As noted by Thorne (1997), formal critique plays a role not only in pressing knowledge forward but also in sustaining our humility. We are indeed humbled by the comments of our colleague regarding the rationale, method, and substance of our study. Although the commentator provided rich food for thought, and we agree with some of her points, we respectfully challenge others. First, we address one misunderstanding on her part. She alluded to our failure to link "two professed interests"; however, our article addressed only one topic: potentially problematic interviewee behaviors. This topic surfaced in nursing literature in a 1992 article by Hutchinson and Wilson on validity threats in interviews. Although scholars might argue with Hutchinson and Wilson's designation of certain behaviors as "problematic," we found their discussion intriguing and shared their concern about the possibility of such behaviors threatening the validity of interview data. We wondered how prevalent such behaviors were; however, Hutchinson and Wilson did not present data regarding prevalence, nor could we locate any studies during an extensive literature search. In response to the commentator's question, "What were the authors' reasons for focusing on interviewee behaviors?" the answer is simple: We decided that an important first step would be exploring the frequency and nature of problematic interviewee behaviors.

Of particular interest to us was one type of problematic behavior, that which quantitative researchers call "social desirability." Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) devoted considerable attention to the topic, stating that "Social desirability is certainly a major factor in self-description among normal individuals" (p. 385). The term includes a variety of behaviors, including attempts to impress, please, or flatter the researcher as well as strategies to present oneself in an unduly favorable light with regard to moral and virtuous action. We suspected that respondents may be tempted to do this (a) if there is a clear power difference (as when nurses interview patients or teachers interview students) and/or (b) if they are being queried about stigmatized or illegal behavior (as in substance use or trading sex for money). Our supposition about power differences between researcher and researched is supported in several journal articles. According to Hofman (2004), power differences may stem from differences in education, ethnicity, or social class, as well as the perceived inequality of the exchange between researcher and participant. In her study of female injection drug users, the power difference between the research team and the respondents was quite clear, as shown in the pejorative language employed in a Withdrawal of Consent form given to the women: "The primary investigator or the staff may stop your participation in this project without your consent if you are disruptive or behave badly" (Hofman, 2004, p. 653). Warr (2004) spoke of the vastness of "the gulf between the life worlds of interviewees and researchers" (p. 586), describing her own

experiences with street workers and unemployed, marginalized young people. Mallory (2001) claimed that "to some extent differences between researcher and participant will always be insurmountable" (p. 89), and she recommended analyzing the differences and even inviting participants to comment on them.

The studies we cited by Shiner and Newburn (1997) and Locker (1981) support the second motivation for responding in a socially desirable manner. People are well aware of social norms and may misrepresent feelings and behaviors that deviate from these norms. Survey researchers of health behavior know that people tend to underreport consumption of alcohol and overestimate frequency of aerobic exercise. Participants understand that it is more socially desirable to say that they go to the opera than to say they watch television cartoons (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Entire textbooks are written about the phrasing of questions because respondents often guess the desired answer from the way the researcher words the question. The setting of data collection affects responding, too. Individuals in therapy for court- mandated child custody rulings portray themselves as healthier than people who undertake therapy voluntarily (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Given the literature cited above (along with that cited in the original article), we remain puzzled that there is so little attention to social desirability by qualitative researchers. To again cite Fontana and Frey (2000): "It seems that everyone relies on the interview as a source of information, with the assumption that interviewing results in true and accurate pictures of respondents' selves and lives" (p. 646). This assumption begs the question that prompted our study. We disagree with our commentator's allegation that we "did not make a clear case for addressing interviewee behaviors and SDRS relative to the validity of [qualitative] interview data." We also dispute her assessment that secondary analysis was an inappropriate method of examining the problem. In retrospect, we could have been more explicit in stating that we chose this approach because abundant data were already available to us, constituting a relevant and cost-effective source for this exploratory study.

Our selection of transcripts was indeed purposeful, as stated on page 193 of the article. As stated on the same page of the article, the transcripts did include notation of interviewee behaviors such as laughing, crying, sighing, or hesitating before answering a question. With regard to the analysis, we spelled out the steps as completely as possible. To some extent, the analysis of phenomenological interview data is an intuitive art. We have a "manner or style of thinking" called phenomenology (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, p. viii). The researcher carefully reads line by line while also keeping in mind the meaning of the whole narrative, seeking to "hear what it says" (Merleau-Ponty, 1968, p. 155).

> The meaning is not on the phrase like the butter on the bread, like a second layer of "copy reality" spread over the sound: it is the totality of what is said...it is given with the words for those who have ears to hear. (Merleau-Ponty, 1968, p. 155)

To enable readers to judge if we heard correctly, we included verbatim quotations from the transcripts in our report. Readers are the ultimate judge of the study's validity. The commentator is in error in stating that our transcripts involved "client satisfaction with health care." None of

the original studies pertained to satisfaction with care. As stated on page 193, one study asked patients about their perceptions of the world of the hospital environment, another inquired about strategies used to solicit nursing care, and the third focused on experiences of university students. No questions about client satisfaction with care were posed by any of the original interviewers. That is why we did not review the literature about client satisfaction with care. That literature is irrelevant to the purpose of the current study of interviewee behavior.

On a more positive note, our commentator raises several excellent questions for future studies, such as, "Are different behaviors 'problematic' in different ways?" We agree that behavioral data may provide a window to a participant's life world and need not always threaten the integrity of a study. As yet, there is no consensus, and scant discussion, among researchers about problematic interviewee behavior. For example, silence was included in the listing by Hutchinson and Wilson (1992); however, Thomas and Pollio (2002) said, "Do not be afraid of silence" (p. 28).

Our goal was, and remains, to stimulate further discourse on the qualitative interview. In our examination of phenomenological interview transcripts, we did not find much evidence of social desirability responding. Because phenomenologists do not come to the interview appointment with a predetermined agenda of directive questions, participant concern about making a good impression may be reduced. We do not know if our study findings are germane to other qualitative methodologies that employ the face-to-face interview. Although we perceive the contribution of our study as relatively modest, we do stand by its rationale and findings. The value of the study is not to provide comfort to qualitative researchers that the interviewee behaviors we discussed are nothing more than expressions of gratitude and good manners but, rather, to bring to the forefront a topic that deserves greater attention. We will have achieved our purpose if readers have a new resolve to reflect more deeply on the interaction of researcher and participant. Notes Rogers (2003), "Good qualitative research consciously grapples with the entwined issues of power and responsibility in relationships with individuals or groups that are often more lasting and intimate than is commonly the case with quantitative projects" (pp. 58-59). If readers seriously consider the issues that we (and our commentator) have raised, our work in preparing the article (and this response) will have been worthwhile.

REFERENCES
Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. Z. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 645- 672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Hofman, N. G. (2004). Toward critical research ethics: Transforming ethical conduct in qualitative health care research. *Health Care for Women International*, *25*, 647-662.
Hutchinson, S., & Wilson, H. S. (1992). Validity threats in scheduled semi-structured research interviews. *Nursing Research*, *41*, 117-119.
Locker, D. (1981). *Symptoms and illness: The cognitive organization of disorder*. London: Tavistock.
Mallory, C. (2001). Examining the differences between researcher and participant: An intrinsic element of grounded theory. In R. S. Schreiber & P. N. Stern (Eds.), *Using grounded theory in nursing* (pp. 85-95). New York: Springer.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *The phenomenology ofperception*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The visible and the invisible*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rogers, A. G. (2003). Qualitative research in psychology: Teaching an interpretive process. In R. Josselson, A. Lieblich, & D. P. McAdams (Eds.), *Up close and personal: The teaching and learning of narrative research* (pp. 49-60). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Shiner, M., & Newburn, T. (1997). Definitely, maybe not? The normalization of recreational drug use amongst young people. *Sociology*, *31*, 511-529.

Thomas, S. P., & Pollio, H. R. (2002). *Listening to patients: A phenomenological approach to nursing research and practice*. New York: Springer.

Thorne, S. E. (1997). Phenomenological positivism and other problematic trends in health science research. *Qualitative Health Research*, *7*, 287-293.

Warr, D. J. (2004). Stories in the flesh and voices in the head: Reflections on the context and impact of research with disadvantaged populations. *Qualitative Health Research*, *14*, 578- 587.