Directivity vs. nondirectivity: Implications of the examination of witnesses in law of the fact-finding interview. The Journal of Communication, 19, 64-75.
- Jucker, J. (1986). News Interviews: A pragmalinguistic analysis. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Kearsley, G. P. (1976). Questions and question asking in verbal discourse: A cross-disciplinary review. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 5, 355-373.
- Killenberg, G. M. (1989). Before the story: Interviewing and communication skills for journalists. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Killenberg, G. M., & Anderson, R. (1976). Sources are persons: Teaching Interviewing as dialogue. Journalism Educator, 31, 16-20.
- Leeds, D. (1993). The art of asking questions. Training Development, 47, 57-58.
- Liden, R. C., Martin, C. L., & Parsons, C. K. (1993). Interviewer and applicant behaviors in employment interviews. Academy of Management Journal, 36, 372-386.
- Mandel, J. E. (1974). A strategy for selecting and phrasing questions in an interview. Journal of Business Communication, 12, 17-23.
- McClendon, M. J. (1994). William Foddy, constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: Theory and practice in Social Research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 58, 639.

- McLaughlin, P. (1990). How to interview: The art of the media interview. North Vancouver, B. C.: International Self-Counsel Press.
- Metzler, K. (1977). Creative interviewing: The writer's guide to gathering information by asking questions. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Morris, G. H., Bruder, K. W., & Poole, T. (1995). How interviewers grapple with answers to their questions: An analysis of third-turn receipts in fact-finding interviews. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference. Albuquerque, NM.
- Morris, G. H., Coursey, M. L., & Thach, E. C. (1987). Formulating understanding in fact-finding interviews. Communication Research Reports, 4, 65-70.
- Nofsinger, R. E. (1990). Everyday conversation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pain, S. L. (1950-51). Thoughts about meaningless questions. Public Opinion Quarterly, 14, 687-696.
- Payne, S. (1979). The art of asking questions. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Payne, S. L. (1949-40). Case study in questions complexity. Public Opinion Quarterly, 13, 653-658.
- Pomerantz, A. M. (1988). Offering a candidate answer: An information seeking strategy. Communication Monographs, 55, 360-373.
- Psathas, G. (1994). Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-Interaction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Richardson, S. A. (1960). The use of leading questions in nonscheduled interviews. Human Organization, 19, 86-89.
- Schegloff, E. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries: "Can I ask you a question?" In D. H. Zimmerman & C. West (Eds.), Language and Social Interaction. (pp. 104-52).

- Schegloff, E. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Analyzing Discourse, Text and Talk. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988/9). From interview to confrontation: Observations on the Bush/Rather encounter. Research on language and social interaction, 22, 215-240.
- Schiffrin, D. (1990). Conversation analysis. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 11, 3-16.
- Sheatsley, P. B. (1948). Closed questions are sometimes more valid than open end. Public Opinion Quarterly, 12, 12.
- Shuy, R. (1983). Three types of interference in an effective exchange of information in the medical interview. In S. Fisher & A. D. Todd (Eds.), The social organization of doctor-patient communication (pp. 189-202). Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Sincoff, M. Z. & Goyer, R. S. (1984). Interviewing. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Skopec, E. W. (1986). Situational interviewing. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stackpole, C., & Widgery, R. (1971). Interviewing as taught in American College and University Speech Departments. Communication Education, 20, 184-191.
- Stamberg, S. & Josephson, L. (1983). Interviewing. In L. Josephson. (Ed.), Telling the Story: The National Public Radio Guide to radio Journalism. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Stewart, C. J. & Cash, W. B. (1994). Interviewing: Principles and practices. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown Communications.
- Suchman, L. & Jordan, B. (1990). Interactional troubles in face-to-face survey interviews. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 85, 232-241.

- Tengler, C. D. & Jablin, F. M. (1983). Effects of question types, orientation, and sequencing in the employment screening interview. Communication Monograph, 50, 245-263.
- Threlfall, B. (1993). Your approach to interview questions. London: New Education.
- Uris, Auren. (1988). Mistakes interviewers make--and how to avoid them. New York: Amacom.
- Vinten, G. (1994). The art of asking questions. Management Decision, 32, 42-49.
- Williams, D. (1942). Basic instructions for interviewers. Public Opinion Quarterly, 6, 634-641.
- Wilson, G. L., and Goodall, H. L. (1991). Interviewing in context. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Zuckerman, H. (1972). Interviewing the ultra-elite. Public Opinion Quarterly, 36, 159-175.

PERMISSION TO COPY

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Texas Tech University or Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center, I agree that the Library and my major department shall make it freely available for research purposes. Permission to copy this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Director of the Library or my major professor. It is understood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my further written permission and that any user may be liable for copyright infringement.

Agree (Permission is granted.)

Shelma Poole

Student's Signature

5-7-96

Date

Disagree (Permission is not granted.)

Student's Signature

Date