

# Mismatching Middle Options: Consequences for Attitude Measurement in Smartphone Surveys

Jan Karem Höhne

*University of Mannheim (Germany)*

*Universitat Pompeu Fabra (Spain)*

Dagmar Krebs

*University of Gießen (Germany)*

## Abstract

Measuring respondents' attitudes is a crucial task in numerous social science disciplines. A popular way to measure attitudes is to use survey questions with rating scales. However, research has shown, that especially the design of rating scales can have a profound impact on respondents' answer behavior. While some scale design aspects, such as scale length and direction, are frequently addressed, some other scale design aspects, such as scale midpoint and polarity, are less frequently addressed. In this study, we therefore investigate the effects of mismatches between scale midpoints and scale polarity – i.e., unipolar “moderately” vs. bipolar “partly/partly” middle options in unipolar scales – on respondents' answer behavior. We conducted an experiment in a smartphone survey (N = 1,641) and randomly assigned respondents to one of two scale conditions (match vs. mismatch). The results reveal that mismatches between scale midpoints and scale polarity slightly affect respondents' answer behavior. More specifically, mismatches cause significant shifts in latent means. Thus, mismatches pose a threat to attitude measurement.

*Keywords: Answer behavior, Field experiment, Latent mean differences, Measurement invariance, Rating scale*

## Introduction

The measurement of attitudes is an important task in social science research to explore and explain social phenomena. To measure attitudes of respondents, researchers typically use rating scales (i.e., closed answer formats with a list of ordered options). When designing such scales researchers must make design decisions because they can influence respondents' answer behavior (see DeCastellarnau, 2018). For instance, researchers must decide whether to have a scale midpoint (i.e., an even or uneven number of scale points). Further scale characteristics that must be decided include the lengths of the scale (i.e., the number of scale points), the polarity of the scale (i.e., unipolar or bipolar), the verbalization of the scale (e.g., completely or end verbalized), the inclusion of numeric values (i.e., whether numbers accompany the scale points or not), the direction of the scale (i.e., decremental or incremental), and the alignment of the scale (i.e., horizontal or vertical). In completely verbalized scales, the aspects of a scale

---

This document is a preprint and thus it may differ from the final version: Höhne, Jan K., & Krebs, Dagmar (2021). Mismatching middle options: Consequences for attitude measurement in smartphone surveys. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 24, 381-386. DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2020.1803621.

midpoint (or middle option) and scale polarity frequently conflict with each other. The reason is that scale midpoints do not match the polarity of the scales (Menold, 2019).

For instance, the English source questionnaire of the interviewer-administered International Social Survey Program (ISSP; 2012) uses survey questions on gender roles with a completely labeled bipolar agreement/disagreement scale. The German version, however, employs comparable survey questions on gender roles with a unipolar agreement scale that contains a bipolar “neither/nor” instead of a unipolar “moderate” middle option (see also Scholz & Jutz, 2014). Conceptionally, the “neither/nor” middle option does not match the unipolar scale. As shown by Höhne, Krebs, and Kühnel (2020), slightly differently labeled scales can have an impact on observational and latent answer distributions, affecting measurement properties (i.e., equidistance between scale points).

While unipolar midpoints (usually) suggest a moderate level of agreement, bipolar midpoints can have different meanings, depending on their formulation (see Menold, 2019; Wang & Krosnick, 2019). They can be conceived as indicating indifference or ambivalence (Menold, 2019; O’Muirheartaigh, Gaskell, & Wright, 1995; Schaeffer & Presser, 2003). Indifference implies that respondents have either a neutral or no position at all towards the object under investigation (Menold, 2019; Sturgis, Roberts, & Smith, 2014). This applies when using middle options that consist of “neither/nor” formulations. In contrast, ambivalence implies that respondents have positive and negative feelings preventing them from having a clear attitude towards the object under investigation (Menold, 2019; Schaeffer & Presser, 2003). This applies when using middle options that consist of “partly/partly” formulations. These (linguistic/logical) differences between middle options have the potential to change the evaluative scale character (Höhne et al., 2020). Particularly, if middle options mismatch scale polarity.

In contrast to other scale design aspects, such as the number of scale points and scale direction, research on the impact of the middle option on answer behavior and data quality is scarce. Menold (2019) conducted one notable study. In a web survey experiment (PC only), the author compared unipolar agreement scales with bipolar agreement/disagreement scales and systematically mismatched the respective middle options. The author shows that reliability decreases when the middle options do not match scale polarity. However, so far, there is still little known about the consequences for attitude measurement when mismatching middle options and scale polarity. In this study, we therefore attempt to fill this knowledge gap and address the following research question: How does the mismatch of a middle option in a unipolar scale affect respondents’ answer behavior in terms of observational and latent answer distributions?

Unlike previous studies, we extend the current state of research by focusing on smartphone surveys. The reasons for this design decision are twofold: first, there is (almost) no research looking at the effects of middle options and scale polarity on respondents’ answer behavior in smartphone surveys. Second, in recent years, the number of smartphone surveys has increased tremendously.

## **Method**

### ***Data Source***

Data collection was conducted by the survey company ResponDi (Germany) in July and August 2019. The company invited respondents varying in age from 18 to 70 years by email. The email included an invitation to participate in a smartphone survey and a URL link that directed respondents to the survey. Once there, an introductory page described the survey topic and procedure and informed respondents that their data would be treated confidentially. Respondents who tried to enter the survey with a non-smartphone device were blocked and asked to use a smartphone for survey completion. We also collected user-agent-strings informing about device characteristics, such as device type and operating system. For this purpose, we used the open-source tool “Embedded Client Side Paradata (ECSP)” developed by Schlosser and Höhne (2018, 2020).

In case of participation, respondents received an incentive from the survey company. The compensation was proportional to the length of the entire survey.

### ***Sample***

A total of 1,726 respondents started the smartphone survey, which took about 20 minutes. Some respondents were excluded from the study ( $n = 85$ ) because they only visited the title page of the web survey or they dropped out before being asked any experimental questions. This leaves us with  $n = 1,641$  respondents for statistical analyses. These respondents had a mean age of 43.3 ( $SD = 15.0$ ), and 62.7% of them were female. In terms of education, 9.0% graduated from a lower secondary school, 37.2% from an intermediate secondary school, and 53.0% from a college preparatory secondary school or university. Another 0.8% still attended school, left school without a degree, or had a different degree than mentioned above.

### ***Experimental Design***

Respondents were randomly assigned to a scale condition. The first group ( $n = 834$ ) received a unipolar agreement scale with a matching middle option (match condition; “agree moderately”). The second group ( $n = 807$ ) received a unipolar agreement scale with a mismatching middle option (mismatch condition; “partly/partly”).

To evaluate the sample composition between the groups, we conducted chi-square tests. The results showed no significant differences regarding age, gender, and education.

### ***Survey Questions***

The five questions used were adopted from those used in the Cross Cultural Survey for Work and Gender Attitudes (2010). They dealt with achievement motivation and were presented with a single presentation approach (i.e., one question per web survey page). The questions were asked with five-point, vertically aligned agreement scales. All questions and answer options were in German (see Appendix for English translations). To improve survey completion and navigation, we used an optimized survey layout, avoiding horizontal scrolling.

## Results

### *Answer Distributions*

We tested whether scales with matching and mismatching middle options differ regarding answer distributions. For this purpose, we conducted chi-square tests for each of the five questions. We also tested the percentages of the two differing middle options for statistical differences. Table 1 displays the results.

The chi-square tests show no significant differences for four out of five questions. The only exception is the third question. For this question, the matching middle option (i.e., “agree moderately”) is selected significantly more often than its mismatching counterpart (i.e., “partly/partly”). Overall, these findings indicate that mismatches between the middle option and scale polarity pose a minor threat to respondents’ answer behavior.

Table 1. Answer distributions in percentages

|         | Question 1:<br>$\chi^2(4) = 3.35,$<br>$p = 0.50$ |              | Question 2:<br>$\chi^2(4) = 2.93,$<br>$p = 0.57$ |              | Question 3:<br>$\chi^2(4) = 15.98,$<br>$p < 0.01$ |              | Question 4:<br>$\chi^2(4) = 8.42,$<br>$p = 0.07$ |              | Question 5:<br>$\chi^2(4) = 2.00,$<br>$p = 0.74$ |              |
|---------|--|--------------|--|--------------|---|--------------|--|--------------|--|--------------|
| Options | Mat<br>ch  | Mismat<br>ch | Mat<br>ch  | Mismat<br>ch | Mat<br>ch   | Mismat<br>ch | Mat<br>ch  | Mismat<br>ch | Mat<br>ch  | Mismat<br>ch |
| 1       | 5  | 6            | 17   | 20           | 8   | 11           | 10   | 13           | 15   | 17           |
| 2       | 25   | 23           | 45   | 44           | 32  | 35           | 34   | 32           | 39   | 39           |
| 3       | 38   | 42           | 26   | 26           | <b>41</b>   | <b>36</b>    | 32   | 35           | 30   | 30           |
| 4       | 23   | 21           | 9  | 8            | 15  | 16           | 18   | 14           | 11   | 10           |
| 5       | 10   | 8            | 4  | 3            | 5   | 3            | 7  | 6            | 5  | 4            |

Note. Bold indicates significant differences between middle options ( $p < 0.05$ ). Due to rounding, the percentages may not add up to 100%. Verbal labels of the match condition: 1 “agree strongly”, 2 “agree somewhat”, 3 “agree moderately”, 4 “agree hardly”, and 5 “agree not at all”. Verbal labels of the mismatch condition: 1 “agree strongly”, 2 “agree somewhat”, 3 “partly/partly”, 4 “agree hardly”, and 5 “agree not at all”.

### *Measurement Invariance and Latent Mean Differences*

We conducted confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) using one latent variable and five indicators (questions on achievement motivation) for scales with matching and mismatching middle options. We then conducted multigroup confirmatory factor analyses (MG-CFAs) to test for configural, metric, and scalar invariance. We used non-significant differences between chi-square values (Byrne, 2012) and differences between CFIs (Comparative Fit Index) and RMSEAs (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) lower than 0.01 (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002) as criteria for accepting measurement invariance. Since all indicators were measured with five-point scales, we assumed a continuous scale level (Rhemtulla, Brosseau-Liard, & Savalei, 2012) and used the MLR (Robust Maximum Likelihood) discrepancy function. Table 2 displays the results.

As Table 2 reveals, measurement invariance can be accepted for scales with matching and mismatching middle options. Particularly, this is indicated by the non-significant results of the chi-square difference tests and implies that both scales are comparable. Thus, the results provide evidence that mismatches between middle options and scale polarity do not pose serious consequences for attitude measurement in smartphone surveys.

We also looked at latent mean differences between the scales with matching and mismatching middle options [ $\chi^2(17) = 14.91$  (1.14), RMSEA = 0.00, CFI = 1.00]. The results show a significant latent mean difference of  $-0.116$  ( $p = 0.031$ ) between scale conditions. The

scales with a mismatching “partly/partly” midpoint produce significantly lower (more positive) answers than scales with a matching “agree moderately” midpoint (reference group).

Table 2. Testing for measurement invariance

| Invariance levels | $\chi^2$ values | Df | RMSEA | CFI   | $\chi^2$ difference test |
|-------------------|-----------------|----|-------|-------|--------------------------|
| Configural        | 9.17 (1.28)     | 8  | 0.013 | 0.999 |                          |
| Metric            | 10.94 (1.19)    | 13 | 0     | 1     | 1.22                     |
| Scalar            | 19.09 (1.14)    | 18 | 0.009 | 0.999 | 8.66                     |

Note. The results are based on the MLR discrepancy function. Scale correction factors are in parentheses.

### ***Composite Reliability***

We also estimated composite reliabilities of the scales with matching and mismatching middle options. For this purpose, we followed the method suggested by Raykoy and Mercoulides (2011). Interestingly, the results reveal almost no differences between the two scales with reliabilities of 0.80 (match condition) and 0.81 (mismatch condition). Thus, mismatching midpoints do not reduce measurement quality in terms of composite reliability.

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

The goal of this study was to investigate the consequences of mismatches between scale midpoints (or middle options) and scale polarity on attitude measurement in smartphone surveys. For this purpose, we conducted an experiment in a smartphone survey with two scale conditions (match vs. mismatch) and analyzed respondents’ answer behavior in terms of observational and latent answer distributions. The results reveal only small differences between scales with a matching middle option and those with a mismatching middle option. This applies to the observational as well as latent level.

Overall, percentages of answers to the matching middle option (“agree moderately”) do not significantly differ from percentages of answers to the mismatching middle option (“partly/partly”). This finding points to the fact that respondents may not interpret or perceive the matching and mismatching middle options differently. In other words, they virtually imply the same for respondents.

The analyses on the latent level show that scalar invariance holds for both scale conditions. This implies that mismatches between the middle option and scale polarity do not affect the intercepts and that the two scales are comparable. Scalar invariance is a prerequisite for comparing latent means. Although the latent mean differences between scales with matching and mismatching middle options are small, they are significantly different. Scales with mismatching “partly/partly” midpoints yield more positive answers than scales with matching “agree moderately” midpoints. However, both scales do not differ in terms of composite reliability, which contradicts findings by Menold (2019).

This study has some limitations that provide perspectives for future research. First, we only investigated the effects of mismatching middle options in unipolar agreement scales. However, it is also important to investigate the effects of mismatching middle options in bipolar agreement/disagreement scales. A further point is that we only tested a “partly/partly” formulation neglecting the possibility of a “neither/nor” formulation. Second, we exclusively focused on questions dealing with achievement motivation. We therefore suggest that future research covers a variety of further question topics. Third, our study was solely conducted in a

non-probability access panel in Germany and, thus, we cannot provide any conclusions on respondents' answer behavior in a cross-cultural or cross-national setting. Also, it would be worthwhile to build on this study and to rerun an experiment in a probability-based panel.

Our results show that respondents' answer behavior seems to be relatively robust against mismatches of middle options. However, mismatches, as in the German questionnaire of the ISSP (2012), may have consequences for attitude measurement in the form of latent mean differences. We therefore advocate paying close attention to design aspects of rating scales for attitude measurement.

## References

- Byrne, B. M. (2012). *Structural equation modeling with Mplus. Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling, 9*, 233–255.
- DeCastellarnau, A. (2018). A classification of response scale characteristics that affect data quality: A literature review. *Quality and Quantity, 52*, 1523–1559.
- Höhne, J. K., Krebs, D., & Kühnel, S.-M. (2020). Measuring income (in)equality: Comparing survey questions with unipolar and bipolar scales in a probability-based online panel. *Social Science Computer Review*. DOI: 10.1177/0894439320902461
- Menold, N. (2019). Response bias and reliability in verbal agreement rating scales: does polarity and verbalization of the middle category matter? *Social Science Computer Review*. DOI: 10.1177/0894439319847672
- O'Muircheartaigh, C., Gaskell, G., & Wright, D. B. (1995). Weighing anchors: Verbal and numeric labels for response scales. *Journal of Official Statistics, 11*, 295–308.
- Raykov, T., & Marcoulides, G. A. (2011). *Introduction to psychometric theory*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Rhemtulla, M., Brosseau-Liard, P. E., & Savalei, V. (2012). When can categorical variables be treated as continuous? A comparison of robust continuous and categorical SEM estimation methods under suboptimal conditions. *Psychological Methods, 17*, 354–373.
- Schaeffer, N. C., & Presser, S. (2003). The science of asking questions. *Annual review of sociology, 29*, 65–88.
- Schlosser, S., & Höhne, J. K. (2018). "ECSP – Embedded Client Side Paradata." *Zenodo*. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1218941>
- Schlosser, S., & Höhne, J. K. (2020). "ECSP – Embedded Client Side Paradata." *Zenodo*. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3782592>
- Scholz, E., & Jutz, R. (2014). ISSP 2012 Germany: Family and Gender Roles IV. GESIS Report on the German Study. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-402638>
- Sturgis, P., Roberts, C., & Smith, P. (2014). Middle alternatives revisited: How the neither/nor response acts as a way of saying "I don't know"? *Sociological Methods & Research, 43*, 15–38.
- Wang, R., & Krosnick, J. A. (2019). Middle alternatives and measurement validity: A recommendation for survey researchers. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 23*, 169–184.

## **Appendix**

English translations of the five survey questions (including answer options) on achievement motivation

I like being in competition with other people.

It is satisfying when I achieve better results than other people.

I am always trying to perform better than other people.

I try harder when I am in competition with other people.

It is important for me to be the best at a task.

Answer options in match condition: Agree strongly, agree somewhat, agree moderately, agree hardly, agree not at all.

Answer options in mismatch condition: Agree strongly, agree somewhat, partly/partly, agree hardly, agree not at all.

The question order in the survey corresponds to the order displayed in the Appendix. The original German wordings of the questions and answer options are available from the first author on request.