

Running Head: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Open-Ended Survey Questions:

Non-Response Nightmare or Qualitative Data Dream?

Angie L. Miller

Amber D. Lambert

Indiana University

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to explore whether those with certain demographic and personal characteristics, including gender, age, cohort, number of children, marital status, citizenship, race, current employment status, income, and institutional satisfaction level, are more or less likely to respond to open-ended questions placed at the beginning, middle, and end of an online alumni survey. Using data from the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP), a series of chi-squared and means comparisons analyses were done to compare whether or not respondents provided an answer to three different open-ended questions throughout the survey. Findings suggest that there are some group differences in likelihood of response, which could be explained by time burden, negativity bias, and self-identification as “other.”

Open-Ended Survey Questions: Non-Response Nightmare or Qualitative Data Dream?

As budgets keep getting tighter at higher education institutions, colleges and universities are often required to show measures of their effectiveness (Kuh & Ewell, 2010). Since surveys are used in so many areas of higher education (Kuh & Ikenberry, 2009; Porter, 2004), alumni surveys have become an important tool utilized for program and institutional assessment. Unfortunately, alumni surveys often have lower response rates than other types of surveys because of bad contact information and other reasons such as suspicion of money solicitation or decreased loyalty after graduation (Smith & Bers, 1987). However, despite lower response rates alumni surveys can still provide rich information to institutions in the form of qualitative data derived from open-ended survey questions. Even with relatively few respondents, institutions may be able to glean information on important concerns of their respondents (Geer, 1991; Krosnick, 1999). For instance, faculty and administrators can learn about the usefulness of alumni degrees in their current work or detailed suggestions for improvements to curriculum, programming, or advising resources. They may also be able to improve alumni outreach and engagement.

A largely recognized disadvantage of open-ended questions is the heavy burden they place on respondents, and the concern that researchers will be unable to obtain adequate answers (Dillman, 2007). Another concern is that even when one has many open-ended responses at hand, how well do the responses represent the opinions of the entire sample? Are some types of respondents more likely than others to complete open-ended questions? If a survey has multiple open-ended questions, does the placement of these questions throughout the survey have an impact on whether people respond? Previous research has shown that some personal characteristics, such as language fluency and positive affect (Wallis, 2012), can increase

likelihood of responding to open-ended questions. The purpose of this study is to explore whether those with certain demographic and personal characteristics, including gender, age, cohort, number of children, marital status, citizenship, race, current employment status, income, and institutional satisfaction level, are more or less likely to respond to open-ended questions placed at the beginning, middle, and end of an online alumni survey.

Method

Participants

The data used for this study was from the 2011 administration of the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP). SNAAP is a multi-institution online alumni survey designed to obtain knowledge of arts education. The participants were 33,801 alumni from 57 different arts high schools, undergraduate, and graduate colleges or arts programs within larger universities. All alumni from each program or institution were invited to participate. Of those who participated, 2,606 were high school level alumni (8%), 23,607 undergraduate level alumni (70%), and 7,588 graduate level alumni (22%). Of these alumni, 38% were male, 62% female, and 0.2% transgender. The majority of alumni (87%) reported their ethnicity as Caucasian. The average institutional response rate was 21%. For the purposes of this analysis, only those who completed the entire survey (did not drop out before making it to the end of the survey) were included to compare across question placement throughout the survey, which lowered the eligible number to 27,212. The characteristics of these respondents remained consistent with the entire sample.

Materials

The measures were questions included in a larger survey administered to participants online. Participants were emailed an invitation including a link to the survey. Participants could

log in multiple times, so they were not constrained to complete all questions during a single setting. Participants were not required to answer any of the items; therefore, they could advance through the survey even if they did not respond to individual items throughout the instrument.

The open-ended questions included in the analysis were three different items, selected due to their placement on the survey instrument. It should be noted that SNAAP contains 11 different open-ended items throughout the entire survey. One item was selected from near the beginning of the survey (appears as the 17th of 82 total questions), one from the middle (appears as the 44th of 82), and one from near the end (appears as the 80th of 82). The item from the near-beginning asked respondents if there was anything their institution could have done better to prepare them for further education or career, the middle item asked them to describe how their arts training is or is not relevant to their current work, and the near-end item asked them to describe any additional information about their education, life, and/or career that were not adequately covered on the survey. From each of these questions, a binary variable was created based on whether or not the respondent provided an answer.

The demographic and personal variables included: gender, age group, graduation cohort, number of children, marital status, citizenship, race/ethnicity, current employment status, income, and institutional satisfaction level. Citizenship (i.e. whether or not respondent was a U.S. citizen) was a binary variable. Age, graduation cohort, and number of children were ordinal variables that contained recoded group ranges. Race/ethnicity was a “check all that apply” question, and therefore was made up of seven binary race/ethnic variables. Gender, marital status, and current employment status were categorical variables, made up of three, four, and seven response options, respectively. Income was an ordinal measure, using midpoints of

ranges; institutional satisfaction was also ordinal, using a four-point scale from “Poor” to “Excellent.” For a complete list of items and response options, see Table 1.

Analyses

A series of fourteen chi-squared analyses was done for each of the three open-ended question binary variables. The chi-squared analyses were run for gender, age group, graduation cohort, number of children, marital status, citizenship, each race/ethnicity option, and current employment status. Three independent samples t-tests were completed for institutional satisfaction and each of the open-ended questions. Three non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests were completed for each of the comparisons of income, as this variable used midpoints for recoding and the skewed variance violated the parametric assumptions of the independent samples t-test.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

In looking at the percentages of responses for the open-ended questions, there are much higher percentages of responses for the near-beginning and middle questions than for the near-end item, keeping in mind that only those who reached the end of the survey are included in this analysis. For the near beginning question, 68% of respondents provided an answer. For the middle question, 79% of respondents provided an answer. For the near-end question, 24% of respondents provided an answer.

Chi-Squared Analyses

When looking at comparisons based on gender, the results indicated that females were significantly more likely to answer the near-beginning and middle questions, but for the near-end question there were no significant differences (see Table 2 for χ^2 values). For age, those groups

over 50 were significantly more likely than their younger counterparts to answer all three questions. For graduation cohort, a similar pattern occurs, with those graduating in or before the year 1990 being significantly more likely to answer all three questions. Furthermore, for marital status, those who are single were significantly less likely to answer all items, which assuming that many of those who are single are younger could be a function of age as well. For number of children, those with no children under 18 dependent on them for support were more likely to answer all three questions. Looking at current employment status, those who were unemployed and looking for work, retired, or selected “other” (and had the opportunity to supply an answer in a corresponding “other” text box) were more likely to answer all three open-ended items. Those who reported they were U.S. citizens when attending their institutions were also more likely to answer all three questions.

Some different patterns occur when looking at the binary race variables.

White/Caucasian individuals were more likely to answer the middle item, while Black individuals were more likely to answer the near-beginning item. Furthermore, American Indians were more likely to answer the near-beginning and near-end items, but not the middle item. Asian individuals were consistently less likely to answer all three items, while interestingly those who selected the “other” race response option (some of whom also wrote in the “other” text box) were consistently more likely to answer all three items. No significant differences were found for Hispanic or Native Hawaiian respondents.

Means and Other Ordinal Comparisons

The results of the independent samples t-tests showed that those who answered the near-beginning and near-end questions were significantly less satisfied with their overall institutional experience (Table 3 for test statistics). In looking at income (recoded into midpoints of ranges),

the Mann-Whitney U test indicated that those who answered the open-ended questions had a significantly lower income than those who did not, which was consistent across all three questions (Table 4 for test statistics).

Discussion

There are several potential explanations for the various patterns found in the results, many of which support previous research and survey methodology knowledge. The finding that U.S. citizens were more likely than non-citizens to respond to the open-ended questions is expected, given the past research showing those with greater English language fluency feel more comfortable responding to questions that require language production, as opposed to language recognition (Wallis, 2012). Furthermore, as completing open-ended response options requires a greater amount of time and mental effort than most close-ended questions (Dillman, 2007), it is not surprising that those with no dependents are more likely to provide open-ended responses. This makes sense as well for those who are unemployed or retired, as they have more flexibility for their time. This greater proportion of free time may also partially explain why older participants, and those from older graduation cohorts, were also more likely to respond to all three open-ended items, and why single participants (who are generally younger) are less likely to provide open-ended responses. Time burden falls more heavily on certain groups than others, and this applies to open-ended questions consistently.

Another explanation for the patterns of results may be that those with negative feelings are more likely to voice their opinions as comments in the open-ended items, using them as a platform for their complaints. This negativity bias has been found in research with workplace environments (Poncheri, Lindberg, Thompson, & Surface, 2008), and may explain why those who are unemployed and looking for work are more likely to respond. These alumni in

particular might be frustrated with their situation, and feel that their institution, who provided them with their degree, should shoulder some of the responsibility. Additionally, it clarifies the pattern of results from the analyses using income and institutional satisfaction. Those who provided open-ended responses had significantly lower levels of income, and were significantly less satisfied with their institutional experience, compared to those who left the questions blank. It seems that the disgruntled alumni are more willing to spend the time and effort to provide a response to the open-ended questions.

A third and quite interesting pattern was found concerning the use of the “other” response option. For both current employment status and race/ethnicity, those individuals who prefer to describe themselves as “other” are also more likely to respond to open-ended questions throughout the survey. A cursory review of the open-text boxes that accompany the “other” employment and race options shows a considerable number of responses that actually do fall into one of the categorizations, but the respondents choose to further explicate on themselves. For instance, some respondents answered “16 hours employed; 25+ hours self-employed” and “freelance 40 or more hours per week” when these responses are really more appropriate for the “Full-time (35 hours or more per week)” response option. Similarly, some respondents reported their “other” race as things like “Caucasian/American Indian,” even though the race/ethnicity question was in a check-all-that-apply format and one could have simply checked both of these response options. It seems that those respondents choosing to identify themselves as an “other,” thinking of themselves as a unique individual, are more likely to provide responses to open-ended questions. Perhaps they are simply more verbose, or they have a disposition that resists the confinement of categorization.

Limitations

Although there are several strengths of this study, some limitations should be noted. Given the data collection procedures and response rates, the sample may not be representative of all arts alumni, or alumni in general, and caution should be made when making generalizations. Furthermore, this study relied on self-reported data, which may not always be completely objective. However, most studies looking at self-reports in higher education suggest that self-reports and actual abilities are positively related (Anaya, 1999; Hayek, Carini, O'Day, & Kuh, 2002; Laing, Sawyer, & Noble, 1988; Pace, 1985; Pike, 1995), and this is generally not a concern for the reporting of demographic variables.

Conclusions

The findings suggest that while a great deal of information can be gained from open-ended survey questions, some groups are more likely than others to provide responses, and this should be kept in mind when interpreting one's qualitative survey results. More research is needed to explore the patterns of results concerning the influence of placement on particular groups, as well personal and environmental influences contributing to the "other" survey response style.

References

- Anaya, G. (1999). College impact on student learning: Comparing the use of self-reported gains, standardized test scores, and college grades. *Research in Higher Education, 40*, 499-526.
- Dillman, D. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method (2nd ed.)*. New York: Wiley.
- Geer, J.G. (1991). Do open-ended questions measure “salient” issues? *Public Opinion Quarterly, 55*, 360-370.
- Hayek, J. C., Carini, R. M., O’Day, P. T., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Triumph or tragedy: Comparing student engagement levels of members of Greek-letter organizations and other students. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(5), 643-663.
- Kuh, G. D. & Ewell, P. T. (2010). The state of learning outcomes assessment in the United States. *Higher Education Management and Policy, 22*(1), 1-20.
- Kuh, G. D. & Ikenberry, S. O. (2009). *More than you think, less than we need: Learning outcomes assessment in American higher education*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute of Learning Outcomes Assessment.
- Krosnick, J. (1999). Survey research. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 537-567.
- Laing, J., Swayer, R., & Noble, J. (1989). Accuracy of self-reported activities and accomplishments of college-bound seniors. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*(4), 362-368.
- Pace, C. R. (1985). *The credibility of student self-reports*. Los Angeles: The Center for the Study of Evaluation, Graduate School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles.

- Pike, G. R. (1995). The relationship between self-reports of college experiences and achievement test scores. *Research in Higher Education, 36*(1), 1-22.
- Poncheri, R.M., Lindberg, J.T., Thompon, L.F., & Surface, E.A. (2008). A comment on employee surveys: Negativity bias in open-ended responses. *Organization Research Methods, 11*(3), 614-630. doi: 10.1177/1094428106295504
- Porter, S.R. (2004). Raising response rates: What works? *New Directions for Institutional Research, 121*, 5-21.
- Smith, K., & Bers, T. (1987). Improving alumni survey response rates: An experiment and cost-benefit analysis. *Research in Higher Education, 27*(3), 218-225.
- Wallis, P. (2012, April). *Profiling college students who skip open-ended items win questionnaires with varied item formats*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Table 1. *List of Variables from SNAAP Survey Instrument Used in Analyses*

Item #	Variable	Question Text	Response Values and Labels
9	instexp	Now, back to your time at [INSTITUTION]. Overall, how would you rate your experience at [INSTITUTION] while pursuing your [HIGH SCHOOL / UNDERGRADUATE / GRADUATE] degree?	1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent
17	edpreptxt	Is there anything that [INSTITUTION] could have done better to prepare you for further education or for your career? Please describe.	Text box
42	curemp	What is your current employment status?	1 = Full-time (35 hours or more per week) 2 = Part-time only (fewer than 35 hours per week) 3 = Unemployed and looking for work 4 = In school full time 5 = Caring for family full time 6 = Retired 7 = Other
	curempothtxt	Write in value: Other employment status	Text box
44	wktraintxt	Please describe how your arts training is or is not relevant to your current work.	Text box
59	income	What was your <i>individual</i> annual income in 2010? (Do not include spousal income or interest on jointly-owned assets.)	1 = \$10,000 or less 2 = \$10,001 to \$20,000 3 = \$20,001 to \$30,000 4 = \$30,001 to \$40,000 5 = \$40,001 to \$50,000 6 = \$50,001 to \$60,000 7 = \$60,001 to \$70,000 8 = \$70,001 to \$80,000 9 = \$80,001 to \$90,000 10 = \$90,001 \$100,000 11 = \$100,001 to \$150,000 12 = More than \$150,000 13 = I prefer not to answer
*	income_R	Recoded from question 59 to remove 13 values and use midpoints of range as value: What was your <i>individual</i> annual income in 2010? (Do not include spousal income or interest on jointly-owned assets.)	Number box
68	gender	What is your gender?	1 = Male 2 = Female 3 = Transgender

Table 1. (Continued) *List of Variables from SNAAP Survey Instrument Used in Analyses*

Item #	Variable	Question Text	Response Values and Labels
69	age	What is your age? In years:	Number box (no decimals)
*	age_R	Recoded from question 69 to put in ranges: What is your age?	1 = 24 or younger 2 = 25 to 29 3 = 30 to 39 4 = 40 to 49 5 = 50 to 59 6 = 60 or older
72	marital	What is your marital status?	1 = Single (never married) 2 = Married or domestic partner 3 = Divorced/separated 4 = Widowed
73	dependent	How many children (under 18) live with you or are dependent on your income for support? Enter total number:	Number box (no decimals)
*	children	Recoded from question 73 to put in ranges: How many children (under 18) who live with you or are dependent on your income for support?	0 = No dependents 1 = 1 2 = 2 3 = 3 or more
74:		What is your race/ethnicity? Check all that apply.	
74.1	race_white	White or Caucasian	
74.2	race_blck	Black or African American	
74.3	race_hisp	Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	
74.4	race_amerind	American Indian or Alaska Native	
74.5	race_haw	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	
74.6	race_asian	Asian	
74.7	race_oth	Other	
	race_othtxt	Write in value: Other race/ethnicity	Text box
75	citizen	While enrolled at [INSTITUTION] were you a U.S. citizen?	0 = No 1 = Yes
80	finalcomments	If there are additional things you would like to tell us about your education, life, and/or career that were not adequately covered on the survey, please do so here. (Please note that you also have a chance to make comments to SNAAP about the questionnaire and the project below.)	Text box
*	Cohort	Last year attended reported by school in alumni file	Number box
*	Cohort_R	Recode of cohort: Last year attended in ranges	1 = 1980 and before 2 = 1981-1990 3 = 1991-1995 4 = 1996-2000 5 = 2001-2005 6 = 2006-2010

Table 2. *Chi-Squared Values and Response Patterns*

	Near-Beginning Item		Middle Item		Near-End Item	
	χ^2 value	Likely to Respond?	χ^2 value	Likely to Respond?	χ^2 value	Likely to Respond?
Gender	16.29***	Females more likely	50.57***	Females more likely	0.02	
Age Group	145.54***	Over 50 more likely	191.26***	Over 50 more likely	355.54***	Over 50 more likely
Graduation Cohort	159.22***	1990 and before more likely	177.45***	1990 and before more likely	258.08***	1990 and before more likely
Number of Dependents	48.01***	No dependents more likely	19.74***	No dependents more likely	34.87***	No dependents more likely
Marital Status	26.63***	Singles less likely	35.11***	Singles less likely	35.96***	Singles less likely
U.S. Citizenship	10.58**	Citizens more likely	65.48***	Citizens more likely	20.94***	Citizens more likely
Race (White)	1.82		11.09**	Whites more likely	2.71	
Race (Black)	13.51***	Blacks more likely	2.11		0.08	
Race (American Indian)	4.69*	American Indians more likely	0.90		6.01*	American Indians more likely
Race (Asian)	49.74***	Asians less likely	55.53***	Asians less likely	32.59***	Asians less likely
Race (Other)	55.53***	“Others” more likely	10.833**	“Others” more likely	59.47***	“Others” more likely
Current Employment Status	256.42***	Unemployed, retired, and “other” more likely	268.34***	Unemployed, retired, and “other” more likely	375.31***	Unemployed, retired, and “other” more likely

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3.

Group Means Comparisons for Institutional Satisfaction

	Answered Question? (Group Mean)	Answered Question? (Group Mean)	<i>t</i> value	df	Sig.	Effect Size (d)
	No	Yes				
Near-Beginning Item	3.57	3.40	20.33	19914.16	***	.26
Middle Item	3.44	3.45	-.907	27082		.01
Near-End Item	3.46	3.42	4.20	9767.14	***	.06

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4.

Group Mean Rank Comparisons for Income

	Answered Question? (Mean Rank)	Answered Question? (Mean Rank)	Mann-Whitney <i>U</i> value	Sig.
	No	Yes		
Near-Beginning Item	13860.60	13173.39	74282028.0	***
Middle Item	12056.14	11307.10	54347479.5	***
Near-End Item	12099.86	11409.52	40097544.5	***

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$