I J C R M
International Journal of Contemporary Research In Multidisciplinary

Research Article

Mindset, Moment, and Measurement: Addressing Bias and Response Instability in Questionnaire-Based Social Science Research

Rupesh Ranjan *
Independent Researcher, India

Corresponding Author: *Rupesh Ranjan

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17680100

Abstract

Questionnaires are indispensable in social science research, yet they are vulnerable to the instability of human cognition and emotion. Respondents' answers often depend on their transient mindset, emotional state, or situational context, which may not reflect their enduring beliefs or behaviours. This paper examines the problem of response bias arising from mindset-dependent answering and evaluates whether such biases undermine the validity of social science research. Drawing upon the works of Choi & Pak (2005), Bogner & Landrock (2016), and Bhattacherjee (2012), among others, it argues that while bias cannot be completely eradicated, it can be minimised through methodological rigour, triangulation, and reflexive interpretation. The study concludes that social sciences do not fail due to bias; rather, their strength lies in the reflexive awareness and transparent management of human variability in responses.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2583-7397
- **Received:** 15-09-2025
- **Accepted:** 28-10-2025
- **Published:** 22-11-2025
- **IJCRM:**4(6); 2025: 190-193
- **©2025, All Rights Reserved**
- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Ranjan R. Mindset, Moment, and Measurement: Addressing Bias and Response Instability in Questionnaire-Based Social Science Research. Int J Contemp Res Multidiscip. 2025;4(6):190-193.

Access this Article Online

www.multiarticlesjournal.com

KEYWORDS: Questionnaire bias, mindset effect, response bias, social desirability, temporal variation, survey validity, methodological rigour, social science research

© 2025 Rupesh Ranjan. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND).https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

1. INTRODUCTION

Questionnaires are among the most frequently employed instruments in social science research. From sociology to psychology, they are used to collect data on human attitudes, perceptions, and behaviours. Yet, one enduring challenge remains: human responses are not static. They fluctuate with emotional states, social contexts, fatigue, and cognitive readiness.

Researchers often assume that responses reflect stable attitudes, but as many scholars have noted (Bogner & Landrock, 2016; Choi & Pak, 2005), answers are shaped by both the respondent's current mindset and the context of the questionnaire. This introduces response bias, defined as systematic deviation of responses from true values.

This paper explores whether such biases imply that social science research "fails" in objectivity — or whether the discipline's reflexive tools can manage them effectively. It critically reviews scholarly approaches to bias, identifies mindset-related challenges, and proposes robust methodological solutions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

- Concept of Response Bias

Response bias occurs when respondents provide inaccurate or misleading answers that systematically deviate from their true opinions or behaviours (Bhattacherjee, 2012). Choi and Pak (2005) catalogued 48 potential biases in questionnaires, including those related to question design, context, and respondent psychology.

Bogner and Landrock (2016) grouped biases into three sources:

1. Respondent-related biases (e.g., motivation, mood, social desirability),
2. Instrument-related biases (e.g., question wording, order effects), and
3. Situational biases (e.g., interviewer presence, timing, environment).

- Mindset and Temporal Variation

Mindset refers to a respondent's temporary emotional, cognitive, or motivational state. Studies show that momentary moods can influence judgments (Schwarz & Clore, 1983). A positive mood may elicit more optimistic responses; fatigue may yield satisficing (choosing the first acceptable option) (Krosnick, 1991). Time-of-day, day-of-week, and recent experiences can also shape how individuals answer. This temporal instability leads to intra-respondent variability, undermining reliability if ignored.

- Social Desirability and Contextual Cues

Social desirability bias — respondents' tendency to give socially approved answers — interacts strongly with mindset. Crowne & Marlowe (1960) developed a scale to measure this bias, noting that responses often mirror "the person one wishes to appear as," not who one is. Moreover, context — such as the presence of others or perceived evaluation — can heighten this bias (Tourangeau & Yan, 2007). Thus, questionnaire responses are both context-dependent and state-dependent.

- **The Reflexive Turn in Social Science**

Contemporary social science recognises that bias is not mere error but part of human interpretive behaviour. The "reflexive turn" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) asserts that researchers must acknowledge subjectivity — both theirs and participants. Hence, the goal is not perfect objectivity but methodological transparency and reflexive control.

Theoretical Foundations of Bias

- **Cognitive-Affective Processing**

Cognitive theories (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) posit that attitude expression depends on cognitive accessibility and affective state. Temporary emotions can prime different beliefs or memories, influencing responses.

- **Framing and Priming Theory**

Tversky and Kahneman (1981) demonstrated that question framing alters responses by activating certain reference points. Thus, even identical facts yield different answers depending on how they are presented.

- **Constructivist Epistemology**

From a constructivist standpoint, knowledge — including survey data — is co-constructed. Responses reflect momentary constructions of meaning, not fixed truths. Consequently, variability does not signal failure but contextual truthfulness.

Types of Biases Related to Mindset

Type	Description	Illustrative Example
Mood bias	Emotions at the time of response affect perception	A person in distress rates life satisfaction lower
Fatigue bias	Respondent's tiredness leads to superficial answers	End-of-survey straight-lining
Priming bias	Earlier questions shape later responses	Political question preceding trust question
Temporal bias	Time/day differences influence cognition	Monday vs. weekend optimism levels
Social desirability	Desire to appear moral or acceptable	Underreporting alcohol use
Contextual bias	Environmental cues alter responses	Responding in the office vs. at home

METHODOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS

- **Design-Stage Strategies**

Pilot testing and cognitive interviewing to detect misinterpretation (Willis, 2005).

Neutral wording, avoiding evaluative terms.

Randomisation of question order to reduce priming (Krosnick, 1991).

Validated scales for sensitive topics (e.g., BIDR by Paulhus, 1991).

Ensuring anonymity and privacy to minimise social desirability (Tourangeau & Smith, 1996).

Pre-survey briefing that emphasises honesty over "right answers."

- **Data-Collection Strategies**

Standardised administration (consistent environment and timing).

© 2025 Rupesh Ranjan. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND).https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Multiple-wave designs to measure temporal stability.
Attention checks to identify satisficing.
Recording contextual variables (time of day, location, mood self-rating).
Mixed methods: follow-up interviews to explore discrepancies.

- **Analytical Strategies**

Statistical controls for time/context variables.
Reliability checks using Cronbach's α and test–retest coefficients.
Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) to separate true and error variance.
Sensitivity analysis to examine how removing extreme cases affects results.
Triangulation with qualitative or behavioural data to validate responses (Denzin, 1978).

DISCUSSION

Does Social Science Fail?

It is tempting to claim that bias renders social science invalid. However, as Bhattacherjee (2012) and GESIS guidelines (Bogner & Landrock, 2016) assert, awareness and mitigation of bias constitute scientific maturity. Unlike natural sciences, where variables can be controlled externally, social sciences study self-interpreting beings. Thus, variability is intrinsic, not extraneous. The aim is not to eliminate bias but to recognise, measure, and manage it. Indeed, biases can even reveal sociological truths: for example, social desirability bias reflects prevailing moral norms. Hence, reflexive awareness transforms bias from weakness into data.

Critics often argue that human subjectivity makes social science inherently unreliable, pointing out that responses change not only due to learning but also due to emotions and fatigue. However, this critique overlooks the adaptive rigour that characterises mature social research. The presence of bias does not signify failure but rather reveals the complexity of human cognition. Scholars such as Bourdieu (1992) and Guba and Lincoln (1994) advocate for reflexivity—a recognition that the researcher is part of the social world being studied. This approach transforms the challenge of bias into an opportunity for deeper understanding.

Furthermore, the instability of responses can itself provide insights into social dynamics. Temporal changes in attitudes may reflect adaptive or reactive behaviours, making instability a meaningful variable rather than mere noise. For example, shifts in opinion under stress or political upheaval provide critical data about human adaptability and social resilience. Therefore, rather than striving for static truth, researchers should embrace dynamic validity—acknowledging that human responses evolve. Moreover, technological advancements now allow for more precise measurement of biases. Techniques such as experience sampling methods (ESM) and implicit association tests (IAT) can track attitude fluctuations over time and across contexts (Greenwald et al., 1998). This shift toward continuous, multi-contextual observation enhances reliability by mapping rather than suppressing cognitive variability. Hence, social science does not fail at this front; it evolves. Awareness of bias and active engagement with it reflect methodological maturity rather than weakness. The challenge, then, is not to eliminate bias but to interpret it with epistemological humility and analytical sophistication.

CONCLUSION

Bias arising from a transient mindset is an unavoidable yet manageable challenge in questionnaire research. Human responses reflect both stable dispositions and momentary states. Recognising this duality strengthens rather than weakens social science.

Through methodological rigour — careful design, repeated measures, statistical control, and triangulation — researchers can separate genuine trends from momentary noise. The credibility of social science lies not in erasing bias but in making it visible, measurable, and theoretically meaningful.

REFERENCES

1. Ajzen I, Fishbein M. Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour. Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice-Hall; 1980.
2. Bhattacherjee A. Social science research: principles, methods, and practices. Tampa (FL): University of South Florida Scholar Commons; 2012.
3. Bogner K, Landrock U. Response biases in standardised surveys. GESIS Survey Guidelines; 2016.
4. Bourdieu P, Wacquant L. An invitation to reflexive sociology. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press; 1992.
5. Choi BCK, Pak AW. A catalogue of biases in questionnaires. Prev Chronic Dis. 2005;2(1):1–13.
6. Crowne DP, Marlowe D. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. J Consult Psychol. 1960;24(4):349–54.
7. Denzin NK. The research act: a theoretical introduction to sociological methods. New York (NY): McGraw-Hill; 1978.
8. Krosnick JA. Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys. Appl Cogn Psychol. 1991;5(3):213–36.
9. Paulhus DL. Measurement and control of response bias. In: Robinson J, et al., editors. Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes. San Diego (CA): Academic Press; 1991.
10. Schwarz N, Clore GL. Mood, misattribution, and judgments of well-being. J Pers Soc Psychol. 1983;45(3):513–23.
11. Tourangeau R, Smith TW. Asking sensitive questions: the impact of data collection mode, question format, and question context. Public Opin Q. 1996;60(2):275–304.

© 2025 Rupesh Ranjan. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND).https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

12. Tourangeau R, Yan T. Sensitive questions in surveys. Psychol Bull. 2007;133(5):859–83.
13. Tversky A, Kahneman D. The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. Science. 1981;211(4481):453–8.
14. Willis GB. Cognitive interviewing: a tool for improving questionnaire design. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage; 2005.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

About the corresponding author

Rupesh Ranjan is an independent researcher from India with a keen interest in interdisciplinary studies spanning social sciences, education, and contemporary policy issues. He actively contributes to academic discourse through research publications, critical analyses, and scholarly engagement, aiming to support evidence-based understanding and knowledge creation across diverse fields.

© 2025 Rupesh Ranjan. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC ND).https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/