Arhiv družboslovnih podatkov

Gradivo vezano na raziskavo

Usage of online panels in survey methodology field, 2016: A systematic review

ADP-IDNo: ONPANR16

Celotni odgovori nekaterih spremenljivk/ Complete answers of some variables

Complete answers of questions that were cut off due to their length

TITLE OF DATA FILE (F2):

Usage of online panels in survey methodology field, 2016: A systematic review – panel

(PDQ_compareGS, PDQ_compareM, PDQ_relations, PDQ_weight, PDQ_profResp, PDQ_speeders, PDQ_panelCond, PDQ_recruit, PDQ_maintain, PDQ_loyalty, PDQ_NRE, PDQ_ME)

PDQ_compareGS (PDQ_cGS)

- age, gender, education, and personality traits compared with ALLBUS national CAPI survey
- attitudinal (respondents' assessment of the current economic situation in Germany and the economic situation in one year, the assessment of respondents' own financial situation and prospective financial situation in one year, general health, religiosity, self-assessed social class, four general attitude questions on societal functioning, and political orientation) and factual (employment status, marital status, frequency of church attendance, religious confession, being born in Germany, citizenship, and type of dwelling) variables compared with two cross-sections from ALLBUS national face-to-face survey (full sample and Internet users sample)
- date of birth, gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, health status, and geographic location compared with US Census
- demographic (gender, age, education, legal marital status, employment, and immigration background) and attitudinal variables (political interest, satisfaction with the government, generalized trust, self-rated health status, assessment of the state of health services, rating of current state of German economy, rating of German economy in one year, rating of respondent's own financial situation, rating of respondent's own financial situation in one year, and general life satisfaction) compared with ALLBUS face-to-face national survey (Internet and non-Internet users) and the German subsample of the 5th ESS round
- demographics, and residential characteristics compared with US Census
- demographics, attitudinal variables (political interest, satisfaction with democracy, and social and institutional trust), and voting behavior compared with a face-to-face national survey (FNES) and a telephone survey; political participation and activity, and use of the Internet and media compared with the FNES
- demographics, voting behavior, and Internet access of the LISS panel members compared with the Dutch population
- gender identity and sex questions, ethnicity, and race compared with two population-based surveys (NHIS and NESARC)
- male, median age, over 65 years old, household composition and size, home-owner, urbanicity, and voting behavior compared with register data from Statistics Netherlands
- satisfaction, and trust in institutions compared with ESS using MTMM approach
- sex, age, education, marriage, living region, and living place compared with National Statistics (GS) and with a paper-based survey

- socio-demographic variables, urbanization region, ethnical background, and voting behavior compared with the Dutch population
- socio-demographics and, opinion and behavior questions compared with Natsal-3 and external benchmark data (the UK population census, the ONS Integrated Household Survey - IHS, and the National Travel Survey)
- socio-economic variables compared with the target population of the tested area
- time spent on different media, satisfaction, political orientation, social and political trust, and left-right orientation compared with ESS using a Split-Ballot-MTMM approach
- urbanicity, region, sex, age, household type, and unemployment rate, level of education, purchasing power, and immigration compared with street-level data from a commercial provider and population statistics from the 2011 census
- WageIndicator Survey (LW) data, i.e., mean wage, socio-demographics, and wage-related covariates compared with LISS panel data and Statistics Netherlands

PDQ_compareM (PDQ_coM)

- age, level of formal education, income, general reason for visiting parks, and self-reported knowledge of parks in the region compared with self-selected public; indicators of mapping effort and data usability compared with self-selected public, random household sampling, and on-site recruitment surveys
- demographics, socio-economic variables, and co-morbidities compared with a RDD survey
- demographics, voting behavior, and Internet access of the LISS panel members compared with a traditional national survey (the Dutch Parliamentary Electoral Study), with an online survey (self-selected sample), and with samples from 19 online panels
- gender, age, date of birth, education, State, ZIP code, annual household income, and response time between the 7 panel vendors surveys
- gender, age, race, home, urbanity, education, income, employment, marital status, and length of stay in panel compared with the mail survey mode; the likelihood of completing the survey by mode (logistic models); the effects of mode on item nonresponse (Poisson regression model)
- GLES data, i.e., distribution of speeders, speeding*age, speeding*education, speeding*evaluation (and its determinants) of Merkel's or Bush's handling of the economy, and speeding*turnout intention compared with ANES data
- proportion of Jews with Jewish denominational affiliations compared with an RDD survey and two opt-in surveys
- questions about traffic behaviors, about agreement with existing road safety measures, about agreement with new car safety provisions, and about personal willingness to reduce car usage for a cleaner environment compared with a probability-based face-to-face survey (same selected questions from SARTRE-4 road safety survey)
- respondent quality (median annual household income, demographics, mean number of panels belonged to, average number of surveys completed per week), opinions about economy/well-being of the country/quality of life/personal relationships/use of social media/values..., and data quality indicators (speeding, straight-lining, inattentiveness behaviors, cheating) compared with 2 Mturk samples
- to compare the effect of nonresponse strategies on satisficing between the Internet and telephone modes
- trust, and attitude toward immigration compared with a face-to-face survey (ESS)

PDQ_relations (PDQ_rel)

- age*education*gender*urbanization*income*social class*household composition*household size*use of mobile for online survey completion
- age*ethnicity*hours a week online*privacy online*agree/disagree questions related to privacy*provided/refused personally identifying information
- age*gender*race*education*income*metrics for fraudulence identification (low-probability screening questions)*inattentiveness (straightlining, speeding, inconsistency of age reporting, and trap questions)*survey version (standard probit model); trap questions*other metrics of poor behavior; behavioral and demographic indicators (the same variables)*SARP (strong axiom of revealed preference) violations (post-probit model); quarantining metrics combination*SARP violators
- age*gender*smartphone ownership; (the same first two variables)*survey access via mobile devices; (the same first two variables)*private Internet access via smartphone; (the same first two variables)*location for private Internet access via smartphone; (the same first two variables)*private use of technical devices to access Internet; (the same first two variables)*survey participation via smartphone in the past; (the same first two variables)*smartphone use behavior (general smartphone behavior, smartphone usability of web content, and mobile survey participation); (the same first two variables)*survey length*compliance rate in instructed survey access (experimental design)
- age*origin*education*housing*need for a simPC and a broadband connection; (the same first 4 variables)*device on loan or not*gender*position in the household*terminated panel participation (=percentage of fully completed questionnaires among those one was selected for); (all the same previous variables)*completed questionnaires (all 3 logistic regressions)
- demographics*opinion and policy preference (38 items)
- demographics*self-rated health status*life satisfaction (regression model for each of the 3 surveys)
- design effect*device type; age*online survey components ("Appealing visual design", and "That smartphones and tablets can be used to take part in the study")*smartphone user or not
- device type*age*gender*education*nationality*living alone*in paid work*online survey experience*indicators of NRE and ME
- device used in month*device used in subsequent month (=device switch)
- distribution of speeders; speeding*age; speeding*education; speeding*evaluation (and its determinants) of Merkel's or Bush's handling of the economy (also excluding page-specific speeders from the analysis); speeding*turnout intention (also excluding page-specific speeders from the analysis)
- experimental condition*gender*education*age*employed or not*married or not*Internet use*4 questions*questionnaire was interesting*response; (the same 9 variables)*number of words provided to the 4 open-ended questions
- experimental conditions*item nonresponse; experimental conditions*interactive terms (among each condition)*item nonresponse; experimental conditions*interactive terms (among each condition)*age*education*SIMpc*item nonresponse; the same three models are used for predicting changes in answers and nondifferentiation
- gender*age*education*race/ethnicity*family income*region*marital status*arm 4 and arm 5 (seeds and recruits)
- gender*age*education*working status*trust*political interest*self-assessed health*survey participation previous 12 months*evaluation questionnaire 1*incentive*unconditioned/conditioned group; knowledge questions about nuclear power plants ("don't know" answers)*unconditioned/conditioned group;

environmental behavior (socially desirable answers)*unconditioned/conditioned group; number of friends' names (item nonresponse)*unconditioned/conditioned group

- gender*age*education*working status*urbanization*household composition*type of device; (the same first 6 variables)*early/late adopter of new technology (to predict unintended mobile responding); (the same first 6 variables)*smartphone usage characteristics (to predict the effect of different characteristics on intended mobile responding); (the same first 6 variables)*preferred device for completing surveys; (the same first 6 variables)*preference for mobile devices when completing surveys (to predict the preference for mobile devices when completing surveys)
- gender*age*Region*5 treatments*response rate
- low/high-frequency scale (3 questions)*survey mode (experiment 1); closed- ended/half- open "Other" category (3 questions)*survey mode (experiment 2); small/large text box (3 questions)*survey mode (experiment 3); alphabetized/randomized response list (3 questions)*survey mode (experiment 4) (percentages and regression coefficients for all the 4 experiments)
- mean age*gender*political attitude*political interest*percentage of final recruitment*respondents who have completed the entire recruitment questionnaire
- mean responses to 26 items*experimental condition (ANOVA); subjective and objective length of the questionnaire*experimental condition (ANOVA); questionnaire evaluation (5 questions)*experimental condition (ANOVA); location at the time of survey completion*experimental condition; device used most in everyday life to access Internet*experimental condition
- notification and permission preferences for research on medical practices (no notification, general information, discussion plus verbal permission, discussion plus written permission)*research scenario (medical record review, randomization - hypertension, randomization - serious condition); preferences if obtaining permission would make research too difficult (3 questions)*research scenario; perceptions of risk and willingness to participate in research on medical practices (2 questions)*research scenario
- one-person household*average age*ethnical background*income*urbanization region*highest educational degree*Internet/non-Internet household
- open-ended question (coded reasons for optimism/pessimism)*degree of optimism/pessimism about the future (5-point scale); open-ended question (self-mentioned societal issues)*offered societal issues (6 of the 21 items)
- sensitive indices (positive attitude towards deviant practices, deviant behavior, monthly alcohol-related behavior, daily alcohol consumption, and household income)*survey mode; context variables (place where the respondent filled in the questionnaire, presence of third persons, trust in confidentiality of the survey mode, sensitivity of the questions, and feeling uneasy answering the questionnaire)*wave*survey mode
- sex*age*education*invitation mode*response rate
- sex*age*education*frequency of Internet use*panel tenure*openness for experience*lottery/no lottery*splitting the payout*outcome variables (nondifferentiation, item nonresponse, and completion)
- sex*age*highly educated individuals; sex*age*heavy drinkers; sex*age*habitual smokers
- sex*age*living with partner or not*education*income*biomarkers (blood cholesterol, salivary cortisol, and waist circumference)
- sexual orientation*gender*ethnicity; sexual orientation*gender*race; transgender status*ethnicity; transgender status*race
- socio-demographics*willingness-to-pay (model with and without correlation parameter)

- survey topic*topic salience*personal interest*membership tenure*accepted survey invitations during the last year*number of other online panels enrolled*gender*education*age*full participation; (the same variables)*speeding; (the same variables)*straightlines; (the same variables)*item omission

PDQ_weight (PDQ_wei)

- design weights, post-stratification weights (age, gender, and education based on unweighted data from ALLBUS)
- multiple weights (i.e., Microcensus sample probability, participation and continuation in the access panel, DE-SILC sample probability, and participation in DE-SILC); large-scale Monte Carlo simulation study: comparison of two estimation techniques (weighted least squares and design-based approach) and strategies (A. a standard approach that uses calibration and design weights, and a composite calibration weight; B. the response propensity scores can be estimated and included as weights, i.e. participation to the access panel, to correct for the self-selection bias + a composite calibration weight) using an income model (regression model) with gender, ethnicity, age, employment, and education
- post hoc weighting for age*gender
- post-hoc weights according to language, gender, and age
- post-stratification using 2011 Census: age within sex
- post-stratification weights
- post-stratification weights (to correct for nonresponse bias)*design weights (to correct for selection bias)
- propensity score weights
- propensity scores to estimate nonresponse bias: mean values of three survey attitudes estimated using propensity scores based on 1. information about the contact course and “concern/refusal conversion” patterns, and 2. district-level data (the mean social status, voter turnout, and the mean age of administrative districts)
- regression models calculate predicted values as imputation of missing responses
- sampling weights applied to 18 demographic quotas, each defined by age, gender, and race/ethnicity
- sampling weights based on past "trap questions" research
- unweighted composite scores and composite scores based on regression weights
- weights (gender-age*education)
- weights for the LISS sample (working time, age, type of contract, occupation, and education); propensity score adjustment weights (individual propensity weights, average propensity weights, and propensity post-stratified weights) for the LW sample computed for 4 models (1=only on socio-demographics, 2=1+work-related covariates, 3=1+2+the webographic "attitude about what is important in life", and 4=1+2+3+the webographic "attitudes about what is important in a job"); calibration weights (working time, age, sector, occupation, gender and education)

PDQ_profResp (PDQ_pRe)

- do survey answers of trained respondents differ systematically from answers of novice respondents
- mean number of panel memberships, mean number of completed questionnaires in the past 4 weeks, frequency of checking email accounts, incentive as motivation, and fun as motivation by 4 Latent Classes of respondents (altruistic nonprofessional, semi-altruistic, semi-professional, and professional);

demographics (age, gender, education, household size, nationality, having paid work, and religion)*psychographics (sense of involvement, voting intention and behavior, and life and health information)*degree of professional respondent (logistic regression)

- mean number of self-reported surveys in the past four weeks; mean number of self-reported online panel memberships; number of surveys*age*gender*race*income*marital status*education*full-time work status*political knowledge/interest/activity*turnout*ideological strength; panel membership*(the same variables except the first)
- number of panels, and number of surveys taken per week

PDQ_speeders (PDQ_spe)

- 6 minutes (half the announced estimated time to complete) to fill in the questionnaire is the threshold defined to classify respondents as speeders (<6 minutes) or non-speeders (>6 minutes)
- alternatives"
- difference in average time to complete each question block (in seconds) for 3 sample groups (USA panel Regular, USA Mturk, and MTurk non-USA)
- difference in mean duration for questionnaires completed with no interruption between experienced (=received only one questionnaire prior to the experimental questionnaire) and not experienced (=received from 4 to 5 questionnaire prior to the experimental questionnaire) respondents
- GLES and ANES data: distribution of speeders using 3 thresholds (responses more than 30% or 40% or 50% faster than the median response time); speeding*age; speeding*education; speeding*evaluation (and its determinants) of Merkel's or Bush's handling of the economy; speeding*turnout intention
- GLES and ANES data: distribution of speeders using 3 thresholds (responses more than 30% or 40% or 50% faster than the median response time); speeding*age; speeding*education; speeding*evaluation (and its determinants) of Merkel's or Bush's handling of the economy; speeding*turnout intention. GLES data: respondent behavior (duration of panel membership, number of completed surveys in the previous four weeks, self-recruitment, and recruitment through extern link)*response time
- positive speeding identification occurs when a respondent took less than four seconds on average to answer each of the 13 choices between optimized sets of product

PDQ_panelCond (PDQ_pCo)

- comparison of the use of Internet applications between Internet households and non-Internet households (after providing them Internet access)
- explorative analysis of whether the lottery condition in Study 1 influenced response behavior 5 months later in Study 2 (general longitudinal effects)
- percentage of straightlining across 10 grid questions (about personality, politics, health, leisure, religion, and income) in core modules by wave (from 1 to 7); straightlining*number of months in panel; straightlining*number of previous surveys
- regressions for the effect of panel conditioning on respondents' preferences regarding pension income (risky pensions, life-cycle spending, risk attitude, and minimum spending) using socio-demographics and interaction terms (LISS*survey completion time, LISS*high school, LISS*college, and LISS*age>=55); probit regressions for the effect of panel conditioning on "don't know" answers (to the same four questions

regarding pension income); difference of means across question-order treatments (within each panel) for the effect of varying the order of options (of the first three questions) for respondents to choose from

- two field experiments to study panel conditioning due to learning the surveying process: experiment 1 - advantageous conditioning (choice of ‘‘don’t know’’ answers and social desirability reduction), experiment 2 - disadvantageous conditioning (information provided in looping questions=questions followed by several rounds of follow-up questions, and break-off and item nonresponse in questions asked after looping questions); in both field experiments more experienced respondents (=respondents could complete as many as four or five surveys prior to the experimental questionnaire) are compared with less experienced respondents (=respondents received only one questionnaire prior to the experimental questionnaire)

PDQ_recruit (PDQ_rec)

- 7 reasons for joining the online panel (by gender, age, and education) and 7 materialism items (factor analysis: first factor is "materialism toward money", and second factor is "materialism toward possessions")
- face-to-face; unconditional and conditional monetary incentives (GESIS)
- face-to-face; unconditional and conditional monetary incentives (GIP)
- GLES data: self-recruitment, and recruitment through extern link*response time
- multi-mode (phone and mail) recruitment experiment with different combinations (8 recruitment-assignment groups) of 3 response inducements (advance letter, prepaid monetary incentive, and phone follow-up)
- recruitment experiment (after asking for the number of friends): 1. respondents are asked to give a list of friends (5 arms: 1. to list one person; 2. to list 10 persons; 3. to list 10 persons but if they are fewer than those indicated in the preceding numerical question, the respondents are prompted for additional people; 4. to list the specific people indicated in the preceding numerical question; 5. to list all friends' first name without a preloaded number and then to list information about their friends); 2. respondents are asked to contact their friends (other conditions are added to the previous 5 arms: 1. control group; 2. high recruiter payment=payment to the recruiter for each successful respondent; 3. respondent incentive=sign-up bonus to the friend who responds; 4. self-selected friends=friends are selected by the respondent; 5. arm 2 + arm 3); 6 waves conducted on arms 4 and 5 (any recruit who has responded in the previous month would be invited to recruit their friends)
- recruitment experiment (with 500 individuals aged 18-69 from the Danish Civil Registration System divided into 5 samples) for a web panel; pre-recruitment online questionnaire answered by all 5 samples' members; 5 recruitment strategies (=treatment groups): 1. invitation and reminder by SMS - sponsor is Gallup, 2. invitation by phone and reminder by e-mail - sponsor is Gallup, 3. invitation by letter and reminder by phone - sponsor is Gallup, 4. invitation and reminder by letter (sample divided into 2 groups, i.e. reminder with or without social proof) - sponsor is the University of Copenhagen, and 5. invitation by letter, including a small piece of quality chocolate and reminder by letter (sample divided into 2 groups, i.e. reminder with or without social proof) - sponsor is the University of Copenhagen
- recruitment of 1200 addresses from the address frame of Statistics Netherlands; 8 experiments that are a combination of contact mode (CATI/CAPI), content of the advance letter (standard/special), incentive payment (none/prepaid/promised), incentive amount (0/10/20/50 euros), and timing of the panel participation request (in letter/after interview); costs (total fieldwork costs, total incentive costs, and total costs per registered household) per panel household to obtain a final panel size of 500 registered

households, calculated for different modes (CATI/CAPI and with/without phone number) and different incentive conditions (none/prepaid/promised and 0/10/20/50 euros)

- telephone and face-to-face; unconditional monetary incentives (LISS)
- two incentives experiments: unconditional/conditional cash incentive in the F2F phase; unconditional/no incentive in the first e-mail reminder to register for the online survey
- unconditional monetary incentives, tablet PCs and 3G Internet (ELIPSS)

PDQ_maintain (PDQ_mai)

- 2 experiments: traditional forms of information (cards, ring binder, advance letter and incentive, e-cards, and newsletter), and innovative forms of feedback information (videos with interviews and graphs showing panel results); effect of the feedback materials on long-term participation, for subgroups with a higher than average probability of becoming sleepers (younger than 35, household with children, lower education, and paid work) or a low probability (older than 64, single person household, college or higher education, and school/study/housekeeping or other) (logistic regressions); effect of respondent demographics on the evaluation of the feedback materials for the 2 experiments (logistic regressions)
- incentive*type of sleeper*sleeper reactivation (percentages, and logistic regression coefficients)
- reminders, monetary incentives, hotline, e-mail and messages, presentation of study results and research teams on website, feedback possibilities in each questionnaire (GESIS)
- reminders, monetary incentives, payout, toll-free hotline, e-mail and messages, presentation of study results and research teams on website, feedback possibilities in each questionnaire, greetings (GIP)
- reminders, monetary incentives, payout, toll-free hotline, e-mail and messages, presentation of study results on website, newsletter, feedback possibilities in each questionnaire, greetings (LISS)
- reminders, personal use of tablet and 3G Internet connection, hotline, e-mail and push messages, presentation of study results on applet, feedback possibilities in each questionnaire (ELIPSS)
- to make contact: two routes to access the questionnaire (e-mail invitation and study's website); to gain cooperation: feedback study results on the website as a way to make the survey salient to panel members, e-mail and phone reminders, monetary incentive; to measure the maintenance: (high) retention rates

PDQ_loyalty (PDQ_loy)

- attrition (and demographics) of incentivized/non-incentivized panel members; member-related (demographics) and panel-related (number of surveys assigned and completed, token gift sent, and number of non-response reminder postcards sent) predictors of attrition in both recruitment modes (3 models); demographics*recruitment factors*panel participation factors*respondent and data attrition*frailty effect (=the tendency of respondent attrition to be contagious within the family)
- attrition rate after 7 surveys in the 3 months of data collection, and socio-demographics of the participants dropping off during the panel (no systematic patterns among participants dropping out of the panel)
- attrition rate by treatment group (conditioned and unconditioned)
- demographics*2 experiments*response in month following mailing or response in second month after mailing or participated all months or still active at end of period (logistic regression models)
- GLES regular members: duration of panel membership, and number of completed surveys in the previous four weeks*response time

- members who are staying longer in the panel have higher response rates than more recent members; comparing long stay panelists by survey mode, web survey members participate less than mail survey ones
- non-Internet households show a high degree of loyalty (average monthly response rate, and attrition rate); likelihood that a household (socio-demographics) leaves the panel
- panel cooperativeness (completed the profile survey, mean number of complete waves, completed from 1 to 10 waves, completed from 11 to 20 waves, completed all waves, skipped last two waves, and answered no waves)*number of calls*initial refusals*protocol change at the recruitment stage (cohort 1); factors contribute to cooperation/non-cooperation (socio-demographics, number of calls to first contact, number of calls to complete interview, ever refused, recruited after protocol change, and no Internet access)*panel cooperativeness (logistic regression); mean scores on response quality indicators*attrition propensity (wave 1); attrition propensity*recruitment cohort*interaction between the first two variables*rate of midpoint responding (wave 9)
- posterior response probabilities for the 9 Latent Classes of respondents in each wave; socio-demographics*psychological variables*survey attitude*9 class memberships (regression model)
- retention of individual panel members in 2008 and 2012
- retention rates of households from 2005 to 2009 (for both the access panel recruitment and the DE-SILC respondents sample); recruitment (for the access panel) and response (for the DE-SILC sample) success*federal state*year (logit model); household structure*income*employment*age*gender* education*citizenship*duration of stay in the panel*response rate (for both the access panel and the DE-SILC sample)*year
- sample composition (over 65 years old, household composition and size, home-owner, urbanicity, and voting behavior) of the surviving panel members; response propensity of the 9 Latent Classes of respondents in each wave; sample composition (male, median age, over 65 years old, household composition and size, home-owner, urbanicity, and voting behavior) of 7 Latent Classes (top-up sample members in 2009 and 2011 are excluded)
- splitting the lottery deters more recently registered panelists from finishing the survey; retainees in the split lottery are more open for experience than retainees in the lump sum lottery (tenure in years)
- straightlining*number of months in panel; straightlining*number of previous surveys
- the main effect of membership tenure is not significant, but members with shorter membership tenure, who have been enrolled in the online panel for six months or less, participated to a higher degree if the topic was made highly salient

PDQ_NRE

- 30 predictors (primary and secondary characteristics) of starting (started/invited panelists) and completion (finished/started questionnaires) rates (2 models)
- age, gender, education, and personality traits are used to study sample composition in the stages of willingness to participate in the panel and actual participation to the online surveys among the sample members (second and third selection stages)
- comparison (based on over 65 years old, household composition and size, home-owner, and urbanicity) between initial nonrespondents (recruitment phase) and 4 Latent Classes of attriters
- completion rate, and eligibility rate

- completion rates (absorption rate=percentage of the invitations delivered, start rate, completion rate, screened out rate, breakoff rate, and number of completed questionnaire)*wave (1 and 2)*survey mode (PC web, and mobile web)
- demographics*response propensity (non-acceptance=refusal or non-response to the invitation in the screening survey, non-completion, and missing opinion from the policy favorability items)
- gender*age*education*method of recruitment*panel tenure*number of other online panels in which a member was enrolled*reasons for joining the online panel*materialism*starting rate; (the same variables)*break-off rate
- initial response rate (household registered as panel member, and participating persons in panel households)
- males, older respondents, very high income households, low educated people, and households without children are more prone to participate (binary probit model)
- members of online panels highly interested in the survey topic have a higher participation rate than panel members with low personal interest; the level of topic salience in the email invitation have no influence on participation behaviour
- nonresponse rates at the agree-to-panel stage and at the panel stage (=final stage of the recruitment process) and reasons; providing people with a simPC leads to more panel participation among the groups often hard to reach in survey research
- number invited*number of respondents*response rate*number of recruits*ratio recruits per recruiter*5 arms (experiment 2); waves*recruitment (arms 4 and 5)
- number of response in recruitment experiment (noncontacts, fully completed survey before reminder, response rate before reminder, final number of fully completed survey, final response rate, final number of incomplete interviews and of explicit refusal online, online refusal rate, and marginal cost of recruited members in euro)*treatment group
- only mentioned
- only mentioned as NOT significant
- only mentioned to correct it with weights
- participation rate, screening participation rate, and dropout rate
- response in recruitment (not usable, not reached, refusals, central questions only, complete recruitment interview, willing to participate in panel, and registered panel member)*interview modes (CATI/CAPI households with/without phone number); experimental factors (phone number and mode, letter, introduce panel, and incentive payment)*panel registration rate (logistic regression model 1); experimental factors (phone number and mode, incentive payment and amount)*panel registration rate (logistic regression model 2)
- response metrics (recruitment rate X completion rate = cumulative response rate) for the telephone recruitment and online participation
- response propensity models at recruitment stage; effect of “concerns/refusal conversion” patterns on the odds of obtaining a full interview (recruitment stage); incentive experiment carried out within the “call announced” subsample
- response rate, and proportion of consented respondents who failed the screener
- response rates at recruitment interview and at panel registration (ELIPSS)
- response rates at recruitment interview and at panel registration (GESIS)
- response rates at recruitment interview and at panel registration (GIP)
- response rates at recruitment interview and at panel registration (LISS)

- response rates of the 3 samples
- starting rate, completion rate, and cumulative response rate by treatment group (conditioned and unconditioned)
- unintended (=spontaneous) and intended mobile response rates

PDQ_ME

- bias between true parliamentary results and estimates from respondents in the 9 classes is measured computing correlation between voting behavior and attrition classes
- conditioning on measured preferences, don't know answers, question order
- demographic distributions and data quality indicators (e. g., inconsistent/conflicting answers) were compared between those who validated and those who did not; the impact of the validation process on the final sample (in terms of demographics, behavioral items, and attitudes on a number of issues) was assessed excluding non-validated respondents
- mapping effort (=the exertion of physical and mental power to complete the mapping activity, measured by the total number of markers placed in the survey process, the total elapsed clock time placing the markers, and the mean elapsed time in placing a marker), and data usability (=proportion of total markers placed that are appropriate to the purpose of the survey)
- means of the response style indicators (acquiescence, extreme responding, neutral middle, and differentiation) per grid (political, and neighborhood)*4 Latent Classes of respondents*effect sizes (Cohen’s f) of the all differences (multivariate analysis of variance - MANOVA); adjusted means of the response style indicators per grid, adjusting for all significant characteristics*4 Latent Classes of respondents*effect sizes (Cohen’s f) of the all differences (MANCOVA)
- members of online panels highly interested in the survey topic show less satisficing behaviour than panel members with low personal interest; the level of topic salience in the email invitation have no influence on data quality in the online panel
- number of surveys*age*gender*race*income*marital status*education*full-time work status*survey effort*interview duration*attrited*straight-line*percent missing*percent "don't know"*junk responses to the open-ended questions; panel memberships*(the same variables except the first)
- quality (=the strength of the relationship between the latent and the observed variables) estimates for each experiment, trait and method are slightly different between the online panel and the face-to-face survey in half of the cases and are in favor of the online panel survey (=the LISS has a higher quality than the ESS); differences (in quality) between methods matter much more than differences between data collection modes
- quality (=the strength of the relationship between the latent variable one is really interested in and the observed answer to a specific question asked in a given survey) estimates for each experiment, trait and method are sometimes higher in the online panel and sometimes in the face-to-face survey
- respondent identity (the proportion of consented respondents who failed to meet the technical criteria, failed to complete the screener questions, and provided discordant responses); discordance (=survey responses were compared with each other, with the panel entry data, and with IP address data)
- satisficing: panel surveys and Natsal-3 CASI show more neutral points (i.e., “don’t know,” “depends,” or “neither agree nor disagree”) when compared with the same (or similar) opinion questions in Natsal-3 CAPI
- social desirability bias
- straightlining, and answers in scale questions

- straightlining*waves; waves*gender*age*marital status*immigration*education*10 grid questions*implausible/plausible straightlining (generalized estimating equations logistic regression)
- strong axiom of revealed preference violations as data quality metrics (i. e., low-probability screening questions, failing "trap questions", straight-lining, speeding, and inconsistent answers); response differences when passing and failing quarantining metrics

TITLE OF DATA FILE (F3):

Usage of online panels in survey methodology field, 2016: A systematic review - individual panel study

(CS_represent, PRQ_Qdesign, PRQ_RR, PRQ_ME)

CS_represent (CS_repr)

- for age, gender, education and household size (representative to the same variables of the GS survey)
- for age, gender, income, and race/ethnicity
- for age*gender only
- for all socio-demographic variables
- for all socio-demographic variables, urbanization region, ethnical background, and voting behavior (better than the panel consisting only of Internet households)
- for demographics (gender, age, race, ethnicity, education, annual household income, political affiliation, and marital status), and residential characteristics (type of home/dwelling structure, and type of living area)
- for demographics, household income, and self-reported health status
- for household structure, income, employment, age, gender, and citizenship
- for socio-demographic and employment related covariates of both the LW and the LISS samples in comparison to the population distributions of Statistics Netherlands
- for socio-demographic variables (less representative than the population-based probability sample of Natsal-3 survey)
- for socio-demographic variables, and personality traits in different selection stages
- for socio-economic characteristics
- for urbanicity, region, sex, age, household type, and unemployment rate, but NOT for level of education, purchasing power, and immigration
- panel vendors underrepresent adults who did not graduate from high school or had annual incomes less than US $15,000, while are representative for Census Bureau divisions only
- significant differences between the online panel and either of the face-to-face reference surveys on most of the demographic and attitudinal variables
- the LISS panel is not representative of the Dutch population for demographics, voting behavior, and Internet access; the LISS panelis quite close to a traditional face-to-face survey, except for the coverage of the elderly and non-Internet population; the LISS panel better represents the elderly, non-Internet users, people with a non-Western background, and Christian Democratic Party voters than the unweighted online survey; online access panels on average differ more from the population than the LISS panel on people

with a non-Western background, voting behavior, Christian Democratic Party voters, and non-Internet users

- the representativeness of the online panel's participants for age and education is not quite equivalent to that of the FNES or the phone survey

PRQ_Qdesign (PRQ_Qde)

- comparison of question layout choices (table, scale orientation, and radio buttons/wide buttons) in 3 experimental conditions (computer, hybrid, and mobile)
- design effect (one-item-per-screen approach); questions about the use and attitude towards insurances compared between 2 groups of panel waves of the Insurance Study (4 with old design and 4 with new design)
- evaluation of the questionnaire between mobile and desktop completion
- experiment on question order effect (open-ended question before or after societal issues)
- experiment with 3 interactive features (motivational statement with initial question, follow-up probe, and follow-up probe with motivational statement) tested on 4 questions (one is the control version)
- experiment with 4 preselection (emphasis on the answer category or the item) and postselection (shaded table cell or row) visual feedbacks
- experiment with two different question wordings (3 denomination+traditional denomination options vs. only one denomination+traditional denomination options)
- experimental design with 2 survey modes (mobile app, and PC web), 2 questionnaire version (A, and B), and 4 question format experiments (low/high-frequency scale, closed- ended/half- open "Other" category, small/large text box, and alphabetized/randomized response list)
- items per screen (paging versus scrolling groups), layout (vertical versus horizontal), number of answer options (5, 7, and 11 points), open-ended versus closed-ended (figure on 1 to 10 scale), avoiding open-ended “Other” option (“Other” versus “Other, specify")
- opinions about different features of the questionnaire (orientation, color, design, and usability), and factors which are important for panelists when taking part in an online survey; questions about the evaluation of the questionnaire compared between 2 groups of volunteer panelists from the online community (1 with old design and 1 with new design)
- order of responses (standard, and reverse)
- survey 1 (visual feedback): 5 versions of the grid (baseline, dynamic columns, dynamic rows, split grids 1, and split grids 2)
- survey 2 (visual complexity, and number of grids): 7 versions of the grid (one grid, low clutter; two grids, low clutter; three grids, low clutter; one grid, high clutter; two grids, high clutter; three grids, high clutter; baseline)

PRQ_RR

- ANES Panel Study: initial panel recruitment refusals, natural log of the number of call attempts, dichotomized callback variable at the median to indicate a busy or hard-to-reach respondent, and a measure of reluctance (that combines refusal conversion and callback attempts measures); ANES Panel Study: respondent reluctance*satisficing

- breakoff rates
- completion rate
- different types of incentives (5 experiments + control group): a cash prize lottery, 2 monetary donations, and 2 text appeals (altruistic and egotistic) + no incentive
- e-mail invitation with or without the attribute "survey topic"
- experimental design with 2 survey modes (PC web, and mobile web) and 2 lengths of the questionnaire (short, and long); number of completed questionnaires*start rate*completion rate*break off rate
- experimental design with 3 survey modes (computer, hybrid, and mobile): response rate
- experimental design: recruitment/response (=initial panel recruitment rate) and survey participation*survey mode (iPhone vs. PC)
- GfK/KN study 1 - phone mode: number of call attempts, natural log of the number of call attempts, and multiple calls; GfK/KN study 1 - web mode: reminder e-mail, natural log of the number of days after the field date it took to for the respondent to complete the survey, and mean proportion of previously completed surveys (only respondents who were invited to participate in at least 10 surveys are examined); GfK/KN study 1 - web mode: respondent reluctance*satisficing
- GfK/KN study 2: reminder e-mail, natural log of the number of days after the field date it took to for the respondent to complete the survey, and mean proportion of previously completed surveys (only respondents who were invited to participate in at least 10 surveys are examined); GfK/KN study 2: respondent reluctance*satisficing
- imputation as a way to estimate nonresponse bias: differences between measured opinions and imputed opinions (38 items)
- invitation modes (text message and e-mail)*response rate; invitation mode*response speed (in the first 24 hours)
- item-nonresponse, and item-nonresponse to an open question
- lotteries (2 studies) to analyse the effect on participation (=response at the study's first page) and completion rates
- lotteries (3 experiments) and offering study results as a way to increase participation (but no effect on completion); participation (=whether a person calls up the study’s first page) rate and completion rate
- lotteries (5 experiments); start rate and completion rate
- offering a survey that is suitable for smartphones to increase younger panel members' participation, effects of design on breakoffs, nonresponse
- response rate
- response rates (initial response rate to a specific question, and response rate after a follow-up probe for a specific question)
- sensitive indices*gender*age*nonresponse (prediction) in wave 2, among those who completed the survey via PC in the first wave (logistic regression)
- survey 1 (visual feedback): 5 versions of the grid (baseline, dynamic columns, dynamic rows, split grids 1, and split grids 2)*mean completion time; breakoff rates
- survey 2 (visual complexity, and number of grids): 7 versions of the grid (one grid, low clutter; two grids, low clutter; three grids, low clutter; one grid, high clutter; two grids, high clutter; three grids, high clutter; baseline)*mean completion time; breakoff rates
- survey mode (mobile app, and PC web)*completion rate*break off rate

PRQ_ME

- ANES Panel Study: satisficing (selecting the first reasonable response in the 47 response order manipulations); ANES Panel Study: respondent reluctance*satisficing
- experimental conditions (items per screen, layout, number of answer options, open-ended versus closed-ended, and avoiding open-ended “Other” option)*item nonresponse*selecting first option*selecting last option*median completion time*mean ease of completion (1=very difficult to 7=very easy)
- experimental design: survey access*survey length*latency period between survey invitation and first survey access; (the same first two variables)*participation time in minutes;(the same first two variables)*detail and consistency of responses to brand funnel questions; (the same first two variables)*number of characters of an open-ended question; (the same first two variables)*conspicuous response behavior in grid statements (same scale point regardless of item, trap question answered incorrectly, and item with reverse polarity answered inconsistently); survey access*choice-based conjoint exercise for mobile telephone contracts (=respondents were asked 12 times to indicate their preferences from among varying combinations of four contracts options, then Sawtooth's Hierarchical Bayes software iteratively estimated coefficients of a logit model of preferences and tested its accuracy against observed preferences)
- experimental design: total completion time, number of questions asked, item missing rates, number of characters entered for open-ended items, and slider bar questions response*survey mode (iPhone vs. PC)
- GfK/KN study 1: satisficing (don't know/no opinion; midpoint selection; nondifferentiation; mental coin flipping=expectation that difficult-to-obtain respondents are more likely to choose response options randomly, that can be tested by examining the relationships between some criterion variables and a a variable that has been shown to be correlated with those criterion variables time and time again); GfK/KN study 1 - web mode: respondent reluctance*satisficing
- GfK/KN study 2: satisficing (don't know/no opinion; midpoint selection; nondifferentiation; mental coin flipping=expectation that difficult-to-obtain respondents are more likely to choose response options randomly, that can be tested by examining the relationships between some criterion variables and a a variable that has been shown to be correlated with those criterion variables time and time again); GfK/KN study 2: respondent reluctance*satisficing
- GLES data: satisficing (no answer, "don't know", middle category, and straight-lining)*response time on the respective survey page
- impact of lotteries and offering study results on item nonresponse
- impact of lotteries and offering study results on nondifferentiation (=straightlining) and item nonresponse
- impact of lotteries on straightlining, item nonresponse, "no comment" option, and length of open-ended answers
- item nonresponse, and number of words of open-ended questions
- item nonresponse, changes in answers, and nondifferentiation
- item nonresponse, open questions, straightlining, timing questions, total time used for the questionnaire
- item nonresponse, open-ended questions (two numeric and one comment questions), and nonsubstantive responses ("don't know responses")
- item nonresponse*completed open question*mean length of open answers*straightlining*primacy effect*mean number of answers in check-all-that-apply*mean duration of questionnaire*mean evaluation*experimental condition (PC, tablet, and smartphone) (ANOVA); (the same first 8 variables)*device switch in 6 waves; changes in the same 8 variables*7 types of device switches

- length of answers to an open question, straightlining, choice of left-aligned answer options in horizontal scales, and survey duration
- measurement invariance (configural, metric, and scalar invariances)
- open-ended question (=final comment) categorized (9 categories) and compared between the two panel samples
- order of responses (standard, and reverse)*survey mode*PC web X standard order*6 radio buttons and check boxes (frequency of mobil web usage on average, experience in using mobile web, frequency of mobile web usage yesterday, time spent in mobile web yesterday, satisfaction with life, and changes in quality of life) (ordinal logistic regressions); survey mode*gender*age*education*place of completing the survey*rate of socially undesirable responses (ordinary least squares regression); non-substantive responses (index that counted the number of ‘‘Difficult to answer’’ responses in 16 radio button questions,check box question, open-ended question, and numeric open-ended question)*survey mode; length of open answers (number of characters, and time to type an answer)*survey mode*mobile feature phone/mobile smartphone*mobile non-touchscreen/mobile touchscreen phone
- response latency, straightlining response bias (comparing response distribution under the 2 topic interest conditions and the 3 salience conditions), and item nonresponse
- response quality in the recruitment questionnaire (item nonresponse, no opinion responses to four attitude measures, and non-differentiation in the same four attitudes measures); response quality in the first wave (item nonresponse, amount of information given to a "check all that apply" question, non-differentiation, and preference for scale midpoints); factors contribute to cooperation/non-cooperation*response quality in the recruitment survey (OLS regression equations); mean scores on response quality indicators*attrition propensity (wave 1); attrition propensity*recruitment cohort*interaction between the first two variables*rate of midpoint responding (wave 9)
- survey 1 (visual feedback): 5 versions of the grid (baseline, dynamic columns, dynamic rows, split grids 1, and split grids 2)*missing data (count, and rate)*"never" responses*fruits endorsed*commission error*variance of responses*nondifferentiation*full- or near-straightlining
- survey 1 (visual feedback): 5 versions of the grid (baseline, dynamic columns, dynamic rows, split grids 1, and split grids 2)*missing data (count, and rate)*"never" responses*fruits endorsed*commission error*variance of responses*nondifferentiation*full- or near-straightlining*mean completion time
- survey 2 (visual complexity, and number of grids): 7 versions of the grid (one grid, low clutter; two grids, low clutter; three grids, low clutter; one grid, high clutter; two grids, high clutter; three grids, high clutter; baseline)*"no" or missing responses*count of fruits endorsed*missing data rate for frequency items and for amount items
- survey 2 (visual complexity, and number of grids): 7 versions of the grid (one grid, low clutter; two grids, low clutter; three grids, low clutter; one grid, high clutter; two grids, high clutter; three grids, high clutter; baseline)*"no" or missing responses*count of fruits endorsed*missing data rate for frequency items and for amount items*mean completion time
- survey mode (mobile app, and PC web)*median completion time
- survey mode*wave*gender*age*sensitive indices (linear mixed model); (the same 4 variables)*context variables*response order (in attitude questions)*sensitive indices (linear mixed model)
- time to complete the questionnaire, timing of questionnaire completion after invitations were sent, length of the answer to an open-ended question, item nonresponse, ‘‘check-all-that-apply’’ question, and primacy effect