Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-101

Advanced statistical modeling

Convenor Dr Jarl Kampen (Research Methodology Group, Wageningen UR, The Netherlands)

1. A Poisson Regression Model Handling Truncated Data with Multiple Inflations
Dr Ting Hsiang Lin (NTPU)
Dr Min-hsiao Tsai (NTPU)

2. A simple test to substantiate the claim that ordinal variables are the product of underlying bivariate normal distributions
Dr Jarl Kampen (Research Methodology Group, Wageningen UR, The Netherlands)
Dr Arie Weeren (Statua, Antwerp University, Belgium)

3. Continuous functions: Approximation via Sampling and Coefficient of Variation
Professor Nikolaos Farmakis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of Mathematics)
Ms Ioanna Papatsouma (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of Mathematics)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-101

Analyses of social change with cross-sectional and longitudinal data 1

Convenor   Ms Malgorzata Mikucka (Universite catholique de Louvain)
Coordinator 1   Mr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC, Luxembourg)

Session Details

The availability of repeated cross-sectional surveys and of panel data allows analyzing social change over time. This kind of analyses became popular after the recent studies on the relationship between economic growth and the trends of subjective well-being. Since then, this approach has been applied in various domains. Currently, researchers are increasingly interested in combining longitudinal and cross-sectional approaches to study social change. However, this field of research is still in its infancy and consequences of various methodological choices are still not well understood.

This session invites papers discussing the conceptual and methodological problems of analyzing social change over time with data such as macro-level time series, cross-sectional, and longitudinal surveys. In particular we welcome substantive research which investigates social change over time, presents novel methodological approaches, as well as postulates "good practices" in analyzing such data. The topics include, but are not restricted to:

1. Research which investigates short- and long-term trends over time, as well as discusses methods of estimating trends and their consequences;
2. Analyses of relationships between changes occurring in various domains of social life, performed both within time-series and comparative frameworks;
3. Papers that distinguish between the effects of cross-sectional differences and the effects of overtime changes of the same factors;
4. Studies analyzing social change with comparative panel data.

1. The coevolution of inequality and tolerance: Contextual changes and acceptance of homosexuality across 28 countries, 1981-2013
Dr Raül Tormos (University of Barcelona & Centre d'Estudis d'Opinió)

2. Modernization and the change in attitudes toward female public role 1988-2008. Drivers and mechanisms of change in 7 cultural contexts
Ms Vera Lomazzi (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan)

3. Measuring Social and Individual Change with Different Longitudinal Research Designs
Dr Tobias Gummer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. Gender, backwardness and mobility: post-2000s India
Dr Mariko Kato (Seinan Gakuin University)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-201

Assessing the Quality of Survey Data 1

Convenor Professor Joerg Blasius (University of Bonn)

Session Details

This session will provide a series of original investigations on data quality in both national and international contexts. The starting premise is that all survey data contain a mixture of substantive and methodologically-induced variation. Most current work focuses primarily on random measurement error, which is usually treated as normally distributed. However, there are a large number of different kinds of systematic measurement errors, or more precisely, there are many different sources of methodologically-induced variation and all of them may have a strong influence on the "substantive" solutions. To the sources of methodologically-induced variation belong response sets and response styles, misunderstandings of questions, translation and coding errors, uneven standards between the research institutes involved in the data collection (especially in cross-national research), item- and unit non-response, as well as faked interviews. We will consider data as of high quality in case the methodologically-induced variation is low, i.e. the differences in responses can be interpreted based on theoretical assumptions in the given area of research. The aim of the session is to discuss different sources of methodologically-induced variation in survey research, how to detect them and the effects they have on the substantive findings.

1. Data quality in repeated surveys. Evidences from a quasi-experimental design
Professor Alessandra Decataldo (Università di Milano Bicocca)
Professor Antonio Fasanella (Sapienza Università di Roma)
Dr Andrea Amico (Sapienza Università di Roma)
Mr Giampiero D'alessandro (Sapienza Università di Roma)
Mrs Annalisa Di Benedetto (Sapienza Università di Roma)

2. Call me maybe? Using phone numbers as indicators of survey data quality
Dr Annie Pettit (Peanut Labs)

3. Processing Errors in the Cross-national Surveys
Ms Ilona Wysmulek (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)
Mrs Olena Oleksiyenko (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)

4. How does household composition derived from census data describe or misrepresent different family types?
Dr Loïc Trabut (Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques (INED))
Professor Eva Lelièvre (Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques (INED))

5. Unexpectedly High Number of Duplicates in Survey Data
Mr Przemek Powa?ko (Polish Academy of Sciences)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-106

Assuring Measurement Quality in the Social Sciences – new standards for quality documentation 1

Convenor	Professor Beatrice Rammstedt (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1	Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 2	Dr Constanze Beierlein (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Conclusions drawn from survey data can only be reliable if the survey instruments (e.g. survey questions and questionnaires) are of sufficient quality. Based on the Total Survey Error approach accessing and documentation of measurement quality in surveys will be addressed. The aim of the session is to evaluate existing standards and current survey practices with respect to the measurement error in surveys and to discuss advantages and limitations as well future developments. Researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with standards and practices in assessment and documentation of measurement quality in surveys, such as assuring the validity of a measure as well diminishing non-systematic, systematic, and processing errors.

1. Assuring Measurement Quality in the Social Sciences - new standards for quality documentation
Professor Beatrice Rammstedt (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Constanze Beierlein (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. Reliability Estimation Methods
Mr Daniel Danner (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. Survey Quality Prediction (SQP 2.0) a tool to quantify survey quality
Professor Willem Saris (UPF)
Dr Daniel Oberski (Tilburg University)
Dr Melanie Revilla (UPF)
Mrs Diana Zavala Rojas (UPF)

4. Implementation of quality management models and strategies for documentation in CBS
Mr Mario Gavri? (IASS)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N-132

Basic Human Values 1

Convenor   Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Zurich)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jan Cieciuch (University of Zurich and Cardinal Stefan Wyszy?ski University in Warsaw)
Coordinator 2 Dr Constanze Beierlein (GESIS)

Session Details

The 4th session organizer is Professor Peter Schmidt, peter.schmidt@sowi.uni-giessen.de, University of Giessen

Values have held an important position in the social sciences since their inception. Max Weber treated values as a central component in his analysis of capitalist society, linking the development of capitalism to the values of the Protestant Ethic. Values have played an important role not only in sociology, but in social psychology, anthropology, political science and related disciplines as well. They have been used to explain the motivational bases of attitudes and behavior and to characterize differences between both individuals and societies.

In 1992, Schwartz introduced a theory of ten basic human values, building on common elements in earlier approaches. The designers of the European Social Survey (ESS) chose this theory as the basis for developing a human values scale to include in the core of the survey. Recently, this theory has been extended to include 19 values (Schwartz et al., 2012) and a new scale, the PVQ-RR, has been developed to measure them.

In this session continuing work on basic human values as postulated by Schwartz will be presented. Presentations which discuss (1) The measurement of human values; (2) Values as predictors of attitudes, opinions or behaviour; (3) Value change; and related topics are welcome. Both substantive and methodological papers using cross-sectional, cross-cultural or longitudinal datasets are welcome.

1. Use of Facet Theory in Developing Values Theory of Shalom Schwartz
Professor Kazufumi Manabe (Aoyama Gakuin University, Japan)

2. Is there Horizontal Transmission of Adolescent Value Orientations: A Preliminary Methodological Inquiry
Professor Klaus Boehnke (Jacobs University Bremen)
Dr David Schiefer (Jacobs University Bremen)

3. A longitudinal study on value change among children in five cohorts
Dr Jan Cieciuch (University of Zurich)
Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Zurich)
Professor Rene Algesheimer (University of Zurich)

4. Universalism, Conservation, and Attitudes toward Minority Groups
Ms Anabel Kuntz (University of Cologne)
Dr Constanze Beierlein (GESIS Mannheim)
Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Zurich)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-102

Comparing the individual name, address and household samples in comparative surveys

Convenor   Dr Piotr Jabkowski (Institute of Sociology, University of Poznan, Poland)
Coordinator 1 Professor Ryszard Cichocki (Quality of LIfe Research Centre, University of Poznan, Poland)

Session Details

Existing literature on survey methodology is not rich in studies of the relationship between the type of sample-frames and the patterns of their fieldwork execution. Most studies focus on the impact of the within-household selection of respondent (characteristic of the address and household samples) on the imperfect coverage of the individuals comprising the population; much less attention has been devoted to the problem of what effects the different sample-frames have on the response-rates and the post-survey structure of the set of respondents and non-respondents.

On the one hand, given the necessity of multi-stage selection of respondents in address and household samples, one would expect lower response and cooperation rates than in the individual-name samples. On the other hand, due to the fact that in the address and household samples there are limits of the control that researchers actually have over the respondent selection, the interviewers may be inclined to select respondent with a higher readiness to cooperate. In other words, if there were to be systematic irregularities committed in the selection of individuals within address and household samples, the contact rates should be higher and refusal rates lower than in individual samples.

The present session would focus on theoretical issues and practical challenges connected with:
- the process of intra-unit selection of respondents;
- within-unit coverage errors;
- statistical consequences of random selection of individuals within address / household samples;
- data sources for individual and address-based / household samples;
- fieldwork based on address and individual-based / household samples;
- response rates in address and individual-based / household samples;
- cooperation and refusal rates in address / household and individual-based samples.

1. Accuracy and Coverage Assessment of House units Frame using Post-Frame update survey (PFS) Methods
Dr Elmogiera Elawad (Social and Economic Survey Research Institute - Qatar University)
Mr Mohamed Agied (Social and Economic Survey Research Institute - Qatar University)

2. RDD versus List Samples. CATI Interviewers' Experience
Dr Wojciech Jablonski (University of Lodz)

3. Nonresponse and Bias in the German Sample of European Social Survey
Mr Michael Weinhardt (Bielefeld University)
Professor Stefan Liebig (Bielefeld University)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-104

Design of Response Scales in (Mobile) Web Surveys

Convenor   Mrs Franziska Gebhard (University of Mannheim)
Coordinator 1 Professor Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)
Coordinator 2 Professor

Session Details

This session focuses on the latest methodology research on ratings scales for desktop and mobile surveys. The two main topics are the implementation of graphical rating scales in online surveys, and the design of answer formats for online, mixed-device, or mobile surveys.

Web surveys offer a wide range of possibilities to design answer scales that are unique to this mode of data collection. Graphical elements like for example slider scales are sometimes used as replacement for rather conventional HTML elements (e.g., radio buttons or checkboxes). Yet the question remains if the quality of these data is the same, there might also be a difference between measurement effects and respondent preferences.

Furthermore, the use of mobile phones or tablets increases. Thus, researchers face new challenges when designing response scales also for small screen devices or devices that are operated by touch screen. Liquid or responsive questionnaire designs (e.g., grid questions on desktop computers versus one item per page on smartphones) as well as new HTML5 input types try to tackle these problems. However, this actually leads to different question contexts, which could affect question understanding and data quality. For example, rating scales optimized for touch screen devices (e.g., HTML5 slider scales or date/time picker) could lead to different ratings on desktop computers.

We encourage submitting papers with a focus on
– the impact of graphical rating scales on data quality
– the implementation of response scales in mixed-device or mobile Web surveys
– new HTML5 input types (e.g., date/time picker, range, or autocomplete)

1. Mobile devices in a web panel: what are the results of adjusting questionnaires for smartphones and tablets
Mr Arnaud Wijnant (Scientific Programmer)
Mrs Marika De Bruijne (Researcher)

2. The effect of response formats on data quality and comparability across online PC and smartphone surveys.
Miss Valerija Kolbas (University of Essex)
Mr Andrew Cleary (Ipsos-MORI)
Professor Nick Allum (University of Essex)

3. Moving beyond the discrete response in subjective scale survey questions
Professor Chris Barrington-leigh (McGill University)

4. A new preference elicitation method, "trio-wise", and its comparison to best-worst scaling
Dr Seda Erdem (University of Stirling)
Dr Danny Campbell (University of Stirling)

5. Higher Item Nonresponse Rates Caused by Slider Scales in Web Surveys
Dr Frederik Funke ((1) datamethods.net (2) LINK Institut)
Professor Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-102

Experimental designs in online survey research 1

Convenor Mr Henning Silber (Göttingen University)
Coordinator 1 Mr Jan Karem Hoehne (Göttingen University)
Coordinator 2 Professor Dagmar Krebs (Giessen University)

Session Details

Experimental studies have become increasingly popular in survey research and are carried out in various disciplines such as sociology, political science, linguistics, economics and psychology. In survey research experimental designs are useful tools to get a better understanding of cognitive processes in order to give better practice advice for improving study and questionnaire design. In particular, the technological advances have made it significantly easier to use experimental designs in online field experiments as well as in computerized laboratory experiments.

This session invites presentations on empirical studies and theoretical discussions of experimental designs in online survey research.

- Empirical online research can include studies on response behavior and social desirability bias, as well as experiments on response rates and question design effects. Furthermore, we especially encourage presentations with replicated experimental results and welcome replications in different social contexts such as different cultural, educational and ethnic groups.
- Additionally, we invite presentations that discuss the value of experiments from a theoretical perspective. Theoretical presentations could contrast the merits and the limits of different forms of experimental study designs or provide a future outlook on the prospects of online experiments in survey research.

Presentations could cover the following research areas:

- Theory of experimental study designs
- Replication of experimental results
- Comparisons between different experimental designs (e. g., laboratory and field experiment)
- Split-ballot experiments (e. g., context effects, question order, response order, acquiescence, visual design effects, verbal effects)
- Choice experiments
- Laboratory experiments on response behavior (e. g., using eye tracking)
- Experiments with incentives
- Vignette studies
- Future prospects of experimental designs

1. Investigation of Response-Order-Effects using Eye Tracking
Mr Jan Karem Höhne (german)

2. Using eye tracking to examine respondent's processing of forced-choice vs. check-all-that-apply question formats
Ms Cornelia Neuert (Gesis - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. Direction of Response Format in Web and Paper & Pencil Surveys
Professor Dagmar Krebs (University of Giessen)

4. Comparing response order experiments with probability and non-probability samples
Mr Henning Silber (Göttingen University)
Professor Jon Krosnick (Stanford University)

Professor David Yeager (University of Texas at Austin)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-202

Interviewers' Deviations in Surveys 1

Convenor   Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Coordinator 1 Professor Peter Winker (University of Giessen)

Session Details

Interviewers' behavior might have an impact on survey data. The session deals with deviations from the instructions when contacting and interviewing respondents. These deviations might be caused by different factors such as task difficulty, interviewers' ability, experience and motivation, but also by the quality of questionnaires and instructions. Deviations might result in bias, but could also foster data quality, e.g. if interviewers try to help the respondents in providing a (correct) answer. The session aims to discuss both, deliberate (e.g. falsifications; providing explanation) and non-deliberate deviations (e.g. interviewers' mistakes).
Researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with all kinds of interviewers' deviations in the survey process which might result in non-observation or measurement errors but also positively influence survey outcomes. Of interest are theoretical approaches and empirical studies on detection and prevention, on explanatory factors and consequences of interviewers' deviations. Thus, interviewers' motivation to deviate from prescribed standards or to produce high quality survey data as well as interviewers' cognitive skills and competencies could be of interest.

1. Do formal survey data properties allow detection of falsified data?
Professor Ivan Rimac (University of Zagreb Faculty of Law Department of Social Work)
Dr Jelena Ogresta (University of Zagreb Faculty of Law Department of Social Work)

2. Interviewers' Abilities and the Quality of Responses
Professor Joerg Blasius (University of Bonn)

3. Detecting Fraudulent Interviewers by Improved Clustering Methods -- The Case of Falsifications of Answers to Parts of a Questionnaire
Professor Peter Winker (Justus-Liebig-University Giessen)
Mr Samuel De Haas (Justus-Liebig-University Giessen)

4. Explaining Political Action: A Comparison of Real and Falsified Survey Data
Mrs Uta Landrock (GESIS)
Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-206

Recent advances in business survey methodology

Convenor Professor Hans Kiesl (Regensburg University of Applied Sciences)

Session Details

Business surveys differ from household surveys in several respects and pose problems like an ambiguous definition of the survey units (firm or establishment), outdated frames, highly skewed distributions of interest, large differences in weights due to the usual pps design, and stratum jumpers (i.e. business units changing size class between the time of drawing the sample and actually surveying the sampled units).

This session aims to bring together researchers from different countries who are coping with methodological problems of business surveys. A special focus will lie on papers dealing with recent developments in job vacancy surveys, which are conducted in every member state of the European Union (and several other countries outside the EU).

1. Covering public sector organisations in business surveys: experiences from the 3rd European Company Survey
Dr Gijs Van Houten (Eurofound)
Dr Milos Kankaras (Eurofound)

2. Implementing a new weighting procedure for a large business survey
Dr Alexander Kubis (Institute for Employment Research)

Dr Martina Rebien (Institute for Employment Research)

3. Multi-mode interviewing in establishment surveys as a means to enhance response rates: Experiences from the multi-country survey "ESENER-2"
Mr Arnold Riedmann (TNS Infratest)
Mr Xabier Irastorza (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work)

4. Methodological challenges in trust research. A case of experimental study involving managers.
Mrs Anna Oleszkiewicz (University of Wroclaw)
Ms Kinga Lachowicz - Tabaczek (University of Wroclaw)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N-131

Social indicators as predictors of subjective well-being

Convenor   Mr Nicholas Otis (McGill University)

Session Details

A growing body of empirical evidence suggests that numerous subjective and objective factors are significantly associated with individual well-being. However, the interplay and causal linkages between these factors are frequently contested. Questions tapping well-being often vary between surveys, potentially impacting research outcomes. In this session, presenters are invited to share research examining the relationships between a diverse range of measures of well-being and its determinants. We encourage submissions from a wide variety of disciplinary, theoretical, and methodological backgrounds.

1. Agency as an indicator of wellbeing
Ms Kadri Rootalu (University of Tartu)
Dr Ave Roots (University of Tartu)

2. Trust as a factor of subjective life satisfaction in Russia
Mrs Anna Mironova (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

3. Associations with Income, Net Worth, and Relative Standard of Living in China
Mr Nicholas Otis (McGill University)

4. Alternatives to GDP - Measuring the Impact of Natural Disasters using Panel Data
Mr Philip Maschke (University of Applied Sciences Merseburg)
Professor Joerg Doepke (University of Applied Sciences Merseburg)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-103

Surveying immigrants and minorities from a comparative cross-country perspective 1

Convenor   Professor Hans-jürgen Andreß (Universität zu Köln)
Coordinator 1   Dr Rossalina Latcheva (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights)
Coordinator 2   Ms Ursula Till-tentschert (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights)

Session Details

Despite the ongoing demand for data on immigrants and ethnic minorities and the increasing availability of immigrant statistics, a considerable lack of comparable data on immigrants and ethnic minorities still persists. The reasons for this are manifold, e.g. diverging definitions of the target groups (by ethnicity, country of birth and country of birth of parents, nationality, and citizenship) and difficulties to properly cover the target population with traditional data collection methods.

One of the main challenges faced by survey researchers are incomplete or the lack of sampling frames. A cross-country and/or cross-cultural survey design introduces additional complexity in surveying immigrants and ethnic minorities. The heterogeneity in regard to applied methodologies (sampling, data collection modes, questionnaire design, translation and weighting) as well as with regard to legal status, language proficiency, and cultural norms of the target populations has an effect on the coherence of results between different groups of origin and between national contexts. Moreover, standard questionnaire classifications, such as ISCED for educational attainment, cannot easily be applied to immigrants and therefore calls for new concepts to be developed and applied.
This session welcomes contributions that focus on these challenges and that offer solutions for some of the difficulties

discussed. It welcomes theoretical contributions as well as survey applications in a cross-country or cross-cultural setting, with a special focus on immigrants, their descendants and ethnic minorities. We particularly encourage submissions which apply a comparative perspective to the following dimensions in survey research:
• Identification and definition of target groups
• Availability and accessibility of different sampling frames and their impact
• Application of different sampling strategies within one survey
• Approaches to reaching target populations
• Differences in field work organisation, training of interviewers
• Modes of interviewing and survey design
• Questionnaire design and translation
• Application of standard classifications
• Weighting

1. Mexicans in America
Dr Gabriela Farfan (World Bank)
Dr Maria Eugenia Genoni (World Bank)
Dr Duncan Thomas (Duke University)

2. Sampling minorities in New Zealand using a combination of imperfect strategies
Dr Robert Clark (University of Wollongong)

3. Surveying the immigrant: challenges and issues of comparability in a survey on EU migrants in four European cities
Dr Maurizio Curtarelli (Ecorys UK)
Miss Anja Meierkord (Ecorys UK)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-101

Surveying precarious topics

Convenor Mr Simon Henke (GESIS - Leiniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Sometimes social surveys are interested in very precarious topics. This can be unrecorded crime, very personal topics (e.g. sex) or even opinions, attitudes or behavior which might be stigmatized within the host society. This session should talk about how it is possible to get the right answer or if not what methods are possible to evaluate the credibility of the given answers.

How well do randomized response techniques (RRT) work in social surveys or which more recent techniques are used (e.g. Unmatched Count Technique, Non-randomized response approach)? Another way to get the correct answer within personal interviews could be to force the interviewer to evaluate the credibility of the given answers. This credibility diagnostic is typically done by the police or within court actions, but this might also be a technique for social surveys on precarious topics. The session is especially interested in experience with these techniques, but also in all practical implementation to get information about precarious topics.

1. Determinants of the trustability of response techniques for accessing sensitive information
Dr Sebastian Sattler (University of Cologne)
Professor Peter Graeff (University of Kiel)

2. An improved comparative sensitive question techniques evaluation study: detecting false positives
Mr Marc Höglinger (ETH Zurich)
Professor Andreas Diekmann (ETH Zurich)

3. Estimating the correlation between sensible behaviours dealing with item missing data
Miss Alessandra Gaia (University of Milan-Bicocca)

4. Studying sex work in Northern Ireland
Dr Dirk Schubotz (Queen's University Belfast)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-103

Using Paradata to Improve Survey Data Quality 1

Convenor   Professor Volker Stocké (University of Kassel, Germany)

Coordinator 1 Professor Jochen Mayerl (TU Kaiserslautern, Germany)
Coordinator 2 Dr Oliver Lipps (Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences (FORS), Lausanne, Switzerland)

Session Details

"Paradata" are measures generated as a by-product of the survey data collection process. Prominent examples of paradata are data available from the sampling frame, call-record data in CATI surveys, keystroke information from CAI, timestamp files, observations of interviewer behavior or respondents' response latencies (see Kreuter 2013 for an overview). These data can potentially be used to enrich questionnaire responses or to provide additional information about the survey (non-)participation process. In many cases paradata are available at no (or little) additional cost, but the theoretical basis for using paradata as indicator for survey data quality is very underdeveloped. Some examples about the use of paradata are:

Paradata in fieldwork monitoring and nonresponse research: Paradata are often used in the survey management context. With control charts survey practitioners can monitor fieldwork progress and interviewer performance. They are also indispensable in responsive designs as real-time information about fieldwork and survey outcomes which affect costs and errors. However, their role as indicator for interviewer or fieldwork effects, as well as predictors for nonresponse is unclear.

Paradata to understand respondent behavior: Paradata might aid assessing of the quality of survey responses, e.g. by means of response latencies or back-tracking. Research has used paradata to identify uncertainty in the answers given by respondents, e.g., if respondents frequently alter their answers. In this new strand of research, however, indicators might still be confounded and tap into multiple dimensions of the response process (e.g., response latencies may be an indicator for retrieval problems and/or satisficing).

1. An Experimental Comparison Using Paradata and Modeled Paradata To improve Interviewer Performance
Miss Tamara Terry (RTI International)

2. Interviewer Effects on Paradata Predictors of Nonresponse
Dr Rachael Walsh (U.S. Census Bureau)
Dr James Dahlhamer (National Center for Health Statistics)

3. Impact of Nonresponse on Survey Estimates of Physical Fitness and Sleep Quality
Dr Linchiat Chang (www.linchiat.com)

4. Using Paradata to Monitor Interviewer Data Quality
Ms Nicole Kirgis (University of Michigan)

Tuesday 14th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-105

Web surveys: challenges and strategies

Convenor   Dr Maria Clelia Romano (ISTAT)
Coordinator 1 Dr Francesca Gallo (ISTAT)

Session Details

Over the past decade the use of Internet has brought a profound effect on the survey methodology and the CAWI technique has received great attention from social researchers.
Social surveys can greatly benefit of the web techniques for two main reasons: on the one hand, the relative low cost of conducting web surveys makes them very competitive and well suited to the current budget constraints; on the other hand, they give a better chance to reach subgroups of population hardly accessible with other techniques.
Furthermore, the combined use of different survey techniques allows to improve the target population coverage and to overcome the drawbacks related to each single technique.
Nevertheless, the CAWI technique requires a great effort in order to design or redesign the entire survey system: the questionnaire, the interaction mode with the respondents, the reminder system and so on.
Although recent literature has provided interesting contributions, there are still gaps in our knowledge on how to deal with official government surveys, which are often much complex and involve a great deal of editing.
The researchers have to face old and new challenges, in a new context, which is strongly characterized by the spread of new technologies. Some of these challenges include the optimal design for questions that require complex coding (e.g. economic activity or occupation), the development of effective instructions to explain complex statistical concepts to respondents or the navigation improvement for complex household questionnaires.
Moreover, in the case of mixed mode, which techniques to combine in order to get the best from each? In which sequence?
The proposed session aims at sharing and discussing the ongoing experiences on web surveys on individuals and on mixed mode techniques including web. New approaches and best practices to improve data quality of the NSIs web surveys are extremely welcome.

1. Correlates of early and late responses to surveys in an online panel
Dr Salima Douhou (CentERdata, Tilburg University)
Mrs Corrie Vis (CentERdata, Tilburg University)

2. Is there any medicalization in celiac disease?
Dr Beba Molinari (Università degli studi di Genova)
Professor Cleto Corposanto (Unviersità Magna Graecia di Catanzaro)

3. Nonresponse and Measurement Bias in Web surveys
Ms Anke Metzler (Darmstadt University of Technology)
Mr Marek Fuchs (Darmstadt University of Technology)

4. The first ISTAT web survey on individuals: main choices and first results
Ms Maria Clelia Romano (ISTAT (Italian National Institute of Statistics))
Ms Francesca Gallo (ISTAT (Italian National Institute of Statistics))

5. Comparison of different mixed-mode and face - to face surveys - response rates and costs
Dr Mare Ainsaar (senior research fellow)
Mr Reigo Hendrikson (analyst)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: L-101

Analyses of social change with cross-sectional and longitudinal data 2

Convenor	Ms Malgorzata Mikucka (Universite catholique de Louvain)
Coordinator 1	Mr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC, Luxembourg)

Session Details

The availability of repeated cross-sectional surveys and of panel data allows analyzing social change over time. This kind of analyses became popular after the recent studies on the relationship between economic growth and the trends of subjective well-being. Since then, this approach has been applied in various domains. Currently, researchers are increasingly interested in combining longitudinal and cross-sectional approaches to study social change. However, this field of research is still in its infancy and consequences of various methodological choices are still not well understood.

This session invites papers discussing the conceptual and methodological problems of analyzing social change over time with data such as macro-level time series, cross-sectional, and longitudinal surveys. In particular we welcome substantive research which investigates social change over time, presents novel methodological approaches, as well as postulates "good practices" in analyzing such data. The topics include, but are not restricted to:

1. Research which investigates short- and long-term trends over time, as well as discusses methods of estimating trends and their consequences;
2. Analyses of relationships between changes occurring in various domains of social life, performed both within time-series and comparative frameworks;
3. Papers that distinguish between the effects of cross-sectional differences and the effects of overtime changes of the same factors;
4. Studies analyzing social change with comparative panel data.

1. Long term trends in life satisfaction in Europe explained(1973-2012
Dr Marc Callens (Research Centre of the Flemish Government)

2. Life satisfaction and domain satisfactions amid rapid economic growth: the case of South Korea
Professor Chris Barrington-leigh (McGill University)

3. Do changes in integration policies have an impact on people's attitudes towards immigrants? Evidence from a dynamic cross-country comparison of European countries.
Miss Marie-sophie Callens (Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research (LISER) & University of Leuven)

4. Differences between data sources and survey types: the impact of the educational expansion on wage inequality in Switzerland
Dr Ursina Kuhn (FORS)
Ms Laura Ravazzini (University of Neuchâtel)
Professor Christian Suter (University of Neuchâtel)

5. Trends in Exposure to Industrial Air Toxins for Different Racial and Socioeconomic Groups: A Spatial and Temporal Examination of Environmental Inequality in the U.S. from 1995 to 2004
Professor Kerry Ard (the Ohio State University)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: O-201

Assessing the Quality of Survey Data 2

Convenor Professor Joerg Blasius (University of Bonn)

Session Details

This session will provide a series of original investigations on data quality in both national and international contexts. The starting premise is that all survey data contain a mixture of substantive and methodologically-induced variation. Most current work focuses primarily on random measurement error, which is usually treated as normally distributed. However, there are a large number of different kinds of systematic measurement errors, or more precisely, there are many different sources of methodologically-induced variation and all of them may have a strong influence on the "substantive" solutions. To the sources of methodologically-induced variation belong response sets and response styles, misunderstandings of questions, translation and coding errors, uneven standards between the research institutes involved in the data collection (especially in cross-national research), item- and unit non-response, as well as faked interviews. We will consider data as of high quality in case the methodologically-induced variation is low, i.e. the differences in responses can be interpreted based on theoretical assumptions in the given area of research. The aim of the session is to discuss different sources of methodologically-induced variation in survey research, how to detect them and the effects they have on the substantive findings.

1. Design effects in household wealth surveys: results from the Eurosystem's Household Finance and Consumption Survey
Mr Guillaume Osier (European Central Bank)
Mr Pierre Lamarche (European Central Bank)

2. Survey Errors in Random Route Samples
Mr Johannes Bauer (Ludiwig-Maximilians Universität München)

3. Interviewer Effects in Real and Falsified Interviews - Results from a Large Scale Experiment
Professor Peter Winker (Justus-Liebig-University Giessen)
Mr Karl-wilhelm Kruse (Justus-Liebig-University Giessen)
Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim)

4. Measurement Error in Discontinuous Online Survey Panels: Panel Conditioning and Data Quality
Professor Lonna Atkeson (University of New Mexico)
Mr Alex Adams (University of New Mexico)
Professor Jeffrey Karp (University of Essex)

5. Cohen's kappa and its generalised nieces and nephews: time to say goodbye?
Dr Jarl Kampen (WUR)
Dr Hilde Tobi (WUR)
Mr Jurian Meijering (WUR)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: L-103

Assuring Measurement Quality in the Social Sciences – new standards for quality documentation 2

Convenor	Professor Beatrice Rammstedt (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1	Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 2	Dr Constanze Beierlein (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Conclusions drawn from survey data can only be reliable if the survey instruments (e.g. survey questions and questionnaires) are of sufficient quality. Based on the Total Survey Error approach accessing and documentation of measurement quality in surveys will be addressed. The aim of the session is to evaluate existing standards and current survey practices with respect to the measurement error in surveys and to discuss advantages and limitations as well future developments. Researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with standards and practices in assessment and documentation of measurement quality in surveys, such as assuring the validity of a measure as well diminishing non-systematic, systematic, and processing errors.

1. Best Practices in Short Scale Development: Comparing State-of-the-Art Methods using Simulated and Empirical Data
Dr Constanze Beierlein (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Germany)

Dr Peter Kruyen (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, The Netherlands)
Professor Beatrice Rammstedt (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Germany)

2. How well do short personality measures work? Comparison of the BFI-10 with the BFI-15 in the Swiss Household Panel
Dr Valérie-anne Ryser (FORS)

3. Evaluating the quality of education variables in cross-national surveys
Ms Verena Ortmanns (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N-132

Basic Human Values 2

Convenor Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Zurich)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jan Cieciuch (University of Zurich and Cardinal Stefan Wyszy?ski University in Warsaw)
Coordinator 2 Dr Constanze Beierlein (GESIS)

Session Details

The 4th session organizer is Professor Peter Schmidt, peter.schmidt@sowi.uni-giessen.de, University of Giessen

Values have held an important position in the social sciences since their inception. Max Weber treated values as a central component in his analysis of capitalist society, linking the development of capitalism to the values of the Protestant Ethic. Values have played an important role not only in sociology, but in social psychology, anthropology, political science and related disciplines as well. They have been used to explain the motivational bases of attitudes and behavior and to characterize differences between both individuals and societies.

In 1992, Schwartz introduced a theory of ten basic human values, building on common elements in earlier approaches. The designers of the European Social Survey (ESS) chose this theory as the basis for developing a human values scale to include in the core of the survey. Recently, this theory has been extended to include 19 values (Schwartz et al., 2012) and a new scale, the PVQ-RR, has been developed to measure them.

In this session continuing work on basic human values as postulated by Schwartz will be presented. Presentations which discuss (1) The measurement of human values; (2) Values as predictors of attitudes, opinions or behaviour; (3) Value change; and related topics are welcome. Both substantive and methodological papers using cross-sectional, cross-cultural or longitudinal datasets are welcome.

1. Validating Schwartz value theory with confirmatory latent class analysis
Mr Marko Sõmer (Tallinn University)

2. Where is the location of
Mr Henrik Dobewall (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)
Mr Toivo Aavik (University of Tartu)

3. Social axioms in cultural value transmission
Mr Georgi Dragolov (Jacobs University Bremen and BIGSSS)
Professor Klaus Boehnke (Jacobs University Bremen)

4. Value-Similarity and Social Trust: The relationship between Social Trust and Human Values in Europe
Miss Mai Beilmann (University of Tartu)
Mr Laur Lilleoja (Tallinn University)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: O-206

Conversations across the fence: Lessons for business survey methods drawn from social surveys, and vice-versa

Convenor Mr Alfred Tuttle (United States Census Bureau)

Session Details

Although typically treated separately in the literature and in practice, surveys of businesses and other organizations have much in common with social surveys of persons and households, namely that they are all completed by human beings. Effective survey requests, collection methods, and communications processes must be designed around the ways people think, interact with survey instruments, and communicate, whether they are being asked about the characteristics of their households or those of their employer.

While business surveys must contend with the additional dimensions of job specialization, information management systems, processes for coordinating work, and organizational goals and priorities, the basic cognitive processes involved in completing either type of survey (comprehension, retrieval, judgment, reporting) remain the same. Likewise, decisions about complying with survey requests are activated by social norms and psychological processes, such as altruism, cost-benefit analyses, social exchange theory, etc.

Thus, in large part, researchers have adapted and modified well-developed social survey methods for application in business surveys. However, with the advent of Web surveys, social surveys, traditionally conducted by interviewers, have been migrating to self-administration, long the primary data collection mode for business surveys. The evolution of the digital world has led to convergences in the design of, for example, Web pages and other electronic interfaces. Common practices in user-centered design shape norms for online interactions and the expectations of users, which become pertinent for both social and business surveys alike.

The purpose of this session is to engender dialogue among survey methodologists from both realms, considering both the application of lessons learned from social surveys to business surveys, and adaptations for business survey methods beyond those required for social surveys. The focus will be on questionnaire evaluation, design, testing and implementation of collection instruments, communication strategies, and other data collection procedures.

1. Second European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risks (ESENER-2) – Questionnaire development process
Mr Xabier Irastorza (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA))

2. From Concept to Question: Using Early Stage Scoping in an Establishment Survey for New Content Versus Revisions to Existing Questions
Ms Kristin Stettler (U.S. Census Bureau)

3. European Union Prescription Medication Study: Design and Field Procedures
Mrs Victoria Albright (RTI International)
Mr Scott P. Novak (RTI International)
Mr Frank Mierzwa (RTI International)
Mr Thomas S. Walker (RTI International)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-104

Direction of Response Scales

Convenor Dr Florian Keusch (University of Michigan)
Coordinator 1 Professor Ting Yan (University of Michigan)

Session Details

The measurement of many constructs in social and marketing research, such as attitudes, opinions, behaviors, personality traits, and personal states, heavily relies on the use of response scales. Survey literature has demonstrated that many design features of response scales (e.g., number of scale points, numeric and verbal labels, spacing of response options, alignment) affect how survey respondents process the scale and use these features to construct their responses. A response scale could run from the positive to the negative pole (e.g., "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree") or the highest to the lowest point (e.g., "all of the time" to "never"). The same scale could also run from the negative to the positive pole (e.g., "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree") or the lowest to the highest point (e.g., "never" to "all of the time"). An important question is then whether or not the direction of a response scale affects survey answers, holding constant the other features of the scale.
This session invites presentations that investigate the influence of scale direction on survey responses. We particularly invite presentations that analyze the influence of scale direction (1) under different modes of data collection, especially emerging modes, such as mobile Web and SMS/texting, (2) considering moderating effects of scale- and question-level characteristics, such as number of scale points, scale alignment, and question content, and (3) in a cross-cultural context.

1. Response scales: Effects of scale length and direction on reported political attitudes
Ms Marta Kolczynska (The Ohio State University, Polish Academy of Sciences)

2. Does Satisficing Drive Scale Direction Effects?
Dr Florian Keusch (University of Mannheim)
Dr Ting Yan (Westat)

3. Ordering Your Attention: Response Order Effects in Web-based Surveys
Dr Frances Barlas (GfK Custom Research)
Mr Randall Thomas (GfK Custom Research)

4. Impact of response scale direction on survey responses in web and mobile web surveys
Dr Ting Yan (Westat)
Dr Florian Keusch (University of Manheim)

5. The importance of scale direction between different modes
Ms Vilma Agalioti-sgompou (ISER, University of Essex, UK)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: L-102

Experimental designs in online survey research 2

Convenor   Mr Henning Silber (Göttingen University)
Coordinator 1 Mr Jan Karem Hoehne (Göttingen University)
Coordinator 2 Professor Dagmar Krebs (Giessen University)

Session Details

Experimental studies have become increasingly popular in survey research and are carried out in various disciplines such as sociology, political science, linguistics, economics and psychology. In survey research experimental designs are useful tools to get a better understanding of cognitive processes in order to give better practice advice for improving study and questionnaire design. In particular, the technological advances have made it significantly easier to use experimental designs in online field experiments as well as in computerized laboratory experiments.

This session invites presentations on empirical studies and theoretical discussions of experimental designs in online survey research.

- Empirical online research can include studies on response behavior and social desirability bias, as well as experiments on response rates and question design effects. Furthermore, we especially encourage presentations with replicated experimental results and welcome replications in different social contexts such as different cultural, educational and ethnic groups.
- Additionally, we invite presentations that discuss the value of experiments from a theoretical perspective. Theoretical presentations could contrast the merits and the limits of different forms of experimental study designs or provide a future outlook on the prospects of online experiments in survey research.

Presentations could cover the following research areas:

- Theory of experimental study designs
- Replication of experimental results
- Comparisons between different experimental designs (e. g., laboratory and field experiment)
- Split-ballot experiments (e. g., context effects, question order, response order, acquiescence, visual design effects, verbal effects)
- Choice experiments
- Laboratory experiments on response behavior (e. g., using eye tracking)
- Experiments with incentives
- Vignette studies
- Future prospects of experimental designs

1. Does Personalized Feedback Increase Respondent Motivation?
Mr Simon Kühne (Socio-Economic Panel (DIW Berlin))
Professor Martin Kroh (Socio-Economic Panel (DIW Berlin))

2. Redistribution preferences and acquiescence bias
Dr Elias Naumann (University of Mannheim)

3. Cheating in web surveys. Evidence from a split-ballot repeated experiment on knowledge questions on basic EU facts
Mr Cristiano Vezzoni (University of Trento, Italy)
Mr Riccardo Ladini (University of Trento, Italy)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-101

Interaction effects and group comparisons in nonlinear models

Convenor   Mr Heinz Leitgöb (University of Linz, Austria)
Coordinator 1 Professor Stefanie Eifler (University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Germany)

Session Details

In contrast to the linear model, the identification of interaction effects and differences in effects between groups in nonlinear models (e.g. logit, probit, Poisson, negative binomial, PH, AFT) is complicated by link functions deviating from identity form and constraints on the variance of random components. As a consequence, many traditional analytical strategies elaborated within the linear modeling approach proved as not appropriate for the identification of the aforementioned effects in nonlinear models. Thus far, this fact has not received all the attention it deserves.

For this reason we warmly welcome presentations dealing with
(i) the identification of interaction effects in all kinds of nonlinear models,
(ii) the separation of model inherent and product term induced interaction effects,
(iii) the relevance of model inherent interaction from a theoretical point of view,
(iv) the identification of differences in effects between groups in all kinds of nonlinear models, and
(v) the isolation of scaling effects in coefficients between groups.

Further, we highly appreciate presentations containing respective empirical applications.

1. Comparing coefficients of nonlinear multivariate regression models between equations
Mr Christoph Kern (University of Duisburg-Essen)
Mrs Petra Stein (University of Duisburg-Essen)

2. Combining Heterogeneous Choice and Fractional Response Models to Analyze Interaction Effects when the Dependent Variable is a Proportion
Professor Richard Williams (Sociology, University of Notre Dame)

3. Model Inherent and Product Term Induced Interaction Effects in Binary Logit Models
Mr Heinz Leitgöb (Goethe University of Frankfurt)
Mrs Stefanie Eifler (University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt)

4. Testing interaction hypotheses in Situational Action Theory
Ms Debbie Schepers (Bielefeld University)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: O-202

Interviewers' Deviations in Surveys 2

Convenor   Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Coordinator 1 Professor Peter Winker (University of Giessen)

Session Details

Interviewers' behavior might have an impact on survey data. The session deals with deviations from the instructions when contacting and interviewing respondents. These deviations might be caused by different factors such as task difficulty, interviewers' ability, experience and motivation, but also by the quality of questionnaires and instructions. Deviations might result in bias, but could also foster data quality, e.g. if interviewers try to help the respondents in providing a (correct) answer. The session aims to discuss both, deliberate (e.g. falsifications; providing explanation) and non-deliberate deviations (e.g. interviewers' mistakes).
Researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with all kinds of interviewers' deviations in the survey process which might result in non-observation or measurement errors but also positively influence survey outcomes. Of interest are theoretical approaches and empirical studies on detection and prevention, on explanatory factors and consequences of interviewers' deviations. Thus, interviewers' motivation to deviate from prescribed standards or to produce high quality survey data as well as interviewers' cognitive skills and competencies could be of interest.

1. Interviewer Effects on Measurement Error
Mrs Daniela Ackermann-piek (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim, Germany)
Professor Annelies G. Blom (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim, Germany)

2. The Effect of Reading Numbers in Telephone Interviews on Response Behavior

Mrs Marieke Haan (University of Groningen)
Dr Yfke Ongena (University of Groningen)

3. Effects of interviewer and respondent behavior on data quality: An investigation of question types and interviewer learning
Dr Antje Kirchner (University of Nebraska - Lincoln)
Dr Kristen Olson (University of Nebraska - Lincoln)

4. Assessing interviewers' reading out latencies for monitoring data quality
Ms Johanna Bristle (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging - MPISOC)
Dr Michael Bergmann (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging - MPISOC)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N-131

Survey data in composite indexes of well-being and socio-economic development 1

Convenor   Professor Krzysztof Zagorski (Kozminski University)

Session Details

There is a growing interest in composite indexes of well-being and socio-economic development, such as OECD "Better Life Index", Kingdom of Buthan's "Gross National Happiness", UNDP "Human Development Index", NEF "Happy Planet Index, a bit more recent proposal by Fitoussi, Sen and Stiglitz, Polish ALK "Index of Balanced Socio-Economic Development" etc. All of them are elaborated in a "beyond GDP" paradigm and in a tradition of social indicators research. Some are limited to objective and subjective social conditions only, some other combine social and economic dimensions, using both survey data and social as well as economic statistics. There are several substantive and methodological problems of these indexes, such as ways of selecting particular simple indicators (index components), relevance of objective and subjective indicators (especially those obtained by social surveys), weighting, constructing "middle-level" indexes and analyzing their interrelations, defining "leading" and "lagging" indexes, checking reliability and validity, analyzing the trends, generalizing and interpreting the results, etc. The papers discussing some of these issues or similar problems of integrating subjective and objective survey data with official and other statistical data into more general indexes at international, national or sub-national level are invited. Both methodological and substantive papers may be accepted, but the preference will be given to papers dealing jointly with the methodology of index construction and the interpretation of obtained results.

1. Beyond Satisfaction and Happiness Scales: The Socioemotional Well-Being Index (SEWBI)
Professor Eduardo Bericat (University of Seville)

2. The European Cultural Activity Index. Theoretical dimensions and methodological challenges
Dr Manuel Herrera-usagre (Andalusian Agency for Healthcare Quality. Department of Sociology. University of Seville)
Dr Ildefonso Marqués-perales (Department of Sociology. University of Seville.)

3. Towards the Development of a Composite Index for Consumerism
Dr MarÍa Dolores MartÍn-lagos LÓpez (UNIVERSITY OF GRANADA)

4. Evaluations and Predictions of Individual and Social Conditions as Elements of "Index of Balanced Economic and Social Development" ("IBESD") for Poland
Ms Katarzyna Piotrowska (Kozminski University)
Ms Krzysztof Zagórski (Kozminski University)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: O-101

Surveying Sensitive Issues: Challenges and Solutions 1

Convenor   Mr Marc Hoeglinger (ETH Zurich)
Coordinator 1   Professor Andreas Diekmann (ETH Zurich)
Coordinator 2   Professor Ben Jann (University of Bern)

Session Details

Surveying sensitive issues such as deviant behavior, stigmatizing traits, or controversial attitudes poses two challenges: The first challenge is data validity. Respondents are likely to misreport when asked sensitive questions, or they refuse answering such questions or even break off the interview. As a result, measurements are biased or incomplete. The second challenge is

respondents' privacy protection. Respondents' data must be carefully protected to avoid leakage of sensitive personal information. Although this concerns almost all surveys in principle, it becomes much more important when, for instance, highly illegal behavior or political attitudes under repression are surveyed.

Switching to self-administrated survey modes such as online interviews mitigates undesired response effects to some extent. Also, adjusting the questionnaire design and the question wording might attenuate response effects. However, empirical results are inconclusive so far and results seem to depend highly on the particular issue and population surveyed. Providing respondents with full response privacy through indirect techniques such as the Randomized Response Technique or the Item Count Technique is a potential solution to both problems mentioned. However, albeit privacy is completely protected by these methods if properly implemented, respondents often lack understanding of and trust in these methods, so that misreporting might not be reduced.

In this session we invite submissions that deal with problems of surveying sensitive issues and/or present potential solutions. We are interested in studies that evaluate established methods such as indirect question techniques, but also in contributions that come up with novel strategies. Furthermore, we encourage submissions that deal with the concept of "sensitivity" and present theoretical frameworks and/or empirical analyses that shed light on the cognitive process of answering sensitive questions and "editing" responses. Submissions on statistical methods to analyze data from special questioning techniques are also welcomed.

1. The randomized response bracketing design
Dr Maarten Cruyff (Utrecht University)
Professor Peter Van Der Heijden (Utrecht University)

2. The Effectiveness of the Item Sum Technique in Eliciting Valid Answers to the Income Question and Self-Reported Alcohol Consumption
Dr Felix Wolter (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz)

3. New versions of the item count technique
Professor Tasos Christofides (University of Cyprus)

4. Asking Sensitive Questions in Surveys: A Vivid Illustration of a Strategy Including True and Masked Responses
Professor Andreas Quatember (Associate Professor)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-103

Using Paradata to Improve Survey Data Quality 2

Convenor   Professor Volker Stocké (University of Kassel, Germany)
Coordinator 1 Professor Jochen Mayerl (TU Kaiserslautern, Germany)
Coordinator 2 Dr Oliver Lipps (Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences (FORS), Lausanne, Switzerland)

Session Details

"Paradata" are measures generated as a by-product of the survey data collection process. Prominent examples of paradata are data available from the sampling frame, call-record data in CATI surveys, keystroke information from CAI, timestamp files, observations of interviewer behavior or respondents' response latencies (see Kreuter 2013 for an overview). These data can potentially be used to enrich questionnaire responses or to provide additional information about the survey (non-)participation process. In many cases paradata are available at no (or little) additional cost, but the theoretical basis for using paradata as indicator for survey data quality is very underdeveloped. Some examples about the use of paradata are:

Paradata in fieldwork monitoring and nonresponse research: Paradata are often used in the survey management context. With control charts survey practitioners can monitor fieldwork progress and interviewer performance. They are also indispensable in responsive designs as real-time information about fieldwork and survey outcomes which affect costs and errors. However, their role as indicator for interviewer or fieldwork effects, as well as predictors for nonresponse is unclear.

Paradata to understand respondent behavior: Paradata might aid assessing of the quality of survey responses, e.g. by means of response latencies or back-tracking. Research has used paradata to identify uncertainty in the answers given by respondents, e.g., if respondents frequently alter their answers. In this new strand of research, however, indicators might still be confounded and tap into multiple dimensions of the response process (e.g., response latencies may be an indicator for retrieval problems and/or satisficing).

1. Predicting Response Times in Web Surveys
Mr Alexander Wenz (University of Essex)

2. Using response latencies in measurement-error models to account for the social desirability bias in surveys
Dr Robert Neumann (Technische Universität Dresden)
Mr Hagen Von Hermanni (Technische Universität Dresden)

3. Moderation Effects of Response Latencies and Meta-Judgments on Response-Effects and Attitude-Behavior Consistency
Professor Jochen Mayerl (University of Kaiserslautern)
Professor Volker Stocké (University of Kassel)

4. Non-observation bias in an address-register-based CATI/CAPI mixed mode survey
Dr Oliver Lipps (FORS, Lausanne, Switzerland)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-105

Web-based Surveys and Mobile Devices

Convenor   Professor Carsten Schröder (German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP))
Coordinator 1 Dr David Richter (German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP))

Session Details

According to figures from Germany's Federal Statistical Office, 51% of German Internet users are already using mobile devices to access the Internet.
The technical progress in communication technologies and their widespread use create new possibilities for collecting data in self-administered online surveys. Indeed, web-based surveys in combination with mobile devices like smart phones, tablet PCs, and so on are gaining rapidly in importance.
Lower costs, higher flexibility, and access to particular population subgroups are seen as the major advantages of these new technologies. At the same time, their use implies new challenges.
How should surveys be designed for these new technologies? Our session invites presentations that investigate how different devices may be combined and how they influence data quality. In particular, we welcome presentations that discuss the role of the use of a device in:
* survey errors
* self-selection
* response rates
* response patterns
* participation parameters (the number of completed questions, and the length of entries to open-ended questions)
* visual design
* survey administration

1. The use of Pcs, smartphones and tablets in a probability based panel survey. Effects on survey measurement error.
Dr Peter Lugtig (Utrecht University)
Dr Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)

2. Unplanned use of mobile devices in a probabilistic online panel survey: Patterns of use and implications for nonresponse and attrition.
Dr Teresio Poggio (Free University of Bozen-Bolzano)
Mr Kai Weyandt (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Wolfgang Bandilla (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Professor Michael Bosnjak (Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, University of Mannheim)

3. Adapting Grid Questions for Mobile Devices
Ms Marika De Bruijne (CentERdata, Tilburg University)
Professor Marcel Das (CentERdata)
Professor Arthur Van Soest (Tilburg University)
Mr Arnaud Wijnant (Scientific Programmer)

Tuesday 14th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-102

Weighting issues in complex cross-sectional and longitudinal surveys 1

Convenor   Ms Nicole Watson (University of Melbourne)
Coordinator 1   Dr Olena Kaminska (University of Essex)

Session Details

A range of issues arise when constructing weights for surveys with complex designs. Use of mixed modes or multiple frames in cross-sectional, longitudinal or cross-national surveys may result in uncertainty in selection probabilities, fieldwork outcomes or response propensities that make it difficult to construct appropriate weights. Further, longitudinal surveys tend to have greater uncertainty over time (as interviews are no longer attempted with some people). Growing complexity of design for multi-purpose surveys calls for the development of weighting methods to reflect them.

How should weights be best constructed in the presence of uncertainty about inclusion probabilities or fieldwork outcomes? How should the response process be best modeled in cross-national surveys where countries differ in quality and type of sampling frame and other auxiliary data? For surveys with multiple frames, how do we best construct weights that combine samples from multiple sources that may have partial overlap in the presence of uncertainty about membership? In constructing weights for longitudinal samples, we need to consider how populations are defined over time, how to treat deaths and other out-of-scopes, how best to adjust for attrition. Further, in household-based longitudinal surveys we need to determine how to best incorporate new sample members arising from changes in the household structure.

This session seeks to bring together survey methodologists involved in constructing weights for complex surveys (both longitudinal and cross-sectional) to explore the approaches taken. Papers submitted to this session might include comparisons of alternative methods, analysis of the impact of a particular component of the weights, or suggestions for new methods.

1. An evaluation of alternative weightings for analysis of a complex cross-sectional health survey
Dr Robert Clark (University of Wollongong)

2. What is a representative genome? The challenges and benefits of applying complex survey weights to genome-wide data
Dr Colter Mitchell (University of Michigan)
Dr Steven Heeringa (University of Michigan)
Dr Roderick Little (University of Michigan)

3. Weighting the European Social Survey: A comparison of effects on selected variables across countries and rounds
Ms Ana Slavec (University of Ljubljana)
Mr Vasja Vehovar (University of Ljubljana)

4. Dead or Alive? Dealing with Unknown Eligibility in a Longitudinal Survey
Ms Nicole Watson (University of Melbourne)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-201

Assessing the Quality of Survey Data 3

Convenor Professor Joerg Blasius (University of Bonn)

Session Details

This session will provide a series of original investigations on data quality in both national and international contexts. The starting premise is that all survey data contain a mixture of substantive and methodologically-induced variation. Most current work focuses primarily on random measurement error, which is usually treated as normally distributed. However, there are a large number of different kinds of systematic measurement errors, or more precisely, there are many different sources of methodologically-induced variation and all of them may have a strong influence on the "substantive" solutions. To the sources of methodologically-induced variation belong response sets and response styles, misunderstandings of questions, translation and coding errors, uneven standards between the research institutes involved in the data collection (especially in cross-national research), item- and unit non-response, as well as faked interviews. We will consider data as of high quality in case the methodologically-induced variation is low, i.e. the differences in responses can be interpreted based on theoretical assumptions in the given area of research. The aim of the session is to discuss different sources of methodologically-induced variation in survey research, how to detect them and the effects they have on the substantive findings.

1. How a Comprehensive Program Interface Reduces the Time Cost of Survey Data Editing
Mr Richard Windle (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System)

2. Sampling designs of the European Social Survey during seven first rounds
Professor Seppo Laaksonen (University of Helsinki)
Professor Sabine Häder (Gesis)
Professor Siegfried Gabler (Gesis)

3. The effect of interviewer probing on item nonresponse and measurement error in cross-national surveys: A latent variable analysis
Dr Jouni Kuha (London School of Economics)
Dr Sarah Butt (City University London)
Dr Myrsini Katsikatsou (London School of Economics)

4. Interviewer related variance in substantive variables in the European Social Survey
Professor Geert Loosveldt (KuLeuven)
Dr Koen Beullens (Kuleuven)

5. Interviewer Effects in the European Social Survey 2010
Professor Joerg Blasius (University of Bonn)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N-132

Basic Human Values 3

Convenor   Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Zurich)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jan Cieciuch (University of Zurich and Cardinal Stefan Wyszy?ski University in Warsaw)
Coordinator 2 Dr Constanze Beierlein (GESIS)

Session Details

The 4th session organizer is Professor Peter Schmidt, peter.schmidt@sowi.uni-giessen.de, University of Giessen

Values have held an important position in the social sciences since their inception. Max Weber treated values as a central component in his analysis of capitalist society, linking the development of capitalism to the values of the Protestant Ethic. Values have played an important role not only in sociology, but in social psychology, anthropology, political science and related disciplines as well. They have been used to explain the motivational bases of attitudes and behavior and to characterize differences between both individuals and societies.

In 1992, Schwartz introduced a theory of ten basic human values, building on common elements in earlier approaches. The designers of the European Social Survey (ESS) chose this theory as the basis for developing a human values scale to include in the core of the survey. Recently, this theory has been extended to include 19 values (Schwartz et al., 2012) and a new scale, the PVQ-RR, has been developed to measure them.

In this session continuing work on basic human values as postulated by Schwartz will be presented. Presentations which discuss (1) The measurement of human values; (2) Values as predictors of attitudes, opinions or behaviour; (3) Value change; and related topics are welcome. Both substantive and methodological papers using cross-sectional, cross-cultural or longitudinal datasets are welcome.

1. Values and Group Boundaries: A Novel Measurement Technique
Dr Rengin Firat (University of Lyon)
Professor Steven Hitlin (University of Iowa)
Ms Hye Won Kwon (University of Iowa)

2. The influence of ethno-cultural type of family on the value orientations of young people: the Case of Siberia Region
Dr Mariya Abramova (Research Fellow Institute philosophy and law SB RAS Department of ethno-social research)
Dr Anna Almakaeva (HRU Higher School of Economics)
Mrs Galina Goncharova (Institute philosophy and law SB RAS Department of ethno-social research)

3. Basic human values higher-dimensional MDS-models and their typologies
Dr Indrek Tart (Tallinn University, Estonian Humanitarian Institute, CCCS)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: L-102

Experimental designs in online survey research 3

Convenor   Mr Henning Silber (Göttingen University)
Coordinator 1 Mr Jan Karem Hoehne (Göttingen University)
Coordinator 2 Professor Dagmar Krebs (Giessen University)

Session Details

Experimental studies have become increasingly popular in survey research and are carried out in various disciplines such as sociology, political science, linguistics, economics and psychology. In survey research experimental designs are useful tools to get a better understanding of cognitive processes in order to give better practice advice for improving study and questionnaire

design. In particular, the technological advances have made it significantly easier to use experimental designs in online field experiments as well as in computerized laboratory experiments.

This session invites presentations on empirical studies and theoretical discussions of experimental designs in online survey research.

- Empirical online research can include studies on response behavior and social desirability bias, as well as experiments on response rates and question design effects. Furthermore, we especially encourage presentations with replicated experimental results and welcome replications in different social contexts such as different cultural, educational and ethnic groups.
- Additionally, we invite presentations that discuss the value of experiments from a theoretical perspective. Theoretical presentations could contrast the merits and the limits of different forms of experimental study designs or provide a future outlook on the prospects of online experiments in survey research.

Presentations could cover the following research areas:

- Theory of experimental study designs
- Replication of experimental results
- Comparisons between different experimental designs (e. g., laboratory and field experiment)
- Split-ballot experiments (e. g., context effects, question order, response order, acquiescence, visual design effects, verbal effects)
- Choice experiments
- Laboratory experiments on response behavior (e. g., using eye tracking)
- Experiments with incentives
- Vignette studies
- Future prospects of experimental designs

1. The effectiveness of incentives on recruitment and retention rates: an experiment in a web survey
Mr Joris Mulder (CentERdata, Tilburg University)
Dr Salima Douhou (CentERdata, Tilburg University)

2. Placement of the Linkage Consent Question in a Web Survey of Establishments
Professor Joseph Sakshaug (University of Mannheim)
Ms Basha Vicari (Institute for Employment Research)

3. Finding Item Nonresponse Patterns: Three Internet Survey Experiments Into the Effects of Nonresponse Options on Item Nonresponse and Distribution of Opinions
Mrs Jannine Van De Maat (Leiden University)

4. Offline recruiting of young people for an online survey - what affects response rates
Dr Eva Zeglovits (University of Vienna and IFES (Institut für Empirische Sozialforschung))

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-103

Innovations in Computer-Assisted Data Collection

Convenor Ms Beth-ellen Pennell (Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan)
Coordinator 1 Ms Patty Maher (Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan)
Coordinator 2 Ms Gina Cheung (Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan)

Session Details

This session (or sessions) will focus on the rapid diffusion of technology and new methods and approaches in automated data collection, including those being used in new and innovative ways in developing or transitional countries. Presentations may address methods and technologies used in data collection for quality monitoring, to reduce costs, make data available more quickly, or to expand measures using such technologies as biometric and biohaviometric devices. We welcome papers that highlight new technologies or older technologies being used in new contexts and new ways. For example, the collection and analysis of rich paradata (process data) is increasingly being used in very diverse settings, even in contexts with very little data collection infrastructure. Other examples of the use of technologies in new contexts include audio computer assisted interviewing, audio recording, digital photography, use of global positioning systems to add contextual data or as a quality control measure, satellite imaging to assist in sample selection, among many other possibly examples. Finally, future focused presentations that highlight methodological and technological challenges and opportunities for the field of survey methodology and survey practice are welcome.

1. Multi Mode Survey Managment Design and Implementation
Mrs Gina Cheung (The University of Michigan Survey Research Center)
Ms Patty Maher (The University of Michigan Survey Research Center)

2. Audio-recording of verbatim thinkalouds: a solution to the problems of interviewer transcription?
Dr Rebekah Luff (National Centre for Research Methods, University of Southampton)
Professor Patrick Sturgis (National Centre for Research Methods, University of Southampton)

3. Using paradata to monitoring interviewers' behavior: Case studies from a national household survey in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Ghana
Mr Yu-chieh (jay) Lin (UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER)
Dr Zeina Mneimneh (UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER)
Mr Kyle Kwaiser (UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER)

4. Data Collection Monitoring and Quality Control: International Examples
Mrs Beth-ellen Pennell (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)
Mrs Gina Cheung (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-202

Interviewers' Deviations in Surveys 3

Convenor   Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Coordinator 1 Professor Peter Winker (University of Giessen)

Session Details

Interviewers' behavior might have an impact on survey data. The session deals with deviations from the instructions when contacting and interviewing respondents. These deviations might be caused by different factors such as task difficulty, interviewers' ability, experience and motivation, but also by the quality of questionnaires and instructions. Deviations might result in bias, but could also foster data quality, e.g. if interviewers try to help the respondents in providing a (correct) answer. The session aims to discuss both, deliberate (e.g. falsifications; providing explanation) and non-deliberate deviations (e.g. interviewers' mistakes).
Researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with all kinds of interviewers' deviations in the survey process which might result in non-observation or measurement errors but also positively influence survey outcomes. Of interest are theoretical approaches and empirical studies on detection and prevention, on explanatory factors and consequences of interviewers' deviations. Thus, interviewers' motivation to deviate from prescribed standards or to produce high quality survey data as well as interviewers' cognitive skills and competencies could be of interest.

1. Interviewer Monitoring and Performance in the Survey of Income and Program Participation
Dr Jason Fields (US Census Bureau)
Dr Matthew Marlay (US Census Bureau)
Dr Holly Fee (US Census Bureau)

2. Is it a must to read questions word by word in survey interview? findings of Chinese Family Panel Studies
Dr Liying Ren (Peking University)
Dr Jie Yan (Peking University)

3. Interviewer-Respondent Interactions in Conversational and Standardized Interviewing: Results from a National Face-to-face Survey in Germany.
Mrs Felicitas Mittereder (Michigan Program in Survey Methodology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
Mrs Jennifer Durow (Michigan Program in Survey Methodology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
Mr Brady West (Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor)

4. The interviewer in the respondent's shoes: Explaining respondent behaviour by the behaviour of interviewers when answering survey questions
Ms Celine Wuyts (Centre for Sociological Research, KU Leuven)
Professor Geert Loosveldt (Centre for Sociological Research, KU Leuven)
Dr Anina Vercruyssen (Centre for Sociological Research, KU Leuven)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-206

Large convenience samples, quantitative research and comparative analysis

Convenor   Mr Patrick Festy (National Institute for Demographic Studies, France)

Session Details

Convenience sampling is often used in qualitative research where the objective is not to measure behaviors or opinions but to detect relationships between different phenomena. It is generally considered as non-scientific in quantitative research, despite some usage when surveyed populations are difficult or costly to reach and/or identify. It is nevertheless regaining popularity due to the development of online surveys where respondents are incented to answer freely accessible questionnaires. The massive number of respondents that can be easily obtained orientates towards quantitative analysis of the material, the more so as most questions are inevitably closed-ended. Even international comparisons of large samples become possible. An EU agency has recently attracted more than 90,000 respondents self identified as lesbians, gays, bisexuals or trans, in 28 countries, the largest sample ever assembled on this population. In a continent of 400,000,000 adults, the number of LGBT people is several millions and the selection bias in the sample risks to be massive, but who is able to resist the temptation of quantitative analysis of such a large and original material?

What is possible and impossible on such data? What lessons can be drawn from qualitative analysis methods, which could be relevant for large samples? Which is more or less biased: simple cross tabulations or more sophisticated analysis? Are meaningless national results open to meaningful cross-national comparisons?

1. An online LGBT survey – surveying a difficult to reach population
Dr Sabine Springer (FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights)
Dr Vida Beresneviciute (FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights)

2. Perception of discrimination experiences on grounds of sexual orientation in the EU LGBT survey
Ms Marie Digoix (Ined)
Dr Elisabeth Morand (Ined)

3. Do surveys correctly cover voters who are over 80 years old?
Professor Jean-yves Dormagen (Université de Montpellier)
Professor Laura Michel (Université de Montpellier)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-104

Methodological developments in time use research

Convenor Miss Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)
Coordinator 1 Dr Stella Chatzitheochari (University of Warwick)

Session Details

Providing a comprehensive and sequential account of daily activities and their context, time use data are increasingly utilised to produce national accounts of well-being, analyse a wide range of health and social outcomes, and understand different aspects of human behaviour. Recent years have witnessed the steady growth of stand-alone time use surveys, as well as the inclusion of time diary elements in large-scale social surveys. This has resulted in an impressive pool of data from developed and developing countries. However, despite this increased interest in the collection of time use data, there is relatively little recent methodological evidence in the area. The majority of earlier work focuses on conventional, paper-based diary formats that are becoming less common, while there is a lack of systematic research examining new modes of data collection and study designs.

This session aims to cover a range of contemporary methodological issues in time use research. In particular, submissions are welcomed on:
- using different modes of data collection and innovative technology for time use data collection, including the web and mobile phones
- designing time use diaries for children and young people including the design of age-specific activity categories and assessing the reliability and validity of children's time diaries
- collecting and analysing time use data in longitudinal surveys
- innovative methods of statistical analysis of time use data
- effects of different modes of data collection, including comparisons of paper-based, web-based and App-based formats
- developments on harmonisation of cross-national time use data

1. Measuring teenager time-use in the UK Millennium Cohort Study: A mixed-mode approach
Dr Stella Chatzitheochari (University of Warwick)
Miss Emily Gilbert (Institute of Education, UCL)
Dr Kimberly Fisher (University of Oxford)

2. Technology and Reporting of Daily Activities – Considerations for Analysis of Behaviours in Mixed-Mode Time Diary Surveys and for Comparison of Time Diary Surveys Collected Via Mobile Technologies with Pen and Paper and Phone Diary Surveys
Dr Kimberly Fisher (Centre for Time Use Research, University of Oxford)

3. Smartphones @work
Dr Michael Bittman (University of New England, Australia)

4. Developing a method to test the validity and reliability of 24 hour time use diaries using wearable cameras: A feasibility pilot
Dr Teresa Harms (Centre for Time Use Research (CTUR), Department of Sociology, University of Oxford)
Professor Jonathan Gershuny (Centre for Time Use Research (CTUR), Department of Sociology, University of Oxford)
Dr Aiden Doherty (Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford)

5. Regularity of time-use. Introducing an objective measure of daily routine
Mr Theun Pieter Van Tienoven (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Sociology Dept., Research Group TOR)
Professor Ignace Glorieux (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Sociology Dept., Research Group TOR)
Mr Joeri Minnen (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Sociology Dept., Research Group TOR)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-105

New forms of data collection: mobile/web 1

Convenor   Dr Emanuela Sala (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di MIlano Bicocca)
Coordinator 1 Dr Mario Callegaro (Google)
Coordinator 2 Dr Teresio Poggio (Faculty of Economics and Management Free University of Bozen-Bolzano)

Session Details

Advances in mobile and Internet technology offer researchers new tools, opportunities and challenges to design and carry out social surveys. The aim of this session is to foster discussion on the use of new forms of data collection in social research and its impact on data quality.

1. Does the Use of Mobile Devices (Tablets and Smartphones) Affect Survey Quality and Choice Behaviour in Web Surveys?
Professor Ulf Liebe (University of Bern)
Dr Klaus Glenk (SRUC, Land Economy, Environment & Society Group)
Mr Malte Oehlmann (Technische Universität Berlin)

2. Technology and Reporting of Daily Activities – Considerations for Analysis of Behaviours in Mixed-Mode Time Diary Surveys and for Comparison of Time Diary Surveys Collected Via Mobile Technologies with Pen and Paper and Phone Diary Surveys
Dr Kimberly Fisher (Centre for Time Use Research)
Professor Jonathan Gershuny (Centre for Time Use Research)

3. The Effects of Adding a Mobile-Compatible Design to the American Life Panel
Dr Vera Toepoel (utrecht university)
Dr Alerk Amin (RAND)
Dr Peter Lugtig (utrecht university)

4. Using WhatsApp as a Survey Tool
Dr Yfke Ongena (University of Groningen)
Mrs Marieke Haan (University of Groningen)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N-131

Survey data in composite indexes of well-being and socio-economic development 2

Convenor   Professor Krzysztof Zagorski (Kozminski University)

Session Details

There is a growing interest in composite indexes of well-being and socio-economic development, such as OECD "Better Life Index", Kingdom of Buthan's "Gross National Happiness", UNDP "Human Development Index", NEF "Happy Planet Index, a bit more recent proposal by Fitoussi, Sen and Stiglitz, Polish ALK "Index of Balanced Socio-Economic Development" etc. All of them are elaborated in a "beyond GDP" paradigm and in a tradition of social indicators research. Some are limited to objective and subjective social conditions only, some other combine social and economic dimensions, using both survey data and social as well as economic statistics. There are several substantive and methodological problems of these indexes, such as ways of selecting particular simple indicators (index components), relevance of objective and subjective indicators (especially those obtained by social surveys), weighting, constructing "middle-level" indexes and analyzing their interrelations, defining "leading"

and "lagging" indexes, checking reliability and validity, analyzing the trends, generalizing and interpreting the results, etc. The papers discussing some of these issues or similar problems of integrating subjective and objective survey data with official and other statistical data into more general indexes at international, national or sub-national level are invited. Both methodological and substantive papers may be accepted, but the preference will be given to papers dealing jointly with the methodology of index construction and the interpretation of obtained results.

1. Re-examination of individual and national variables to explain subjective well-being
Miss Shuchen Wang (National Taiwan University)

2. The increasing importance of survey data in indexes of public health
Professor Andrei Veikher (National Research University "Higher School of Economics" - St. Petersburg,)

3. Synthetic index to measure the prevalence of personal accidents in the European Union
Dr Mercedes Camarero (Department of Sociology. Pablo de Olavide University)

4. The Crime Safety Index: a composite indicator about concern and fear of crime
Dr Manuel Jesús Caro Cabrera (Universidad de Sevilla)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-101

Surveying Sensitive Issues: Challenges and Solutions 2

Convenor	Mr Marc Hoeglinger (ETH Zurich)
Coordinator 1	Professor Andreas Diekmann (ETH Zurich)
Coordinator 2	Professor Ben Jann (University of Bern)

Session Details

Surveying sensitive issues such as deviant behavior, stigmatizing traits, or controversial attitudes poses two challenges: The first challenge is data validity. Respondents are likely to misreport when asked sensitive questions, or they refuse answering such questions or even break off the interview. As a result, measurements are biased or incomplete. The second challenge is respondents' privacy protection. Respondents' data must be carefully protected to avoid leakage of sensitive personal information. Although this concerns almost all surveys in principle, it becomes much more important when, for instance, highly illegal behavior or political attitudes under repression are surveyed.

Switching to self-administrated survey modes such as online interviews mitigates undesired response effects to some extent. Also, adjusting the questionnaire design and the question wording might attenuate response effects. However, empirical results are inconclusive so far and results seem to depend highly on the particular issue and population surveyed. Providing respondents with full response privacy through indirect techniques such as the Randomized Response Technique or the Item Count Technique is a potential solution to both problems mentioned. However, albeit privacy is completely protected by these methods if properly implemented, respondents often lack understanding of and trust in these methods, so that misreporting might not be reduced.

In this session we invite submissions that deal with problems of surveying sensitive issues and/or present potential solutions. We are interested in studies that evaluate established methods such as indirect question techniques, but also in contributions that come up with novel strategies. Furthermore, we encourage submissions that deal with the concept of "sensitivity" and present theoretical frameworks and/or empirical analyses that shed light on the cognitive process of answering sensitive questions and "editing" responses. Submissions on statistical methods to analyze data from special questioning techniques are also welcomed.

1. Surveying sensitive questions: Prevalence estimates of self-reported delinquency using the crosswise model
Dr Dirk Enzmann (University of Hamburg, Institute of Criminal Sciences)

2. Pouring water into the wine. The advantages of the crosswise model asking sensitive questions revisited.
Ms Sandra Walzenbach (University of Konstanz)
Professor Thomas Hinz (University of Konstanz)

3. Effects of Survey Sponsorship and Mode of Administration on Respondents' Answers about their Racial Attitudes
Professor Volker Stocké (University of Kassel)

4. The Impact of Survey Mode (Mail versus Telephone) and Asking About Future Intentions
Dr Timothy Beebe (Mayo Clinic)

5. The effect of socio-demographic (mis)match between interviewers and respondents on the data quality of answers to sensitive questions
Dr Anina Vercruyssen (KU Leuven)
Ms Celine Wuyts (KU Leuven)

Professor Geert Loosveldt (KU Leuven)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-101

Surveys, ipsative and compositional data analysis (CODA)

Convenor   Dr Berta Ferrer-rosell (University of Girona - Department of Economics)
Coordinator 1 Dr Josep Daunis-i-estadella (University of Girona - Department of Computer Science, Applied Mathematics and Sta
Coordinator 2 Professor Vera Pawlowsky-glahn (University of Girona - Department of Computer Science, Applied Mathematics an

Session Details

Statistical compositions are common in the chemical and biological analysis in the fields of geology and biology, among others. Typically the size is irrelevant and only the proportion or the relative importance of each component is of interest. In survey measurement, the so-called ipsative data also consist of positive data arrays with a fixed sum and which only convey information on the relative importance of each component. Examples include surveys measuring compositions of household budgets (% spent in each product category), time-use surveys (24-hour total), educational instruments allocating a total number of points into different abilities or orientations (e.g. Kolb's learning styles or Boyatzis' philosophical orientations), and social network compositions (% of family members, friends, neighbours, etc.)

Statistical analysis of compositional data is challenging because they lie in a restricted space and components cannot vary independently from one another ("all other things constant"): the relative importance of one component can only increase if the relative importance of at least one other component decreases. A popular solution is to transform compositional data by means of logarithms of ratios of components before applying standard analysis methods, while interpreting the results with great care.

Standard statistical methods such as ANOVA, linear regression and cluster analysis have a well documented tradition in compositional data analysis although there is room for improving the methods and make them friendlier to a wider audience. Less has been done regarding typical survey research analysis methods, for instance, multivariate analysis methods and latent-variable methods. The naive analysis of raw proportions is of common practice even if it is plagued with statistical problems (inconsistent inferences, heteroskedasticity, non-normality, censoring, perfect collinearity, and unclear interpretation, among others). The session aims to bridge methodological knowledge between the natural and social sciences in order to narrow this gap.

1. Multiplicative Ipsative Data and Compositional Data. Why, Why Not, How and How Not?
Dr Glòria Mateu-.figueras (University of Girona)
Dr Josep Daunis-i-estadella (University of Girona)
Dr Berta Ferrer-rosell (University of Girona)

2. Relating Sets of Ipsative Variables from Forced Choice Questionnaires. A Compositional Canonical Correlation Analysis Approach
Dr Josep Daunis-i-estadella (University of Girona)
Dr Glòria Mateu-figueras (University of Girona)
Dr Josep Antoni Martín-fernández (University of Girona)

3. Application of CODA to the Experiential Learning Theory. The Third Learning Style Dimension.
Professor Joan Manuel Batista Foguet (ESADE BS. Universitat Ramon Llull. Spain)
Mr Ricard Serlavós (ESADE BS. Universitat Ramon Llull. Spain)
Professor Germà Coenders (Universitat de Girona. Spain)
Professor Richard Boyatzis (CASE Western Reserve University. Cleveland)

4. It All Adds Up: A Comparison of Constant Sum Tasks on Self-reported Behavior
Mr Randall Thomas (GfK Custom Research)
Dr Frances Barlas (GfK Custom Research)

5. Clustering compositional data. An example with a repeated cross-sectional travel budget survey
Dr Germa Coenders (University of Girona)

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-106

The New Data Sharing Environment: Increasing Options, Increasing Access 1?

Convenor   Dr Peter Granda (University of Michigan)

Session Details

The New Data Sharing Environment: Increasing Options, Increasing Access?

Peter Granda
Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR)
University of Michigan

As social science funding agencies throughout the world place increasing emphasis on data sharing, both data producers and data repositories face new challenges. Data producers must fulfill public-access requirements when receiving funding awards. After their data are collected, they may be tempted to share the data themselves, but they often do not want the maintenance responsibility for the long term. Data repositories can offer the infrastructure and staff expertise to assist producers in meeting their responsibilities as good data stewards but must decide how much effort to expend to archive, curate, and preserve the increasing amounts of data being generated.

New options have appeared on the scene including data sharing sites like Dropbox and Figshare and "self-deposit" services hosted by social science data archives. These options offer a variety of mechanisms to deposit and publish data resources, different pricing models, and storage models that range from keeping the original bitstream for a definite period to a full preservation commitment including curation and migration of these files indefinitely.

This session brings data producers and data repositories together to present their views of the current and future data sharing environments. Key questions at this session:

• How do producers want to make to make their data available for secondary use?
• Should the output of data from all funding sources be preserved?
• Who decides which data files should be stored for the short term and which should receive permanent curation and preservation?
• Who should pay for the costs of data sharing? The funder, the person awarded the grant, national governments through their support of national archives, another entity?
• What types of repository structures best promote data access?

1. Strengthening and Widening the Data Archive Research Infrastructure
Mr Paul Jackson (CESSDA)

2. Data Retention and Public Opinion in the Administrative Data Research Network
Miss Tanvi Desai (Administrative Data Research Network)
Miss Melanie Wright (Administrative Data Research Network)
Dr Kakia Chatsiou (University of Essex)

3. Data Availability and Reuse — Results of An Empirical Study Among German Researchers
Mr Benedikt Fecher (DIW & HIIG)
Mr Marcel Hebing (DIW)
Mr Friesike Sascha (HIIG)

4. SowiDataNet – How to Counteract the Growing Disparity of the Data Landscape in the Social and Economic Sciences in Germany
Ms Monika Linne (GESIS Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften)

5. Trusted Digital Repository – Sustainable Access
Mr Dag Kiberg (NSD (Norwegian Social Science Data Services))

Tuesday 14th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-102

Weighting issues in complex cross-sectional and longitudinal surveys 2

Convenor	Ms Nicole Watson (University of Melbourne)
Coordinator 1	Dr Olena Kaminska (University of Essex)

Session Details

A range of issues arise when constructing weights for surveys with complex designs. Use of mixed modes or multiple frames in cross-sectional, longitudinal or cross-national surveys may result in uncertainty in selection probabilities, fieldwork outcomes or response propensities that make it difficult to construct appropriate weights. Further, longitudinal surveys tend to have greater uncertainty over time (as interviews are no longer attempted with some people). Growing complexity of design for multi-purpose surveys calls for the development of weighting methods to reflect them.

How should weights be best constructed in the presence of uncertainty about inclusion probabilities or fieldwork outcomes? How should the response process be best modeled in cross-national surveys where countries differ in quality and type of sampling frame and other auxiliary data? For surveys with multiple frames, how do we best construct weights that combine samples from

multiple sources that may have partial overlap in the presence of uncertainty about membership? In constructing weights for longitudinal samples, we need to consider how populations are defined over time, how to treat deaths and other out-of-scopes, how best to adjust for attrition. Further, in household-based longitudinal surveys we need to determine how to best incorporate new sample members arising from changes in the household structure.

This session seeks to bring together survey methodologists involved in constructing weights for complex surveys (both longitudinal and cross-sectional) to explore the approaches taken. Papers submitted to this session might include comparisons of alternative methods, analysis of the impact of a particular component of the weights, or suggestions for new methods.

1. Dual-Frame Telephone Surveys: Adjusting for Device-Specific Nonresponse
Mr Matthias Sand (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. A simulation study to evaluate the weighting estimators used for dual-frame telephone surveys
Professor Michele Haynes (The University of Queensland)
Mr Shane Dinsdale (The University of Queensland)
Dr Bernard Baffour (The University of Queensland)

3. Constructing cross-sectional weights for the German Panel of Household Finances
Dr Panagiota Tzamourani (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Dr Tobias Schmidt (Deutsche Bundesbank)

4. Partial MAR
Mrs Olena Kaminska (ISER, University of Essex)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-101

Advanced survey estimation methods for treatment of non-sampling errors 1

Convenor	Dr Alina Matei (University of Neuchatel, Switzerland)
Coordinator 1	Professor Giovanna Ranalli (University of Perugia, Italy)

Session Details

Non-sampling errors can be generated by nonresponse, frame imperfections, measurement and data processing errors. We focus here on nonresponse and coverage errors as a possible source of non-negligible bias. Nonresponse is determined by the failure to obtain fully or partially information from the sampled units. Coverage or frame errors are caused by the gap between the target population and the sampling frame.

The proposed session will bring together presentations proposing advanced estimation methods for treatment of these types of non-sampling errors. The presentations will focus on methodologies to deal with nonresponse, frame imperfections or both. Methods using propensity score methods or (generalized) calibration to handle nonresponse, estimation methods for multiple-frame sampling, joint calibration for nonresponse and frame imperfections, calibration in the presence of domain misclassification, etc. are invited to be submitted in this session.

1. Estimation of proportions in dual frames using ordinal logistic regression.
Dr Arcos Antonio (University of Granada)
Dr Maria Del Mar Rueda (University of Granada)
Mr David Molina (University of Granada)

2. Indirect Sampling and the Multiple Frame Surveys
Professor Manuela Maia (Universidade Católica Portuguesa- Faculdade de Economia e Gestão)

3. The Blocked Imputation Approach as a Method to incorporate Information on why Data are Missing
Dr Peter Lugtig (Utrecht University)
Miss Roline Kamphuis (Utrecht University)
Dr Shahab Jolani (Utrecht University)

4. Weighting adjustment for nonignorable nonresponse with a heterogeneous structure of the variable of interest
Dr Alina Matei (Universityof Neuchatel, Switzerland)
Ms Caren Hasler (Universityof Neuchatel, Switzerland)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-103

Enhancing survey data with geocoded auxiliary data 1

Convenor   Dr Sarah Butt (City University London)
Coordinator 1 Mr Rory Fitzgerald (City University London)
Coordinator 2 Ms Kaisa Lahtinen (City University London)

Session Details

Combining survey data with auxiliary data from other sources provides researchers with a wealth of potential opportunities to improve survey data collection and the quality of the inferences that can be drawn from survey data. One type of auxiliary data that is increasingly widely available is geocoded data i.e. data that can be linked to survey data based on the geographic location of sampled addresses. This includes census data, administrative data from government agencies and other public sector bodies, commercial databases and geospatial maps. Such data can be used to answer substantive research questions about the effect of location on attitudes and behaviour. By providing information about all sample units, geocoded data are also a potentially valuable tool to aid data collection and for overcoming non-response bias.

However, using auxiliary data from pre-existing sources presents a number of challenges.
Identifying suitable auxiliary variables that are correlated with the survey variables of interest (and, in the case of non-response analysis, response propensity) can be difficult. There are concerns over the coverage, accuracy and timeliness of external databases, the extent to which data which is often highly aggregated can characterise sampled households, and the increased likelihood of deductive disclosure as a result of combining different data sources.

This session invites studies that have combined survey data with geocoded auxiliary data to share their learning regarding the opportunities and challenges associated with this approach. We are interested in papers that provide insights into any of the following:
• The pros and cons of using different sources of geocoded auxiliary data
• Strategies for linking geocoded auxiliary data to survey data
• Modelling item or unit non-response using auxiliary data
• Combining auxiliary data and survey data cross-nationally

1. Using Geo-coded Data as Part of the Multi-level, Multi-Source Approach to Improve Surveys
Dr Tom W. Smitht@norc.uchicago.edu (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Dr Jibum Kim (Sungkyunkwan University)

2. Using geocoded auxiliary data to predict nonresponse in address-based samples: Are household- level commercial data any better than aggregate-level census data?
Dr Sarah Butt (City University London)
Ms Kaisa Lahtinen (City University London)
Mr Rory Fitzgerald (City University London)

3. The use of geo-coded data to develop an interview performance management system
Mr Joel Williams (TNS BMRB)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N-132

European Values Study 1

Convenor Dr Ruud Luijkx (Tilburg University)

Session Details

The European Values Study (EVS) is a unique research project into Europe's basic values. First, it spans a period of almost 30 years with surveys in 1981, 1990, 1999, and 2008. Second, EVS has an extensive geographical coverage. In Europe, the survey has gradually been expanded from mostly Western European countries in 1981 to the whole of Europe in 2008. Third, even though several items have been changed in the consecutive waves, EVS still includes an impressive number of unchanged questions. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the questionnaires pertain to a very broad spectrum of life domains: family and marriage, economics, work, leisure, politics, religion, morality. This allows to introduce domain-specific and overarching concepts and to examine the relationships between basic values and attitudes in different fields. Such a rich data source also offers a unique chance for substantive and methodological investigations. We are particularly interested in papers which make use of the comparative potential of EVS from a methodological and a substantive perspective. To give a few examples: Do the measurement instruments that have been used in EVS guarantee comparability across time and space? How accessible is this huge data base? What are the basic empirical findings on long-term change and what are the main cross national differences? How are the specific domain values related to each other and to the overarching concepts? How does one

carry out such analyses? What are the main problems? However, other empirical and methodological topics are possible too. Researchers are invited to submit paper proposals for this session on EVS.

1. European profiles of religious beliefs and practices
Dr Loek Halman (Tilburg University)
Dr John Gelissen (Tilburg University)

2. Polarization of social attitudes in Europe? Trends in educational cleavages
Dr Inge Sieben (Department of Sociology, Tilburg University)
Professor Paul De Graaf (Department of Sociology, Tilburg University)

3. Religious Culture in Host Country and Immigrants' Membership in Civic Associations
Dr Malina Voicu (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Miss Elena Damian (University of Cologne)

4. Class voting in Western Europe. Do various class schemas make a difference?
Professor Oddbjørn Knutsen (Department of Political Science, University of Oslo)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: L-102

Experimental designs in online survey research 4

Convenor   Mr Henning Silber (Göttingen University)
Coordinator 1 Mr Jan Karem Hoehne (Göttingen University)
Coordinator 2 Professor Dagmar Krebs (Giessen University)

Session Details

Experimental studies have become increasingly popular in survey research and are carried out in various disciplines such as sociology, political science, linguistics, economics and psychology. In survey research experimental designs are useful tools to get a better understanding of cognitive processes in order to give better practice advice for improving study and questionnaire design. In particular, the technological advances have made it significantly easier to use experimental designs in online field experiments as well as in computerized laboratory experiments.

This session invites presentations on empirical studies and theoretical discussions of experimental designs in online survey research.

- Empirical online research can include studies on response behavior and social desirability bias, as well as experiments on response rates and question design effects. Furthermore, we especially encourage presentations with replicated experimental results and welcome replications in different social contexts such as different cultural, educational and ethnic groups.
- Additionally, we invite presentations that discuss the value of experiments from a theoretical perspective. Theoretical presentations could contrast the merits and the limits of different forms of experimental study designs or provide a future outlook on the prospects of online experiments in survey research.

Presentations could cover the following research areas:

- Theory of experimental study designs
- Replication of experimental results
- Comparisons between different experimental designs (e. g., laboratory and field experiment)
- Split-ballot experiments (e. g., context effects, question order, response order, acquiescence, visual design effects, verbal effects)
- Choice experiments
- Laboratory experiments on response behavior (e. g., using eye tracking)
- Experiments with incentives
- Vignette studies
- Future prospects of experimental designs

1. Recruiting processes in German Companies: How are foreign diplomas currently valued? – A Factorial Survey Design –
Mrs Alexandra Mergener (Researcher; Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB))
Mr Tobias Maier (Researcher; Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB))
Dr Robert Helmrich (Head of Division; Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB))

2. Method effects in factorial surveys: Investigating effects of vignette construction and presentation
Dr Carsten Sauer (Bielefeld University)
Professor Katrin Auspurg (Goethe University Frankfurt)

3. Mixed-mode experiment - evaluation of effects on data quality, response rates and cost reduction
Mrs Mikaela Järnbert (Statistician)
Mr Johan Eklund (Statisticial)

4. How do implicit attitudes affect the perception of candidates in TV debates during the campaign: Evidence from Austria
Dr Kathrin Thomas (University of Vienna)
Dr David Johann (Univeristy of Vienna)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: L-101

Global Societal Change

Convenor Dr Tom W. Smith (NORC at the University of Chicago)

Session Details

This session examines societal change using major cross-national datasets such as the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, the East Asian Social Survey, the European Social Survey, the International Social Survey Program, and the World Values Survey. Special focus is on the 1) impact of globalization on attitudes and behaviors across countries, 2) whether there are signs of convergence, and 3) the role of cohort turnover in shaping global societal change.

1. Democratic Development and Changes in Political Efficacy: Latin America in Comparative Perspective
Dr Alejandro Moreno (Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico)

2. Public Attitudes towards Homosexuality and Gay/Lesbian Rights in Comparative and Temporal Perspective
Dr Tom W. Smith (NORC)

3. Convergence or Divergence of Asian Family Values and Practices: A Comparative Study Based on EASS 2006 and Other Replicated Surveys
Professor Hachiro Iwai (Kyoto University)
Professor Noriko Iwai (JGSS Research Center, Osaka University of Commerce)

4. TOWARDS A COMMON PATTERN OF RELIGIOUS CHANGE. CHURCH ATTENDANCE DECLINING TRENDS IN SEVENTEEN WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES (1973-2013)
Mr Ferruccio Biolcati Rinaldi (University of Milan)
Mr Cristiano Vezzoni (University of Trento)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-202

How do interviewers influence data?

Convenor Miss Claudia Karwath (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 1 Miss Manja Attig (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

There are various modes of data collection, such as telephone, face-to-face or online. Some of these modes include the use of interviewers, which play a special role in the study organization. For example, they have to contact and motivate the respondent for participation. In this case, interviewers not only can influence the collecting data process (e.g., finding the right respondent) but furthermore they can affect data quality in different ways as well (e.g., influencing the response of the participants).

To organize studies, especially with different modes of data collection, it is important to involve possible effects of using interviewers.

Therefore, the following session focus on topics such as:

- Interviewer characteristics and their influence on data
- Interviewer-respondent interactions
- Effects of different modes of data collection

1. Social Desirability as interviewer effect between CAPI and CASI in Japan

Mr Isamu Sugino (Ochanomizu University)
Dr Daisuke Kobayashi (Jin-ai University)
Dr Aki Kaeriyama (Rikkyo University)

2. Understanding dynamics of consent requests in surveys: Consent to biomarker data collection and administrative data linkage in the Health and Retirement Study
Ms Colleen Mcclain (Michigan Program in Survey Methodology)
Dr Sunghee Lee (Michigan Program in Survey Methodology)
Dr Jessica Faul (University of Michigan)

3. Financial Literacy and Interviewer Effects
Dr Tobias Schmidt (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Dr Panagiotta Tzamourani (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Professor Joachim Winter (LMU Munich)

4. Interviewer Effects in the CAPI-Study of the Early Childhood Cohort of the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS)
Miss Claudia Karwath (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Miss Manja Attig (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Mrs Hannes Kliem (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: L-103

Intra-EU immigration: new form of migration, new challenges for survey methodology?

Convenor	Professor Céline Teney (University of Bremen)
Coordinator 1	Professor Laurie Hanquinet (The University of York)

Session Details

Since the Maastricht treaty and the right of free movement, EU countries have been facing a growing wave of intra-EU migration. In contrast to the classical immigration waves –such as the guest workers in the 60´s and 70´s, recent intra-EU migrants tend to be highly mobile and skilled. This new form of migration has been receiving increasingly more attention from the scientific community. Above all, case and qualitative studies have boomed during the last years. By contrast, quantitative sociology –with a few exceptions- has largely overlooked this new migration phenomenon. This neglect is mainly due to the difficulty of identifying intra-EU immigrants in the receiving countries and the resulting challenges of drawing representative large-N samples of recent intra-EU movers. Indeed, EU citizens have the right to cross national borders without any registration obligations. This implies that most of the selection procedures traditionally used for sampling classical immigrants are obsolete for this new migration wave. How can we capture this freedom of move? And how can we represent and possibly map it?

With this panel, we hope to bring together quantitative sociologists who seek to study this new form of migration. We would like to discuss innovative strategies for drawing representative samples of these intra-EU migrants, these EU citizens who decide to live in another EU country, but also new exciting techniques to account for this freedom of move. We are, for instance, interested in visual techniques to map EU migrants' movements. We are therefore welcoming contributions that present ways of sampling this specific population. Contributors are invited not only to shed light on the strengths and advantages of sampling strategies but also to discuss the shortcomings, sampling difficulties and representativity of the sample.

1. Sampling migrant populations using onomastic sampling – possibilities and limitations
Ms Anna Siuda (Trinity College Dublin)

2. International migration and statistics globalization: Spain as a case of study
Ms Carmen Ródenas (Universidad de Alicante)
Ms Mónica Marti (Universidad de Alicante)

3. The use of resident registration data for sampling German emigrants and remigrants
Dr Friedrich Scheller (University of Duisburg Essen, Germany)
Mr Andreas Ette (Federal Institute for Population Research, Germany)
Dr Lenore Sauer (Federal Institute for Population Research, Germany)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-201

Measurement errors in official statistical surveys

Convenor	Mr Anton Karlsson (Statistics Iceland)

Coordinator 1   Mr Øyvin Kleven (Statistics Norway)

Session Details

National Statistical Institutes (NSI's) in the European Statistical System have traditionally not focused on survey measurement error. There is therefore a lack of knowledge in the system on the spread, amount and influence of measurement error on the results of surveys conducted by the NSI's in the system. This lack of knowledge prevents survey methodologists from applying relevant methods or best practices in order to deliver high-quality data that has been thoroughly checked with regards to effects of measurement error. It is therefore important to provide a venue for survey methodologists working on minimizing measurement errors in NSI-surveys for them to present their work, exchange ideas and study new methods and techniques. The issue of measurement error in NSI surveys has become especially relevant with the emergence of newer modes of data collection (e.g. web-questionnaires) and the use of multiple modes within a single survey. We therefore propose to organize a session for the ESRA 2014 conference in Reykjavik, Iceland where the focus will be on measurement error in official statistical surveys, e.g.: 1) Pretesting survey instruments used in NSI-surveys and its effectiveness in reducing measurement error; 2) cross-national comparisons of items in order to assess their comparability over different countries; 3) measurement effects due to the use of different modes in NSI surveys; 4) methods and practices for monitoring measurement error in ongoing surveys; 5) Post-survey corrections for measurement error in NSI surveys; 6) The cross-national comparability of output harmonized surveys.

1. Measurement error across modes in the Icelandic Labour Force Survey
Mr Anton Karlsson (Statistics Iceland)

2. Effects of dependent interviewing on respondents and interviewers
Ms Sophia Nebel (Federal Statistical Office of Germany)
Mr Daniel Zimmermann (Federal Statistical Office of Germany)

3. Adjusting measurement effects in mixed-mode inference: evaluation of an approach using re-interview data
Dr Thomas Klausch (Utrecht University / Statistics Netherlands)
Dr Barry Schouten (Utrecht University / Statistics Netherlands)

4. Detecting and correcting for measurement errors in election surveys by auxiliary information
Mr Oyvin Kleven (Statistics Norway)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-206

Multi-actor surveys

Convenor Mrs Inge Pasteels (University of Antwerp, Belgium)

Session Details

For this session researchers are invited to submit papers considering a particular survey methodological topic within the context of multi-actor surveys. Recently multi-actor surveys came up as a new type of surveys besides individual and household surveys. In surveys with a multi-actor design, several individuals who are related to each other by precisely defined social ties, are involved. All individuals together with the well-defined social relationships and social roles constitute the multi-actor unit. Several types of multi-actor surveys can be distinguished according to the sampling unit. If the sampling unit corresponds with only one directly selected individual around which the remaining multi-actor pattern will be built, survey data are considered as being "singular multi-actor data". If several persons are directly sampled, survey data are "multiple multi-actor data". In case of two directly sampled individuals, we refer to this type of survey data as "dyadic multi-actor data". Furthermore, several settings can be approached by a multi-actor survey, e.g. families with members living in different households, an educational system with pupils, teachers and parents as the main actors or labor force settings with employers and employees. Papers in this session can deal with a wide range of survey methodological issues as sampling, fieldwork processes and fieldwork monitoring, item and unit nonresponse, weighting and imputation, interviewer effects and interviewer training, mixed mode designs,…. but highlighting specificities of well-known techniques, procedures, terminology,… given the multi-actor survey design has to be the main goal of the paper.

1. The effect of interviewers' motivation and attitudes on respondents' consent to contact secondary respondents in a multi-actor survey
Dr Jette Schröder (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Claudia Schmiedeberg (Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich)
Dr Laura Castiglioni (Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich)

2. Surveying child activities – A case of a multi-actor approach within in the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS)
Dr Thomas Bäumer (LIfBi)
Mr Tobias Linberg (LIfBi)

3. Who's willing to talk about divorce? Adjustment of nonresponse bias among divorcees using survey data with a multi-actor design.
Mrs Inge Pasteels (University of Antwerp)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-105

New forms of data collection: mobile/web 2

Convenor　　　Dr Emanuela Sala (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di MIlano Bicocca)
Coordinator 1 Dr Mario Callegaro (Google)
Coordinator 2 Dr Teresio Poggio (Faculty of Economics and Management Free University of Bozen-Bolzano)

Session Details

Advances in mobile and Internet technology offer researchers new tools, opportunities and challenges to design and carry out social surveys. The aim of this session is to foster discussion on the use of new forms of data collection in social research and its impact on data quality.

1. Challenges and Strategies for developing one instrument for multi-mode surveys
Mrs Gina Cheung (SRC University of Michigan)
Mrs Jennifer Kelly (SRC University of Michigan)

2. Challenges of technology based surveys and dealing with them within the German National Educational Panel Study (NEPS)
Dr Roman Auriga (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories, Germany, Bamberg)

3. Triangulation of Subjective Well-Being in the German Socio-Economic Panel Study
Dr David Richter (German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP))
Professor Richard Lucas (Michigan State University)
Professor Jürgen Schupp (German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP))

4. Adapting survey questionnaires to touch-screen tablets. The ELIPSS Panel example
Miss Emmanuelle Duwez (SciencesPo - CDSP)
Mr Mathieu Olivier (SciencesPo - CDSP)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-102

Potentials and constraints of weighting to improve survey quality

Convenor　　　Dr Stephanie Steinmetz (University of Amsterdam)
Coordinator 1　Professor Kea Tijdens (University of Amsterdam)

Session Details

As scientific surveys are indispensable instruments of social research, their results can impact significantly on public opinion formation and official decision making. Therefore, the accuracy of a survey is of paramount importance. However, it is determined by many aspects of the survey process, including sampling, patterns of response and non-response as well as survey design and data collection procedures.
The introduction of the web as a new mode of data collection, however, has triggered a heated debate on their scientific validity and the degree to which their results can be generalised for the whole population – in particular for non-probability web surveys. To deal with problems arising from sample biases, it has been emphasised that weighting procedures are necessary for generalising web survey results for the whole population, even though particularly the implications of propensity score or other advanced adjustment techniques are still under discussion. As the application of such adjustment procedures has produced rather diverse results, it is not entirely clear whether the representativeness of web surveys can be improved through weighting. The session aims to evaluate the potentials and constraints of different adjustment procedures to improve survey quality.
Papers are invited which address the methodological foundation of different adjustment techniques, and provide insights into their simple and advanced application for offline and online surveys. Contributors are particularly encouraged to explore, compare and critically discuss the efficiency of different weighting procedures to improve survey quality.

1. Representativity Through Statistical Adjustment via Matching? Ways to Control for Sampling Effects of Different

Modes in the Context of the German Federal Election 2013
Mr Sven Vollnhals (University of Mainz)

2. Improving the Quality of Volunteer Web Panels: Evaluating Different Weighting Methods for the Dutch Leisure Panel
Mrs Stephanie Steinmetz (University of Amsterdam)
Mrs Vera Toepoel (University of Utrecht)
Mrs Annamaria Bianchi (University of Bergamo)

3. The dubious zero-correlation between weighting variables and target variables: A false way to upgrade survey power?
Dr Koen Beullens (Centre for Sociological Research - KU Leuven)
Professor Geert Loosveldt (Centre for Sociological Research - KU Leuven)

4. How good are VAA to estimate voters' positioning? Some explorations for Greece and Iceland
Dr Ioannis Andreadis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)
Dr Stephanie Steinmetz (University of Amsterdam)
Dr Annamaria Bianchi (University of Bergamo)
Dr Gudbjorg Andrea Jonsdottir (University of Iceland)

5. Estimating the Number of Farms in the U.S. Using Capture-Recapture
Ms Denise Abreu (USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-104

The impact of questionnaire design on measurements in surveys 1

Convenor   Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Coordinator 1   Ms Kathrin Bogner (GESIS)

Session Details

Questionnaire design is crucial for obtaining high-quality survey data. Still, there is a great need for research that helps to better understand how and under which conditions different design aspects of questionnaires impact measurement process and survey data quality. Therefore, researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with questionnaire design features such as question wording, visual design and answer formats, instructions, introductions and other relevant design aspects of questionnaires. Also, different means of measurement such as questions with nominal answer categories, rankings, ratings, sematic differentials or vignettes can be addressed or can be matter of comparison. Of interest is the impact of questionnaire design on response behavior, on systematic as well as non-systematic error or on validity. In addition, respondents' cognition or motivation can be in focus of the studies.

1. Designs and Developments of the Income Measures in the European Social Surveys
Dr Uwe Warner (Perl, Germany)
Professor Jürgen H.p. Hoffmeyer-zlotnik (University of Giessen)

2. Item non-response and readability of survey questionnaire
Dr Mare Ainsaar (Senior research fellow)
Mr Laur Lilleoja (PhD student)
Dr Jaan Mikk (Senior research fellow)

3. Helping Respondents Provide Good Answers in Web Surveys
Professor Mick Couper (University of Michigan)
Dr Chan Zhang (Fudan University)

4. Rating scale labeling in web surveys: Are numeric labels of advantage?
Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-106

The New Data Sharing Environment: Increasing Options, Increasing Access 2?

Convenor   Dr Peter Granda (University of Michigan)

Session Details

The New Data Sharing Environment: Increasing Options, Increasing Access?

Peter Granda
Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR)
University of Michigan

As social science funding agencies throughout the world place increasing emphasis on data sharing, both data producers and data repositories face new challenges. Data producers must fulfill public-access requirements when receiving funding awards. After their data are collected, they may be tempted to share the data themselves, but they often do not want the maintenance responsibility for the long term. Data repositories can offer the infrastructure and staff expertise to assist producers in meeting their responsibilities as good data stewards but must decide how much effort to expend to archive, curate, and preserve the increasing amounts of data being generated.

New options have appeared on the scene including data sharing sites like Dropbox and Figshare and "self-deposit" services hosted by social science data archives. These options offer a variety of mechanisms to deposit and publish data resources, different pricing models, and storage models that range from keeping the original bitstream for a definite period to a full preservation commitment including curation and migration of these files indefinitely.

This session brings data producers and data repositories together to present their views of the current and future data sharing environments. Key questions at this session:

• How do producers want to make to make their data available for secondary use?
• Should the output of data from all funding sources be preserved?
• Who decides which data files should be stored for the short term and which should receive permanent curation and preservation?
• Who should pay for the costs of data sharing? The funder, the person awarded the grant, national governments through their support of national archives, another entity?
• What types of repository structures best promote data access?

1. European data access: issues and challenges
Dr Reza Afkhami (UK Data Archive, University of Essex)

2. Ways and means to make data accessible – data collection and data sharing practices of the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights
Dr David Reichel (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights)

3. Data Sharing Platform datorium
Ms Natascha Schumann (GESIS Leibniz Institute for Social Sciences)

Wednesday 15th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N-131

The use of survey data to study well-being and economic outcomes

Convenor	Mr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC, HSE-LCSR)
Coordinator 1	Ms Chiara Peroni (STATEC)
Coordinator 2	Mr Cesare Riillo (STATEC)

Session Details

Despite the popularity of well-being measures in economic studies, the relation between subjective well-being and economic performance is still an open issue.

Several empirical studies based on survey data collected on individuals suggest that happier people are more productive and more committed to their work. Happier workers are more pragmatic, less absent, more cooperative and friendly (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Judge et al., 2001) change their job less often and they are more accurate and willing to help others (Spector, 1997). Moreover, happier people earn more money and have better relationships with colleagues and clients, all aspects that contribute to work productivity (George and Brief, 1992; Pavot and Diener, 1993; Wright and Cropanzano, 2000). These results have been confirmed also in experimental settings (Oswald et al., 2009). Further evidence suggests that increased life satisfaction has a positive impact on firms' economic outcomes (Edmans, 2012).

However, the evidence on the relation between well-being and economic performance is not conclusive. For example, this literature would benefit from new analysis linking survey data to auxiliary data sources on economic outcomes as well as from widening the scope of economic indicators used (Dimaria et al. 2014).

This session aims at collecting contributions analysing the role of well-being and/or job satisfaction on economic outcomes. We welcome applications on life satisfaction, job satisfaction, productivity, entrepreneurship, innovation, employment, inequality,

economic growth.

4th organizer: Dr. Wladimir Raymond, Wladimir.Raymond@statec.etat.lu, STATEC, Luxembourg

1. Modelling survey data to analyze the perception of work–related stress
Ms Stefania Capecchi (Department of Political Sciences, University of Naples Federico II)

2. Returning to work after childbirth: The role of job satisfaction
Dr Julia Gumy (University of Bristol)
Dr Anke Plagnol (City University London)

3. Happiness matters: the role of well-being in productivity
Mr Charles-henri Dimaria (STATEC)
Ms Chiara Peroni (STATEC)
Mr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC and HSE)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-101

Advanced survey estimation methods for treatment of non-sampling errors 2

Convenor   Dr Alina Matei (University of Neuchatel, Switzerland)
Coordinator 1   Professor Giovanna Ranalli (University of Perugia, Italy)

Session Details

Non-sampling errors can be generated by nonresponse, frame imperfections, measurement and data processing errors. We focus here on nonresponse and coverage errors as a possible source of non-negligible bias. Nonresponse is determined by the failure to obtain fully or partially information from the sampled units. Coverage or frame errors are caused by the gap between the target population and the sampling frame.

The proposed session will bring together presentations proposing advanced estimation methods for treatment of these types of non-sampling errors. The presentations will focus on methodologies to deal with nonresponse, frame imperfections or both. Methods using propensity score methods or (generalized) calibration to handle nonresponse, estimation methods for multiple-frame sampling, joint calibration for nonresponse and frame imperfections, calibration in the presence of domain misclassification, etc. are invited to be submitted in this session.

1. Decomposition of wage discrimination through a calibration method
Miss Mihaela Catalina Anastasiade (University of Neuchâtel)
Mr Yves Tillé (University of Neuchâtel)

2. Incorporating spatial and operational constraints in the sampling designs for forest inventories
Miss Audrey-anne Vallée (Université de Neuchâtel)
Mr Bastien Ferland-raymond (Ministère des Forêts, de la Faune et des Parcs)
Professor Louis-paul Rivest (Université Laval)
Professor Yves Tillee (Université de Neuchâtel)

3. Ratio type estimators for the estimation of population coefficient of variation under two-stage sampling
Mr Muhammad Jabbar (The University of Lahore)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N-131

Determinants of subjective well-being or dimensions of quality of life?

Convenor   Mr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC, Luxembourg)
Coordinator 1   Ms Malgorzata Mikucka (Universite catholique de Louvain)

Session Details

The literature distinguishes mainly two approaches to measuring well-being. The first one is adopted by institutions and policy-oriented bodies that adopt multidimensional indexes of quality of life. Such indexes supplement the more commonly used

income-based measures of well-being and allow a detailed description of living conditions and an assessment of societies' progress in achieving citizens' quality of life.

The second approach considers subjective well-being measured with a single variable, usually life satisfaction or happiness, and investigates its economic and non-economic determinants.

These two approaches treat differently the same set of variables. For example, income or health would be regarded as dimensions of quality of life in the first approach, but they would be seen as determinants of subjective well-being in the second approach.

This session invites analyses of advantages, disadvantages, and implications of the choice between the two approaches to measuring well-being. We invite papers addressing the following and related questions:
(1) Are there any ways to empirically assess the correctness of each of the two approaches? Can we test if a factor should be treated as an outcome (i.e. a dimension of quality of life) or rather as a determinant of subjective well-being?
(2) What is the relationship between the single measure of subjective well-being and the multiple dimensions of quality of life?
(3) Policy-oriented initiatives propose lists of dimensions of quality of life, but do we actually need multiple indicators? How to make sense of multidimensional indexes of well-being?
(4) Which lessons about well-being can we learn by using each of these approaches?

1. Mapping the Landscape: Patterns in Individual, Social and Societal Wellbeing in Europe since 2002
Dr Eric Harrison (City University London)

2. Beyond GDP: Using equivalent incomes to measure well-being in Europe
Professor Koen Decancq (University of Antwerp)
Professor Erik Schokkaert (KULeuven)

3. Is subjective well-being multidimensional?
Dr Georgiana Ivan (EUROSTAT, EUROPEAN COMMISSION, LUXEMBOURG)

4. Is it sufficient to measure life satisfaction in order to measure quality of life?
Dr Kathrin Gärtner (Statistics Austria)
Dr Franz Eiffe (Statistics Austria)
Mr Matthias Till (Statistics Austria)

5. Life Quality Measurement for the Assessment of Progress
Professor Paul Anand (The Open University)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-103

Enhancing survey data with geocoded auxiliary data 2

Convenor	Dr Sarah Butt (City University London)
Coordinator 1	Mr Rory Fitzgerald (City University London)
Coordinator 2	Ms Kaisa Lahtinen (City University London)

Session Details

Combining survey data with auxiliary data from other sources provides researchers with a wealth of potential opportunities to improve survey data collection and the quality of the inferences that can be drawn from survey data. One type of auxiliary data that is increasingly widely available is geocoded data i.e. data that can be linked to survey data based on the geographic location of sampled addresses. This includes census data, administrative data from government agencies and other public sector bodies, commercial databases and geospatial maps. Such data can be used to answer substantive research questions about the effect of location on attitudes and behaviour. By providing information about all sample units, geocoded data are also a potentially valuable tool to aid data collection and for overcoming non-response bias.

However, using auxiliary data from pre-existing sources presents a number of challenges.
Identifying suitable auxiliary variables that are correlated with the survey variables of interest (and, in the case of non-response analysis, response propensity) can be difficult. There are concerns over the coverage, accuracy and timeliness of external databases, the extent to which data which is often highly aggregated can characterise sampled households, and the increased likelihood of deductive disclosure as a result of combining different data sources.

This session invites studies that have combined survey data with geocoded auxiliary data to share their learning regarding the opportunities and challenges associated with this approach. We are interested in papers that provide insights into any of the following:
• The pros and cons of using different sources of geocoded auxiliary data
• Strategies for linking geocoded auxiliary data to survey data
• Modelling item or unit non-response using auxiliary data
• Combining auxiliary data and survey data cross-nationally

1. Grandparents, Nurseries and Employment Options: The Geography of the return to work for Mothers in the Czech Republic
Dr Thomas Emery (NIDI)
Mrs Alzbeta Bartova (University of Edinburgh)

2. Combining Sample, Survey and Geocoded Auxiliary Data for Predicting Sales Volumes at Gasoline Stations
Dr Kurt Pflughoeft (MaritzCX)
Ms Sharon Alberg (MaritzCX)

3. Examining neighbourhood effects on educational opportunities: Facing challenges in combining survey data with geocoded auxiliary data cross-nationally
Ms Dafina Kurti (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. Enhancing longitudinal surveys with geocoded time-series data: Examples from research on school-to-work transitions in Germany
Miss Katarina Weßling (University of Tuebingen)
Mr Andreas Hartung (University of Tuebingen)
Professor Steffen Hillmert (University of Tuebingen)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-102

Factorial survey experiments

Convenor Dr Edurne Bartolome Peral (University of Deusto)

Session Details

Experimental designs, and factorial surveys in particular, have become very popular in the study of social relations and social processes in the last years. Factorial Survey consits in presenting repeated hypothetical situations, containing a number of variations,which respondents need to judge or decide on. In addition to the situation, key information on respondents is also collected and analyzed.

As the topics and contexts covered by this methodology are also growing very fast, many issues regarding application, topics, problems, particular groups or samples etc. arise during the process of such researches.

The main aim of this session is to share and present:

1.- Different applications of this methodology in social sciences

2.- Improvements and challenges of the use of the methodology in specific contexts or situations.

3.- Pariticularities of this methodology in dealing with specific groups

1. Decomposing the Deteminants of (Dis)Trust in Outgroups in Germany and Spain: Results from an Experimental Design using the Factorial Survey
Dr Edurne Bartolome Peral (University of Deusto)

2. Feasibility of the Factorial Survey Method in Ageing Research: Consistency Effects Among Older Respondents
Mr Andrea Teti (Institute of Medical Sociology, Charité, Berlin)
Dr Christiane Gross (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)

3. The factorial survey and its application in developing countries: effect of age and education
Mr Francisco Olivos (Centre for Social Conflict and Cohesion Studies)

4. On External Validity of Multifactorial Survey Experiments. Comparing fictional bonus payments, awarded by employers and first semester-students
Dr Knut Petzold (Department of Sociology, CU Eichstätt-Ingolstadt)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-101

Global societal change 2

Convenor   Mr Ferruccio Biolcati Rinaldi (University of Milan)
Coordinator 1 Mr Cristiano Vezzoni (University of Trento)

Session Details

This session examines societal change using major cross-national datasets such as the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, the East Asian Social Survey, the European Social Survey, the International Social Survey Program, and the World Values Survey. Special focus is on the 1) impact of globalization on attitudes and behaviors across countries, 2) whether there are signs of convergence, and 3) the role of cohort turnover in shaping global societal change.

1. Measuring online and offline participation: problems and solutions from the Australian case
Dr Jill Sheppard (The Australian National University)

2. Measuring political participation of women in Spain. A longitudinal analysis.
Miss Elena Badal Valero (Universitat de Valencia)
Mr Jose Manuel Pavia Miralles (Universitat de Valencia)

3. The Impact of Globalization on Radical Right Voting
Dr Kathrin Thomas (University of Vienna)

4. Global Risks and Perceptions of Science and Technology
Professor So Young Kim (KAIST)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-202

Investigating Survey Fieldwork Processes: Interviewers and Their Strategies

Convenor   Dr Wojciech Jablonski (University of Lodz)

Session Details

This session invites presentations dealing with different aspects of fieldwork in interview surveys – both in person (PAPI/CAPI) and over the telephone (CATI). In particular, we are interested in two issues. On the one hand, we will focus of the fieldwork procedures, guidelines, sets of rules, etc. implemented in order to keep the research process standardized and achieve high quality of survey data. On the other, we will investigate the problem of complying with these principles during fieldwork.

Topics that might come under this theme include (but are not limited to):
- innovative practices in interviewers' qualification and training (general, project-specific, and refresher);
- procedures of monitoring and evaluating interviewers' job performance (in particular, detecting interviewers' deviations);
- analysis of interviewers' behaviour during survey introduction and while asking questions/recording answers;
- interviewers' attitude toward their job (specifically the difficulties they encounter while administering the survey, and the solutions they implement in order to overcome these problems).

1. A new method for the analysis of interviewer variance, with an empirical application
Professor Patrick Sturgis (University of Southampton)
Dr Ian Brunton-smith (University of Surrey)
Dr George Leckie (University of Bristol)

2. The Impact of 'Third-Party Help' on Data Quality in Face-to-Face Interviews
Dr Melissa Quetulio-navarra (Wageningen University)
Dr Wander Van Der Vaart (University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht)
Professor Anke Niehof (Wageningen University)

3. Standardised Interviewer Training, Accreditation and Quality Procedures on the Millennium Cohort Study Age 14 survey
Ms Nickie Rose (Ipsos MORI, London, UK)
Ms Anne Conolly (Ipsos MORI, London, UK)
Dr Rachel Williams (Ipsos MORI, London, UK)

4. Modifying Interviewer Strategies to Reduce Cost of Data Collection
Dr Rachael Walsh (U.S. Census Bureau)
Mr Scott Boggess (U.S. Census Bureau)

5. Using panel data to identify interviewer effects? A comparison with common interviewer effect identification

strategies
Mr Simon Kühne (Socio-Economic Panel (DIW Berlin))
Professor Martin Kroh (Socio-Economic Panel (DIW Berlin))

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-206

Lay and co-researchers in survey research - participatory survey design

Convenor   Dr Dirk Schubotz (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)
Coordinator 1   Dr Ingvill Mochmann (GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Traditionally, participatory research projects which involve lay people as co-researchers or peer researcher have used qualitative and interpretive methods, such as focus groups, interviews or action research methods. The role of lay people in survey research, which is often regarded as very technical and perhaps too demanding for anyone without a related academic background, has rarely been extended beyond the function of piloting questions. However, with an increasingly active role of advocacy groups, and with policy regulations in many European countries that require decision makers to involve clients in the improvement of welfare services, there has been a growing scope to involve lay researchers in survey design. Examples for this are health research, children's rights based research and research involving older people. Lay people have been involved in research advisory groups, but also directly in the drafting of questions, the data collection, analysis and dissemination - and in rare cases, the actual design of the study.

For this session we invite papers that report on empirical experiences of involving lay people in any aspect of survey research. We also invite papers discussing thoughts and challenges of lay researcher involvement in survey research from a more theoretical and epistemological perspective.

1. Using participatory research to develop surveys on hidden populations
Professor Ingvill C. Mochmann (Cologne Business School and GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. OurMap of Environmental Justice: Using GIS and Digital Media for Youth-led Community-Based Participatory Action Research
Ms Marisol Becerra (The Ohio State University)

3. Involving children as co-researchers in the development of a children's rights questionnaire
Dr Katrina Lloyd (Queen's University Belfast)
Ms Lesley Emerson (Queen's University Belfast)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-201

Measurement errors in the wealth surveys 1

Convenor   Mr Junyi Zhu (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Coordinator 1 John Sabelhaus (Federal Reserve Board)
Coordinator 2 Brian Bucks (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau)

Session Details

Obtaining a comprehensive picture of households' balance sheets and understanding their wealth accumulation process is of increasing interest to a large audience ranging from poli-cymakers and researchers to the general public. Consequently, more and more wealth surveys have been established worldwide. However, wealth data are susceptible to measurement errors specific to the nature of various asset and liability items. For example, households may not assess the value and amount of their assets constantly. And the valuation of less traded or distinctive assets is not straightforward. The knowledge required to answer some question can be demanding. Financial topics are always sensitive. Typically, questions on ownership of assets or liabilities are answered more accurately than questions on their value and in most cases the reporting quality of the debts outperforms that of the assets. Households from both ends of the wealth distribution are hard to identify and reach. The longitudinal data adds another layer of difficulty in distinguishing true changes from measurement errors. On the other hand, reporting error, the main measurement error, does not have a homogeneous pattern but can be classified.
We would like to invite survey practitioners to discuss how to detect and tackle measurement errors in wealth surveys. Researchers can analyze the missing pattern within the survey as a signal of potential errors. Matching to external surveys or administrative data and utilizing the panel dimension are other options to gauge the plausibility of answers. But then, there have

been many prevention and reconciling measures. They include careful design and sequencing of questions, specialized interviewer training, software real-time checks, editing by reviewing the comments, dependent interviewing, etc. Innovative approaches are especially welcome. For example, using tax records, property lien data, online finance websites or other sources can fill the gap in building comprehensive profile of wealth accumulation.

1. Asking highly flexible forms of disaggregated income and single total question: a case study from PHF on measuring income in general purpose household survey
Mr Junyi Zhu (Deutsche Bundesbank)

2. The Mechanisms of Item Nonresponse and Measurement Error in Income Questions
Ms Barbara Felderer (University of Mannheim)

3. Comparing range questions vs. unfolding brackets as a means of reducing non-response on financial questions
Dr Mary Beth Ofstedal (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)
Dr Mick Couper (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-102

Modelling unit nonresponse and attrition processes 1

Convenor   Ms Carina Cornesse (GIP, Mannheim University)
Coordinator 1 Dr Gabriele Durrant (School of Social Sciences, University of Southampton)
Coordinator 2 Professor Annelies Blom (GIP, Mannheim University)

Session Details

This session focuses on analysing the processes leading to unit nonresponse in cross-sectional and attrition in longitudinal data. Unit nonresponse and attrition are major issues affecting data quality in surveys. Their importance has increased over the past decades as response rates in the US and Europe have been decreasing across survey modes and nonresponse rates may be related to nonresponse bias.

When modelling the fieldwork processes leading to nonresponse, research can draw on auxiliary data sources. These may include paradata, such as call record data, interviewer observations, time stamps during the interview, or variables from external data sources, such as administrative, register and census data.

In recent years, the statistical techniques that have been developed to model unit nonresponse and attrition and applied to survey data have become increasingly sophisticated. In addition, both ex-post modelling to learn from previous fieldwork outcomes and real-time modelling to inform adaptive and responsive survey designs have found its way into the survey methodological realm.

For our session we invite submissions from researchers who model unit nonresponse and attrition processes. We specifically encourage submissions of papers that use auxiliary data to model unit nonresponse and attrition processes and papers that use complex statistical models for this purpose.

1. Using Call Record and Previous Wave Information to Predict Final Outcome and Length of Call Sequences in a Longitudinal Survey
Dr Gabriele Durrant (School of Social Sciences, University of Southampton)

2. Explaining attrition. Whether it occurs, how and when.
Dr Peter Lugtig (Utrecht University/ University of Essex)

3. Call and Response: Modelling Longitudinal Contact and Cooperation using Lagged Contact Records Data
Mr Carlos Lagorio (Institute for Social and Economic Research - University of Essex)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-105

New forms of data collection: mobile/web 3

Convenor   Dr Emanuela Sala (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di MIlano Bicocca)
Coordinator 1 Dr Mario Callegaro (Google)
Coordinator 2 Dr Teresio Poggio (Faculty of Economics and Management Free University of Bozen-Bolzano)

Session Details

Advances in mobile and Internet technology offer researchers new tools, opportunities and challenges to design and carry out social surveys. The aim of this session is to foster discussion on the use of new forms of data collection in social research and its impact on data quality.

1. On the Go: How Mobile Participants Affect Survey Results
Dr Frances Barlas (GfK Custom Research)
Mr Randall Thomas (GfK Custom Research)

2. The Happiness Analyser
Mr Kai Ludwigs (Happiness Research Organisation)

3. The use of text messages in a web-survey. The case of a survey of Italian graduates
Dr Emanuela Sala (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di Milano Bicocca)
Miss Chiara Respi (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di Milano Bicocca)
Dr Alessandra Decataldo (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di Milano Bicocca)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-101

Social Desirability and Non-Reactive Methods in Survey Research: Improving Theory and Data Collection 2

Convenor	Dr Ivar Krumpal (University of Leipzig)
Coordinator 1	Professor Roger Berger (University of Leipzig)
Coordinator 2	Professor Mark Trappmann (IAB Nürnberg)

Session Details

Social desirability bias is a problem in surveys collecting data on private or norm-violating issues (e.g. sexual behavior, health related issues, voting preferences, income, or unsocial opinions) as soon as the respondent's true score differs from his or her perception of the social desirable score. Due to the respondents' strive for social approval and keeping a favourable self-image as well as data protection concerns, collecting valid data on private or norm-violating issues is a challenging task. More specifically, respondents may engage in impression management or self-deception or edit their answer before reporting it. Non-reactive data collection methods could improve measurements and data quality in surveys where social desirability bias is a potential problem. Therefore, the possibilities and limits of non-reactive methods (e.g. record linkage approaches, surveys without questions, biomarkers, field experiments or administrative data usage) will be critically discussed and compared to methods which are based on self-reports.

This session has four main goals: (1) discussion of the theoretical foundation of the research on social desirability bias in the context of a general theory of human psychology and social behavior. A clearer understanding of the social interactions between the actors that are involved in the data collection process could provide empirical researchers with a substantiated basis for optimizing their survey design and data collection to achieve high quality data; (2) presentation of current empirical research focusing on non-reactive methods of data collection in connection with the problem of social desirability; (3) discussion of new designs combining or contrasting non-reactive methods with standard 'question-and-answer' survey measurement in innovative ways; (4) exploration of possibilities of integrating such new and innovative approaches in well-established, large-scale population surveys taking into account problems of research ethics and data protection.

1. Validation of a lost letter experiment with a post-hoc survey
Professor Roger Berger (Sociology, University of Leipzig)

2. Two behavioral measures of dishonesty for surveys: An application on the five-factor model of personality and risk taking willingness
Mr Marc Höglinger (ETH Zurich)

3. The impact of data collection mode on sensitive social position indicators
Dr Ave Roots (University of Tartu)

4. Capturing Intrinsic Motivation of Teachers: A Framing Experiment
Ms Mariam Adil (World Bank)
Ms Shwetlena Sabarwal (World Bank)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-106

Social science data harmonization and replication: challenges and solutions for the 21st century

Convenor   Dr Kristi Winters (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Statistical analyses often require extensive data preparation and variable harmonization before the research can begin, yet there are no set documentation standards to facilitate transparent and precise replication. Second, increasing numbers of academic journals are adopting data policies to facilitate transparency and replication. This move to best practices increases the burden on researchers to make their data preparation, harmonization and variable transformation work transparent. Third, researchers have crossed the threshold into a digital world where, every day, humans create 2.5 quintillion bytes of data. This has led to a proliferation in datasets and the digital age has made accessing and combining data from multiple sources easier than ever. While this is a tremendous boom to social research, it further increases the need for transparency in variable transformations and harmonizations. All of this comes at a time when research journals space or stylistic constraints result in the omission of methodological details. This panel invites papers that address the challenges - and opportunities - the age of 21st century digital data present to social scientists. Paper topics may include, but are not limited to, issues of replication and replicability, documenting data preparation and variable harmonizations, trends in journal data policies, and resources for documenting data preparation for publication purposes and journal data policies.

1. The Inter-Disciplinary Importance of Data Harmonization
Dr Peter Granda (University of Michigan)

2. Harmonizing Large International Projects on Public Opinion: Challenges in Preparing Data for Quantitative Analysis.
Mrs Olena Oleksiyenko (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology Polish Academy of Sciences)
Professor Kazimierz Slomczynski (The Ohio State University; Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)
Dr Irina Tomescu-dubrow (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)

3. Fractal approach to cross-disciplinary research synthesis in social science and harmonization of research projects information space: methodology issues
Mrs Ludmila Kolesnikova (Dr. in Econ.Sc., Professor, IIPAM RANEPA, R&D Co-ordinator, NPO "SOCINCO")
Mrs Ludmila Vasilenko (Dr. in Soc.Sc., Professor, IIPAM RANEPA, Director, NPO "SOCINCO")
Mrs Ekaterina Mityasova (MA, Consultant, NPO "SOCINCO")

4. Increasing transparency and data replicability in the social sciences: a case study using CharmStats
Mr Sebastian Netscher (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

5. Harmonizing longitudinal data using CharmStats: the Australian Election Study
Dr Kristi Winters (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Steven Mceachern (Australian Data Archive)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-103

Survey Research in Developing Countries 1

Convenor   Dr Irene Pavesi (Small Arms Survey)

Session Details

This session explores the challenges involved in conducting survey research in developing countries and discuss best practices in sampling, questionnaire design and fieldwork organisation.

Even more often than in developed countries up-to-date data on population size and composition is absent. Mobile populations, scarcely populated areas and areas connected only by low quality roads and security issues complicate the creation of a sampling frame. What strategies have researchers used to deal with these challenges?

Response rates tend to be high in developing countries. This is in part because in rural areas trust tends to be high or a survey is seen as an interesting break from everyday life. However in some cases the consent of village heads or other local leaders is an order to people to participate. How does this fit with the idea of informed consent?

High poverty in some areas raises ethical questions on whether and how respondents should be compensated for their time; if respondents receive cash or in kind compensation this can lead to competition among households for inclusion in the survey. What are appropriate ways to compensate respondents?

Large household with complex structures can make collection of household data a time consuming and error prone process.

How can data be collected in an efficient way?

High ethnic and linguistic diversity poses challenges to both questionnaire translation and selection of interviewers. How can these challenges be dealt with?

If the people who design the questionnaire are not from the country of data collection, what procedures can be used to ensure that concepts in the survey resonate with those of the target population?

We welcome papers on these and related topics, such as reaching female respondents, use of ICT in data collection, surveying in (post-)conflict areas, and surveys among populations with high illiteracy rates

1. Raising the quality of nationally representative surveys in developing countries: A Nigerian case study on overcoming methodological challenges
Mr Joe Boniaszczuk (GfK South Africa)
Ms Phyllis Macfarlane (GfK NOP UK)
Dr Heiko Rölke (DIPF)

2. Multicultural, Multilingual, Multisocial… Multi-Everything: Empirical learning across 6 years of NIDS in South Africa
Mr Michael Brown (University of Cape Town)

3. When national censuses met small-scale surveys… A longitudinal project in rural Mali
Mrs Veronique Hertrich (INED)
Mrs Assa Doumbia (INSTAT, Mali)

4. Overcoming Social Desirability Bias: Use of ICVI in a South African Informal Settlement
Mr Wesley Hill (iCOMMS - University of Cape Town)

Wednesday 15th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-104

The impact of questionnaire design on measurements in surveys 2

Convenor	Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Coordinator 1	Ms Kathrin Bogner (GESIS)

Session Details

Questionnaire design is crucial for obtaining high-quality survey data. Still, there is a great need for research that helps to better understand how and under which conditions different design aspects of questionnaires impact measurement process and survey data quality. Therefore, researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with questionnaire design features such as question wording, visual design and answer formats, instructions, introductions and other relevant design aspects of questionnaires. Also, different means of measurement such as questions with nominal answer categories, rankings, ratings, sematic differentials or vignettes can be addressed or can be matter of comparison. Of interest is the impact of questionnaire design on response behavior, on systematic as well as non-systematic error or on validity. In addition, respondents' cognition or motivation can be in focus of the studies.

1. Smart Respondents: let´s keep it short.
Mrs Inna Becher (LINK Institute for Market and Social Research, Zurich)

2. From web to paper: evaluation from data providers and data analysts. The case of annual survey finances of enterprises
Mrs Deirdre Giesen (Statistics Netherlands)

3. Is variation in perceptions of inequality and redistribution actual or artifactual? Effects of wording, order, and number of items.
Dr Kinga Wysie?ska-di Carlo (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)
Dr Zbigniew Karpi?ski (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)

4. Does the Position of Non-cognitive Tests in the Questionnaire Affects Data Quality?
Dr Rafael Novella (Inter-American Development Bank)

5. Exploring a new way to avoid errors in attitude measurements due to complexity of "scientific" terms: an example with the term biodiversity
Miss Léïla Eisner (University of Lausanne)
Professor Caroline Roberts (FORS, University of Lausanne)

Wednesday 15th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-101

Poster Submission

Convenor Professor Bart Meuleman (University of Leuven)

1. Item-nonresponse and dropouts in an experimental mixed-mode study containing sensitive questions
Mr Johann Carstensen (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)

2. Survey misreporting of welfare receipt - respondent, interviewer, and interview characteristics
Dr Gerrit Müller (IAB)
Dr Kerstin Bruckmeier (IAB)
Professor Regina Riphahn (University Erlangen-Nuremberg)

3. Prejudicial Nonresponse: When Does Non-ignorable Missing Data Destroy Internal Validity?
Dr Edward F. Wolff (Arcadia University)
Dr Jeffery Osgood, Jr. (West Chester University)
Dr Steven Kramer (21st Century Partnership for STEM Education)
Dr R. Lorraine Bernotsky (West Chester University)

4. Age happiness using the cumulative data of the European Social Survey
Professor Seppo Laaksonen (University of Helsinki)

5. Using multilevel modeling for exploring the factors affecting women's attitudes towards domestic violence
Ms Munkhzul Zookhuu (University of Geneva)

6. The development of the Near-Peer Effectiveness Scale (NPES)
Dr Boaz Shulruf (University of New South Wales)
Dr Helen Scicluna (University of New South Wales)
Dr Tony O'sullivan (University of New South Wales)

7. Randomness, probability e representativeness: playing with the concepts in sample surveys
Professor Sonia Stefanizzi (Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Milan-Bicocca, Italy)
Professor Fulvia Mecatti (Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Milan-Bicocca, Italy)

8. Linking LinkedIn data with Survey Responses
Dr Ashley Kirzinger (University of Illinois Springfield)

9. Survey Quality Predictor 2.0
Ms Anna De Castellarnau (RECSM, UPF)

10. Cross-cultural perception of environmental problems between socio-economic groups
Mr Thorsten Euler (University of Bremen / Germany)

11. Some experiments on mail survey implementations: Handwriting letter, leaflet, envelope, questionnaire design, and schedule.
Dr Takahiro Tsuchiya (The Institute of Statistical Mathematics)
Dr Yoosung Park (The Institute of Statistical Mathematics)

12. Using Graph Databases and Graph Algorithms to Manage and Analyse Linked Data
Dr James Farrow (SANT DataLink)

13. Network analysis of survey data. Methodological reflections
Dr Elisa Bellotti (University of Manchester)

14. An interview: between the freedom and the "inner censor"
Mrs Yuliya Zadnipryana (Leibniz University Hannover)

15. Limitations on the use of Multiple Imputation in longitudinal panel datasets with many waves: Empirical Comparison of some alternative solutions.
Professor David Johnson (Pennsylvania State University)
Dr Rebekah Young (University of Washington)

16. Is form processing application cost saving? A practical example.
Mr Julien Danhier (ULB - GERME)
Miss Emilie Martin (ULB - GERME)
Miss Alejandra Alarcon-henriquez (ULB - GERME)

17. MOTUS-app: time-use research through smartphones and tablets
Mr Joeri Minnen (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Sociology Dept., Research Group TOR)
Mr Ignace Glorieux (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Sociology Dept., Research Group TOR)
Mr Theun Pieter Van Tienoven (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Sociology Dept., Research Group TOR)

18. Secondary data analysis of teens' surveys on Social Hygiene for modeling of non-Smoking behavior after experience of cigarette usage
Dr Violetta Khabibulina (Pavlov First Saint-Petersburg State Medical University)

19. Problems with the new ICT development index – indexing the intensity of Internet use
Dr Sylvia Peacock (York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada)

20. Doing Beauty and sexual orientation
Mr Johannes Krause (Heinrich-Heine University)

21. Participation in a probability-based mixed-mode panel: Effects of prepaid versus promised Incentives
Ms Ines Schaurer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Professor Michael Bosnjak (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences; Free University Bozen-Bolzano)

22. Information Networks and Generalized Trust: Evidence from the German Socio-Economic Panel
Dr Johannes Jarke (University of Hamburg)

23. Teaching research methods: common problems and misconceptions related to random sampling
Dr Premalatha Karupiah (Universiti Sains Malaysia)

24. Measuring Financial Literacy in a Large-Scale General Survey
Mr Jonas Beste (Institute of Employment Research)

25. Initiatives and Working Plan to Improve Response Rates
Mr Laflamme Francois (Statistics Canada)
Mrs Rivais Lise (Statistics Canada)

26. Is it worth using paradata to correct for total non-response before calibration in telephone survey? A simulation study based on a real survey
Mr Stéphane Legleye (INED)
Mr Nirintsoa Razakamanana (INED)
Mrs Géraldine Charrance (INED)
Miss Hélène Juillard (INED)

27. Differences between Best-Worst and Discrete Choice Experiments in Examining Electric Vehicle Purchasing Behaviour
Dr Doina Olaru (The University of Western Australia)
Mrs Fakhra Jabeen (The University of Western Australia)
Dr Brett Smith (The University of Western Australia)

28. Cross-national cognitive interview: challenges and solutions for larger scale studies.
Dr Anna Sandoval Giron (American Institutes for Research)

29. Longitudinal establishment data – Analyses of family-friendly arrangements in response to increasing work-life balance demand
Mrs Corinna Frodermann (University of Nuremberg)
Mrs Daniela Grunow (University of Frankfurt)
Mrs Dana Müller (Institute for Employment Research, Nuremberg)

30. Metadata interoperability and access for microdata
Mrs Chantal Ripp (Statistics Canada)
Ms Donna Dosman (Statistics Canada)

31. Sources of work-family conflict in the life of European men
Miss Nikolett Geszler (Corvinus University of Budapest)

32. Children's Time Use Patterns and the Trade-off Within
Dr Sarah Grace See (Collegio Carlo Alberto)

33. Conner's Adult ADHD Rating Scales: Psychometric properties of the Catalan version
Miss Laura Nuño (Hospital Clínic de Barcelona)
Professor Juana Gómez-benito (University of Barcelona)
Professor Juan Antonio Amador (University of Barcelona)

34. Experiments in securing web participation of children and young adults
Dr Annemieke Luiten (CBS - Statistics Netherlands)
Mrs Sjoertje Vos (CBS-Statistics Netherlands)
Dr Barry Schouten (CBS-Statistics Netherlands)

35. Development and content validity of an instrument for assessing entrepreneurial orientation in the educational field
Dr Arantxa Gorostiaga (University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU)
Dr Nekane Balluerka (University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU)
Dr Imanol Ulacia (University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU)
Dr Jone Aliri (University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU)
Dr Goretti Soroa (University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU)

Dr Aitor Aritzeta (University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU)
Dr Alexander Muela (University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU)

36. The duration of a survey field
Dr Jean-marie Le Goff (University of Lausanne. Lines Center and Lives NCCR)

37. Translatability of bullying and cyberbullying items for School Climate Surveys in the United States
Dr Anna Sandoval Giron (American Institutes for Research)
Dr Yan Wang (American Institutes for Research)

38. Panel Attrition Trough Time
Dr Carmen Klement (Fakultät für Staats- und Sozialwissenschaften)
Dr Ulrich Pötter (DJI)

39. Quality of life index vs. Lfe satisfaction single variable in a longitudinal and local study in Guadalajara
Mr Victor Ortiz (Gobierno del Estado de Jalisco)

40. Testing the Theory of Social Integration
Ms Ashley Amaya (JPSM at the University of Maryland)

41. Assessing affective dispositions and preferences towards creativity: Development and validation of EDICOS
Dr Goretti Soroa (Faculty of Psychology, UPV/EHU)
Professor Nekane Balluerka (Faculty of Psychology, UPV/EHU)
Dr Arantxa Gorostiaga (Faculty of Psychology, UPV/EHU)
Dr Aitor Aritzeta (Faculty of Psychology, UPV/EHU)
Dr Jone Aliri (Faculty of Psychology, UPV/EHU)
Dr Alex Muela (Faculty of Psychology, UPV/EHU)

42. Picking up the Pieces – Applying the "Disease Filter" to Health Data
Dr Christiane Gross (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)
Dr Thomas Schübel (Deutsches Jugendinstitut)
Dr Rasmus Hoffmann (European University Institute)

43. The Level of Integration of the Third Country Nationals with Respect to Associative Behaviour. Propensity Score Matching Approach
Dr Marie Valentova (LISER Luxembourg)
Dr Aigul Alieva (LISER Luxembourg)
Miss Marie-sophie Callens (LISER Luxembourg)

44. The Greek economic crisis as a "case study"
Dr Stefania Kalogeraki (University of Crete, Greece)

45. The Impact of Nonresponse on Estimates of Volunteering in the Case of Denmark
Mr Jonathan Hermansen (Roskilde University)

46. Using R to estimate parameters from sensitive data with randomized response techniques
Dr Antonio Arcos (University of Granada)
Miss Beatriz Cobo (University of Granada)
Dr Maria Del Mar Rueda (University of Granada)

47. A competencies study on Andalusian students using new estimation methods with the PISA survey data.
Dr Maria Del Mar Rueda (Univeristy of Granada)
Dr Ana Lara (University of Granada)
Dr Ismael Sánchez-borrego (University of Granada)

48. Social Connections and Generalized Trust: Exploring the Reasons Behind the Correlation
Mr Sergio Lo Iacono (University of Essex)

49. Calibrated Prevalences From Different Approaches of Infertility in Women: a Cross-Sectional Population-Based Study
Mr A. Cabrera-león (Biomedical Research Networking Centre on Public Health and Epidemiology)
Mr M.n. Moya-garrido (Andalusian School of Public Health. Andalusian Ministry of Health and Wellbeing, Spain)
Mr M.n. Lopez-villaverde (ValmeHospital, Andalusian Ministry of Health and Wellbeing, Spain)

50. Improvements of EU-SILC quality
Mr Emilio Di Meglio (Eurostat)
Mrs Emanuela Di Falco (Eurostat)

51. Changing value orientations and the impact of interviewer age.
Mr Volker Hüfken (Heinrich-Heine University, Department of Social Sciences)

52. Web listening and latent meanings: a possible mixture?
Professor Emma Zavarrone (IULM University)

53. Fertility in the unregistered marriage in Russia

Ms Zilia Vafina (Higher School of Economics)

54. The local and the national in European citizens' political discussions: a multilevel analysis of 31 countries
Mr João Cancela (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

55. Job stability and Fertility Intentions across Europe: does labour market legislation matter?
Dr Tatiana Karabchuk (Higher School of Economics)

56. Social Research in Developing Countries: Experiences with Open Source Solutions, Capacity Building and Mental Models
Dr Heiko Rölke (DIPF)
Dr Andreas Neus (GfK Verein)
Mr Ingo Barkow (DIPF)

57. Data Fusion: Using automated Expert Knowledge as Auxiliary Source of Information
Dr Ronald Gebauer (Friedrich Schiller University of Jena)

58. Sample design of Portuguese National Health Examination Survey
Ms Irina Kislaya (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge, IP, Lisbon, Portugal)
Dr Baltazar Nunes (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge, IP, Lisbon, Portugal)
Ms Rita Roquette (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge, IP, Lisbon, Portugal)
Dr Sónia Namorado (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge)
Dr Carlos Matias Dias (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge)

59. The Multinational Time Use Study: Compiling a Cross-National Cross-Time Record of Changes in People's Daily Activities
Dr Kimberly Fisher (Centre for Time Use Research)
Professor Jonathan Gershuny (Centre for Time Use Research)

60. Record Linkage Method for the Social Survey in Statistics Korea
Dr Mi Ock Jeong (STATISTICS KOREA)
Dr Pil Keun Choi (STATISTICS KOREA)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N-131

Long-Term Cross-National Assessment of Social Cohesion

Convenor   Professor Klaus Boehnke (Jacobs University Bremen)

Session Details

Cohesion as a social indicator reflecting the quality of contemporary societies is a topic of increasing importance in times of globalization and a significant increase in migration flows around the world. Several different conceptualizations of social cohesion have been offered in the literature, but a comprehensive empirical assessment of social cohesion across time and in various regions of the world has not been provided yet. Recently Bertelsmann Foundation commissioned an attempt to provide a benchmarking concept and a secondary data-analytic approach to assessing social cohesion in the OECD world since 1989. Conceptually, the Bertelsmann project defines social cohesion as a multidimensional characteristic of a collective measured at the micro, meso, and macro levels on nine dimensions, namely social network quality, trust in people, acceptance of diversity, identification with the social entity, trust in institutions, perceived fairness, solidarity and helpfulness, respect for social rules, and magnitude of civic participation. Empirically the study had Scandinavian countries emerge at the top of the social cohesion ranking and South-Eastern European states at the bottom among 34 countries. Bertelsmann also commissioned an analysis on the development of social cohesion in the 16 German states since the fall of the Iron Curtain and fueled research into antecedents and consequences of social cohesion. Currently extensions of the research program to the local level in Germany as well as to other regions of the world are discussed, and so are future assessments of social cohesion based on newly gathered data. Several contributions from the Bertelsmann project will form the backbone of the suggested session, but both a critical view at the concepts and analytic strategies of the research published so far as well as independent contributions to social indicator research in the sphere of social cohesion will be highly beneficial for the session.

1. The Essentials of Social Cohesion
Dr Jolanda Van Der Noll (University of Hagen)
Dr David Schiefer (Jacobs University Bremen)

2. What makes societies cohesive? And what is cohesion good for?
Professor Jan Delhey (Jacobs University Bremen)
Mr Georgi Dragolov (Jacobs University Bremen and BIGSSS)
Dr Zsòfia Ignacz (Free University Berlin)

3. How cohesive are modern societies? Evidence from the Bertelsmann Cohesion Radar
Mr Georgi Dragolov (Jacobs University Bremen and BIGSSS)

Dr Jan Lorenz (Jacobs University Bremen)
Dr Zsofia Ignacz (Free University Berlin)

4. Do individual-level value preferences impact country-level social cohesion? An exploratory multi-level analysis based on ESS data
Dr Mandy Boehnke (University of Bremen, Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences (BIGSSS))
Professor Klaus Boehnke (Jacobs University Bremen)

5. Problems of Equivalence of Social Cohesion Measurement: Evidence from Post-Communist Countries
Ms Ekaterina Lytkina (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Laboratory for Comparative Social Research, Department of Sociology)
Ms Natalya Voronina (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Department of Sociology)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-201

Measurement errors in the wealth surveys 2

Convenor   Mr Junyi Zhu (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Coordinator 1 John Sabelhaus (Federal Reserve Board)
Coordinator 2 Brian Bucks (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau)

Session Details

Obtaining a comprehensive picture of households' balance sheets and understanding their wealth accumulation process is of increasing interest to a large audience ranging from poli-cymakers and researchers to the general public. Consequently, more and more wealth surveys have been established worldwide. However, wealth data are susceptible to measurement errors specific to the nature of various asset and liability items. For example, households may not assess the value and amount of their assets constantly. And the valuation of less traded or distinctive assets is not straightforward. The knowledge required to answer some question can be demanding. Financial topics are always sensitive. Typically, questions on ownership of assets or liabilities are answered more accurately than questions on their value and in most cases the reporting quality of the debts outperforms that of the assets. Households from both ends of the wealth distribution are hard to identify and reach. The longitudinal data adds another layer of difficulty in distinguishing true changes from measurement errors. On the other hand, reporting error, the main measurement error, does not have a homogeneous pattern but can be classified.
We would like to invite survey practitioners to discuss how to detect and tackle measurement errors in wealth surveys. Researchers can analyze the missing pattern within the survey as a signal of potential errors. Matching to external surveys or administrative data and utilizing the panel dimension are other options to gauge the plausibility of answers. But then, there have been many prevention and reconciling measures. They include careful design and sequencing of questions, specialized interviewer training, software real-time checks, editing by reviewing the comments, dependent interviewing, etc. Innovative approaches are especially welcome. For example, using tax records, property lien data, online finance websites or other sources can fill the gap in building comprehensive profile of wealth accumulation.

1. Comparing Wealth – Data Quality of the HFCS
Ms Anita Tiefensee (Hertie School of Governance)
Dr Markus M. Grabka (DIW)

2. Measuring Income and Wealth at the Top Using Administrative and Survey Data
Dr Jesse Bricker (Federal Reserve Board)
Dr Alice Henriques (Federal Reserve Board)
Dr John Sabelhaus (Federal Reserve Board)

3. The Wealth of Wealthholders
Professor Matthew Shapiro (University of Michigan)
Dr John Ameriks (The Vanguard Group, Inc)
Professor Andrew Caplin (NYU)

4. Micro and macro data: A comparison of the Household Finance and Consumption Survey with Financial Accounts in Austria
Mr Peter Lindner (Oesterreichische Nationalbank)
Mr Michael Andreasch (Oesterreichische Nationalbank)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-101

Methods for Improving Causal Inference in the Social Sciences

Convenor   Professor Jochen Mayerl (University of Kaiserslautern, Germany)
Coordinator 1 Professor Volker Stocké (University of Kassel, GErmany)
Coordinator 2 Professor Levente Littvay (Central European University, Hungary)

Session Details

The central aim of social sciences is to discover the causal effect of explanatory variables on various outcomes. However, we are often restricted to quasi-experimental, observational and in particular cross sectional survey data. Under these conditions, the causal status of observed associations remains unclear, because of unobserved heterogeneity and reverse causation. At present the methodological tools for improving causal inference are not common knowledge.
These tools are firstly different kinds of fixed-effects estimation (e.g. school fixed-effects) which eliminates the possibly endogenous between-variance. When longitudinal panel data is available, different methods like individual fixed effects panel regression, cross-lagged autoregressive models, latent growth curve models, and autoregressive latent trajectory models are used to decide on causality. Differences-in-differences estimators can be used on the aggregate level. Secondly, matching-techniques (e.g. propensity score matching) comparing the difference of similar members of the treatment and control group are feasible as well. Thirdly, instrumental variable approaches, utilizing exogenous determinants of the treatment condition to estimate causal effects. Fourthly, regression discontinuity techniques are used in order to exploit variance at the edge between strata of the explanatory variables.
All these methods of causal analysis make certain assumptions, for instance no systematic missing data, the SUTVA-condition and unconfoundedness. In contrast to more common methods of analysis, the consequences of violations of these assumptions are much less analyzed. The same is true for decisions which have to be made when causal analyses are applied. For instance, which criterion should be used in the case of matching-techniques? How to judge the exogeneity and strength of an instrumental variable?

This session invites methodological and empirical contributions which apply methods for improving causal inference in survey research, compares them to "naive" methods or presents progress in methodological issues.

1. Methodological Issues in the Analysis of the Scar-Effects of Unemployment
Mr Sebastian Beil (Ruhr University Bochum)

2. Better a Living Donkey than a Dead Lion: Identification and Estimation of the Causal Effect at the Aggregate Level, if assumptions at Individual Level are Violated
Dr Ulf Kroehne (German Institute for International Educational Research (DIPF), Frankfurt am Main (Germany))
Professor Johannes Hartig (German Institute for International Educational Research (DIPF), Frankfurt am Main (Germany))
Professor Eckhard Klieme (German Institute for International Educational Research (DIPF), Frankfurt am Main (Germany))

3. The interrelation of immigrants' interethnic ties and socioeconomic status in Germany. An autoregressive panel analysis.
Mr Sascha Riedel (University of Cologne)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-105

Mobile and mixed-device surveys

Convenor   Dr Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)
Coordinator 1 Mrs Marika De Bruijne (CentERdata)
Coordinator 2 Mr Arnaud Wijnant (CentERdata)

Session Details

Mobile and mixed-device surveys

Online surveys can nowadays be completed on many devices. The devices range from a traditional desktop computer, to a tablet, smartphone or hybrids of these. There is a clear increase in the use of mobile devices for survey completion. Small displays and alternative input mechanisms impose challenges for survey research. In addition, the mixes of devices poses challenges to survey methodologists, mainly in questionnaire design and measurement error, but also in sampling and nonresponse conversion.

We are seeking presentations that highlight potential opportunities and problems in mobile and mixed-device data collection, compare different approaches to deal with these problems, and/or propose solutions. For example:

- how can mixed-devices help to reduce noncoverage and nonresponse bias?
- can survey respondents be effectively nudged towards using a particular device within a web-survey?
- what possibilities and threats do mixed-device survey open up for measurement?
- how to design Web survey questionnaires effectively for use across mobile or mixed-devices?

-etc.

1. Questionnaire Design Experiments with PC- and Tablet-based Web Surveys in a Controlled Setting
Mr Alexander Wenz (University of Essex)

2. Do mobile participants reduce data quality in general population surveys? A replication and extension using data from the GESIS Panel
Dr Bella Struminskaya (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Mr Kai Weyandt (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Teresio Poggio (Free University of Bozen-Bolzano)

3. Effects of Mobile versus PC Web on Survey Response Quality: a Crossover Experiment in a Probability Web Panel
Mr Christopher Antoun (Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan)

4. App vs. Web for Surveys of Smartphone Users
Mrs Kyley Mcgeeney (Pew Research Center)
Miss Ruth Igielnik (Pew Research Center)

5. The Role of Automated SMS Text Messaging in Public Opinion Research
Dr Nina Hoe (Institute for Survey Research - Temple University)
Dr Heidi Grunwald (Institute for Survey Research - Temple University)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-102

Modelling unit nonresponse and attrition processes 2

Convenor   Ms Carina Cornesse (GIP, Mannheim University)
Coordinator 1 Dr Gabriele Durrant (School of Social Sciences, University of Southampton)
Coordinator 2 Professor Annelies Blom (GIP, Mannheim University)

Session Details

This session focuses on analysing the processes leading to unit nonresponse in cross-sectional and attrition in longitudinal data. Unit nonresponse and attrition are major issues affecting data quality in surveys. Their importance has increased over the past decades as response rates in the US and Europe have been decreasing across survey modes and nonresponse rates may be related to nonresponse bias.

When modelling the fieldwork processes leading to nonresponse, research can draw on auxiliary data sources. These may include paradata, such as call record data, interviewer observations, time stamps during the interview, or variables from external data sources, such as administrative, register and census data.

In recent years, the statistical techniques that have been developed to model unit nonresponse and attrition and applied to survey data have become increasingly sophisticated. In addition, both ex-post modelling to learn from previous fieldwork outcomes and real-time modelling to inform adaptive and responsive survey designs have found its way into the survey methodological realm.

For our session we invite submissions from researchers who model unit nonresponse and attrition processes. We specifically encourage submissions of papers that use auxiliary data to model unit nonresponse and attrition processes and papers that use complex statistical models for this purpose.

1. Investigatin Nonresponse Bias: Why Do Different Interviewers Cause Different Degrees of Selectivity?
Mr Michael Ruland (WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin, Germany)
Mrs Sara Kretschmer (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories, Bamberg &Institute for Employment Research, Nuremberg, Germany)
Mrs Jennifer Elsner (University of Siegen, Germany)

2. Does the Switch to a Mixed-Mode Design Increase Panel Attrition? Evidence from the UKHLS Innovation Panel
Miss Alessandra Gaia (Univerisyt of Milan-Bicocca)

3. Using Machine Learning to Correct for Survey Nonresponse Bias
Dr Antje Kirchner (University of Nebraska- Lincoln)
Dr Curtis Signorino (University of Rochester)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: L-102

Natural Experiments in Survey Research

Convenor   Professor Henning Best (University of Wuerzburg)
Coordinator 1 Dr Gerrit Bauer (University of Munich)

Session Details

In this session we are particularly interested in papers on identification of treatment effects in natural experiments, research combining surveys with natural-experimental designs, papers that employ multiple methods of treatment estimation, and innovative ways to design or analyze natural experiments in cross-sectional and especially panel surveys.

Though experiments are generally regarded as the royal road to causal inference, natural experiments often face serious problems: endogeneity, insufficiencies in standardizing treatment- and control conditions, and self-selection into study- and control group. Advances in data analysis have tackled these problems, and methods such as IV-regression, conditional fixed-effects models and propensity score matching help in identifying unbiased treatment effects.

We are not only interested in applications of natural experiments in the social sciences but especially encourage submissions on methods and designs. Examples of such methods include applications of IV-regression, conditional fixed-effects models, propensity score matching and regression discontinuity designs.

1. Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: Overview, Typology & Evaluation Criteria
Dr Gerrit Bauer (LMU Munich)
Professor Henning Best (University of Wuerzburg)

2. The short term effect of the escalation of 2008-crisis on the relation between social vulnerability and welfare and labour market threats. A natural experiment approach.
Dr Marie Valentova (LISER Luxembourg)
Miss Marie-sophie Callens (LISER)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-101

Social Desirability and Non-Reactive Methods in Survey Research: Improving Theory and Data Collection 1

Convenor   Dr Ivar Krumpal (University of Leipzig)
Coordinator 1   Professor Roger Berger (University of Leipzig)
Coordinator 2   Professor Mark Trappmann (IAB Nürnberg)

Session Details

Social desirability bias is a problem in surveys collecting data on private or norm-violating issues (e.g. sexual behavior, health related issues, voting preferences, income, or unsocial opinions) as soon as the respondent's true score differs from his or her perception of the social desirable score. Due to the respondents' strive for social approval and keeping a favourable self-image as well as data protection concerns, collecting valid data on private or norm-violating issues is a challenging task. More specifically, respondents may engage in impression management or self-deception or edit their answer before reporting it. Non-reactive data collection methods could improve measurements and data quality in surveys where social desirability bias is a potential problem. Therefore, the possibilities and limits of non-reactive methods (e.g. record linkage approaches, surveys without questions, biomarkers, field experiments or administrative data usage) will be critically discussed and compared to methods which are based on self-reports.

This session has four main goals: (1) discussion of the theoretical foundation of the research on social desirability bias in the context of a general theory of human psychology and social behavior. A clearer understanding of the social interactions between the actors that are involved in the data collection process could provide empirical researchers with a substantiated basis for optimizing their survey design and data collection to achieve high quality data; (2) presentation of current empirical research focusing on non-reactive methods of data collection in connection with the problem of social desirability; (3) discussion of new designs combining or contrasting non-reactive methods with standard 'question-and-answer' survey measurement in innovative ways; (4) exploration of possibilities of integrating such new and innovative approaches in well-established, large-scale population surveys taking into account problems of research ethics and data protection.

1. Surveys in Legislative Research: Methodological Challenges and Opportunities
Mr Pirmin Bundi (University of Zurich)
Professor Frédéric Varone (University of Geneva)
Professor Thomas Widmer (University of Zurich)

2. Application of Paradata to Identify Social Desirability in Surveys
Mr Fabian Schüßler (University of Kaiserslautern)
Professor Jochen Mayerl (University of Kaiserslautern)

3. Social Desirability and Experimental Vignettes in Survey Research. A Validation Study Using Non-Reactive Data
Dr Knut Petzold (Department of Sociology, CU Eichstätt-Ingolstadt)

4. External Validation of a Factorial Survey with Longitudinal and Administrative Data
Mr Konstantin Mozer (Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-206

Student Involvement in Surveys

Convenor   Professor Mary Gray (American University, Washington DC)
Coordinator 1 Mr Emmanuel Addo (American University, Washington DC)

Session Details

Session proposal: Student Involvement in Surveys

There are many ways to include undergraduate and graduate students in survey classes in practical applications of what they are studying. Hearing of successful projects would assist and encourage other academics to involve their students at an early stage of their careers and would provide practical benefits to the students. Such projects also have been found to entice students in substantive fields of survey research to continue and expand their statistical training. Hands-on work that produces tangible results can be inspirational for young people as well as intrinsically valuable, especially when important policy issues are addressed. Such training can be organized not only through colleges and universities but also through groups such as Statisticians without Borders which provides pro bono assistance to NGOs, particularly in the developing world, in a framework that pairs experienced volunteers with novices. A session where examples of such projects are presented will open up broad possibilities for the development of participatory training to conference participants. For example, an exit poll survey in various states within the United States in November 2014 will examine the disparate effect on minority ethnic groups and rural, inner city and low income populations of voter ID laws that suppress access to the polls would be one potential contribution to the session; a successful pilot project in the state of Virginia is the model for this endeavor.

1. Every Vote Counts - Student Generated Exit Polls to Examine Effect of Voter ID Laws
Professor Mary Gray (American University, Washington DC)
Professor Emmanuel Addo (American University, Washington DC)
Professor Kelly Mccolville (Swarthmore College)
Mr Benjamin Muirhead (American University, Washington DC)

2. Lessons from a student-led exit poll experiment
Dr Iasonas Lamprianou (University of Cyprus)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: L-101

Substantive Analyses of Intensive Longitudinal Data

Convenor   Professor Jennifer Barber (University of Michigan)

Session Details

Recent, rapid improvements in technology have greatly facilitated survey researchers' ability to collect frequent, closely-spaced surveys. This is sometimes called intensive longitudinal data, or frequent assessment panel data. Truly illuminating analyses of the resulting data , which take full advantage of the frequent assessments, can be challenging.

Some traditional analytic methods, such as hazard models and linear growth curve models, are well-suited to intensive longitudinal data because they involve time-varying variables, and the intensive longitudinal data are easily translated into such time-varying variables. However, standard latent trajectory methods have difficulty with 100+ assessments per unit of analysis. In addition, intensive longitudinal data are particularly well-suited for examining transitions, sequences, and patterns, which are not easily illustrated with traditional analytic methods.

This session will present examples of innovative substantive research using many closely spaced assessments per unit of

analysis. These examples will spur other researchers to analyze their own intensive longitudinal data in new and innovative ways.

1. Comparison of precarious job entry histories over time
Mr Ralf Dorau (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

2. Survey design based inferences for regression effects in non-stationary models for longitudinal count data
Dr Vandna Jowaheer (Associate Professor)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: L-103

Survey Research in Developing Countries 2

Convenor   Dr Irene Pavesi (Small Arms Survey)

Session Details

This session explores the challenges involved in conducting survey research in developing countries and discuss best practices in sampling, questionnaire design and fieldwork organisation.

Even more often than in developed countries up-to-date data on population size and composition is absent. Mobile populations, scarcely populated areas and areas connected only by low quality roads and security issues complicate the creation of a sampling frame. What strategies have researchers used to deal with these challenges?

Response rates tend to be high in developing countries. This is in part because in rural areas trust tends to be high or a survey is seen as an interesting break from everyday life. However in some cases the consent of village heads or other local leaders is an order to people to participate. How does this fit with the idea of informed consent?

High poverty in some areas raises ethical questions on whether and how respondents should be compensated for their time; if respondents receive cash or in kind compensation this can lead to competition among households for inclusion in the survey. What are appropriate ways to compensate respondents?

Large household with complex structures can make collection of household data a time consuming and error prone process. How can data be collected in an efficient way?

High ethnic and linguistic diversity poses challenges to both questionnaire translation and selection of interviewers. How can these challenges be dealt with?

If the people who design the questionnaire are not from the country of data collection, what procedures can be used to ensure that concepts in the survey resonate with those of the target population?

We welcome papers on these and related topics, such as reaching female respondents, use of ICT in data collection, surveying in (post-)conflict areas, and surveys among populations with high illiteracy rates

1. Responding on sensitive topics: firearm issues in post conflict settings
Dr Irene Pavesi (Small Arms Survey)

2. Second Stage Sampling for Conflict Areas: Methods and Implications
Ms Kristen Himelein (The World Bank Group)
Dr Stephanie Eckman (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))

3. Good practices in ethical and safe survey research on violence against women
Dr Henrica A.f.m. Jansen (UNFPA)

4. Surveying in the Aftermath of an Earthquake : The Lessons of Haiti
Miss Claire Zanuso (DIAL)

5. How random is within household random selection?
Dr Evelyn Ersanilli (University of Oxford)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-104

The impact of questionnaire design on measurements in surveys 3

Convenor   Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Coordinator 1   Ms Kathrin Bogner (GESIS)

Session Details

Questionnaire design is crucial for obtaining high-quality survey data. Still, there is a great need for research that helps to better understand how and under which conditions different design aspects of questionnaires impact measurement process and survey data quality. Therefore, researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with questionnaire design features such as question wording, visual design and answer formats, instructions, introductions and other relevant design aspects of questionnaires. Also, different means of measurement such as questions with nominal answer categories, rankings, ratings, sematic differentials or vignettes can be addressed or can be matter of comparison. Of interest is the impact of questionnaire design on response behavior, on systematic as well as non-systematic error or on validity. In addition, respondents' cognition or motivation can be in focus of the studies.

1. The Who: experimental evidence on the effect of respondent selection on collecting individual asset ownership information
Mr Talip Kilic (The World Bank)
Ms Heather Moylan (The World Bank)

2. Portuguese National Health Examination Survey: questionnaire development
Ms Ana Santos (Epidemiology department, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge)
Professor Ana Paula Gil (Epidemiology department, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge)
Professor Marta Barreto (Epidemiology department, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge)
Ms Vânia Gaio (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge)
Dr Sónia Namorado (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor)
Ms Irina Kislaya (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge)
Ms Heidi Lyshol (Norwegian Institute of Public Health)
Dr Baltazar Nunes (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge)
Dr Carlos Matias Dias (Department of Epidemiology, National Health Institute Doutor Ricardo Jorge)

3. An integrated household survey for Wales
Dr Steven Marshall (Welsh Government)

4. Undesired response to surveys, wrong answers or poorly worded questions? How respondents insist on reporting their situation despite unclear questioning
Dr Eva Lelièvre (INED)
Dr Loïc Trabut (INED)

5. Ask a Positive Question and Get a Positive Answer: Evidence on Acquiescence Bias from Health Care Centers in Nigeria
Dr David Evans (World Bank)
Professor Mario Macis (Johns Hopkins University)
Mr Felipe Dunsch (World Bank)
Ms Qiao Wang (World Bank)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-103

Uses of Geographic Information Systems Tools in Survey Data Collection & Analysis

Convenor   Dr Stephanie Eckman (IAB)
Coordinator 1   Mr Ned English (NORC)

Session Details

The application of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and related tools to survey data collection and analysis has dramatically increased in recent years. Traditionally, GIS tools have been applied primarily in the frame construction, sampling, and data collection phases of survey research. More recently, researchers have begun to use records of interviewer travel to detect falsification and determine how to make data collection more efficient. The techniques of geostatistics and geospatial models can provide new methods for studying and reducing nonresponse and measurement error. As these technologies become less expensive and easier to use, and geographic data becomes more widely available on the web, we expect survey researchers to find even more uses for these tools. While we embrace these tools, however, we should also maintain a healthy

skepticism about their capabilities and limitations.

This series of sessions at the ESRA 2015 conference will bring together survey researchers from different countries to discuss novel applications of GIS technology to data collection and analysis and to share ideas. We encourage papers that discuss the use GIS or GPS technologies in any stage of the survey process, and how these tools can help us understand, reduce or adjust for different error sources. We are also interested in papers that review errors in GIS technology and how they can impact survey quality.

1. Fantasyland: Comparing Subjective and Objective Measures of Farm Land Area in Household Surveys
Ms Sydney Gourlay (World Bank Group)
Dr Calogero Carletto (World Bank Group)
Ms Siobhan Murray (World Agroforestry Centre)

2. NORC PLACES: An interactive GIS-enabled tool for sharing and displaying community generated information about location specific obstacles to field work
Mr Kyle Fennell (NORC)

3. Can you hear me now? GIS applications for sampling and analysis on a survey of aircraft noise annoyance.
Mr Eric Jodts (Westat)
Mr Michael Giangrande (Westat)
Ms Pam Broene (Westat)
Dr Sharon Lohr (Vice President, Westat)

4. A GIS-based technique for sample building: the experience of the Issp in Italy
Professor Cinzia Meraviglia (University of Eastern Piedmont, Italy)
Dr Gianni Bregolin (Quantitas srl / Venice Gateway for Science and Technology, Italy)

5. Intelligent geocoding service for recurring origin-destination surveys
Mr Ihor Reshetnov (KIIS, NaUKMA)

Wednesday 15th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N-132

Values and Value Change in a Changing World 1

Convenor   Dr Malina Voicu (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Dr Hermann Dülmer (University of Cologne)

Session Details

Values are socialized during formative years and deeply rooted in individual personality. However, people do not always strictly follow their value priorities acquired during early socialization and do not ignore changing in their living environment. Ronald Inglehart assumed that economic and physical security during one's formative years has an important influence on his /her value orientation (socialization hypothesis). On the other hand, values may also adapt to changes in environment (scarcity hypothesis). People who grown up in affluent societies become more tolerant towards minorities or with respect to family norms and sexuality and are more interested and more engaged in politics. What are the long term consequences on values of decreasing affluence due to the economic crisis experienced by many European countries during last years? Do people become less tolerant and less politically engaged? What is the impact of changing in living conditions on different values like universalism, conformity, or security as distinguished by Shalom Schwartz? Does changing in living conditions impact in the same way on values' structure distinguished by Inglehart and Schwartz? Can similarities and differences be identified?

This session welcomes contributions that try to investigate empirically the impact of changing environment conditions on values and attitudes. We particularly encourage submissions based on international comparisons, using comparative survey data such as European Values Study, World Values Survey, European Social Survey, or International Social Survey Program. Substantive contributions, approaching the impact of changing in living conditions on values as well as innovative methodological approaches, which, by instance, help disentangling age, cohort and period effects, are equally welcomed.

1. Changes in basic human values from a dynamic multilevel perspective
Dr Henrik Dobewall (Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Spain)
Dr Raul Tormos (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain)

2. Relative Intergenerational Change in Basic Values of European Post-Communist countries
Dr Maksim Rudnev (National Research University Higher School of Economics)
Dr Vladimir Magun (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

3. Religion and Value Orientation in Europe
Professor Annette Schnabel (Bergische Universitaet Wuppertal)

4. The Linkage of Ideology and Acceptance of the Market Model
Dr Jon Miller (University of Michigan, USA)
Professor Ronald Inglehart (University of Michigan, USA)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-206

Analysis of Cognitive Interview Data 1

Convenor   Dr Kristen Miller (National Center for Health Statistics)
Coordinator 1 Kristen Miller
Coordinator 2 Gordon Willis (National Cancer Institute)

Session Details

While researchers have analyzed cognitive interviews in a variety of ways, there has been little discussion regarding the process of analysis in cognitive interview literature. That is, there has been little explanation as to how cognitive interviews should be examined and studied to produce reputable findings. In the past year, however, this void has begun to be addressed by publications presenting various analytic techniques for producing cognitive interview findings. Additionally, it has just recently been recognized that cognitive interviewing studies can serve multiple functions toward understanding the performance of a survey question. As traditionally understood, cognitive interviewing studies can identify various difficulties that respondents may experience when attempting to answer a survey question. Cognitive interviewing studies may also examine construct validity in that they can identify the content or experiences that respondents consider and ultimately include in their answer. Finally, cognitive interviewing studies can examine issues of comparability, for example, the accuracy of translations or equivalence across socio-cultural groups. The type of analytic processes employed within a cognitive interviewing study guides the types of conclusions that can be made. This session will focus specifically on issues related to the analysis of cognitive interviews. Topics include analytic techniques, specific methods for addressing study goals (e.g. accuracy of translations and cross-cultural comparability), practices to support study transparency and believability, and ways of assessing and addressing varying levels of data quality,

1. Overview: Analysis of the Cognitive Interview in Questionnaire Design
Dr Gordon Willis (National Cancer Institute, NIH)

2. I don't believe it! How credible are your cognitive interview findings?
Ms Jo D'ardenne (NatCen Social Research)
Ms Debbie Collins (NatCen Social Research)

3. A comparison of pretest recommendations based on cognitive interviews
Mrs Wanda Otto (GESIS)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-101

Assessing and addressing measurement equivalence in cross-cultural surveys 1

Convenor   Dr Gijs Van Houten (Eurofound)
Coordinator 1   Dr Milos Kankaras (Eurofound)

Session Details

Over the past decades the number of cross-cultural surveys has increased dramatically. A major challenge in cross-cultural surveys is to ensure that the answers of different respondents to survey items measure the same concepts. If measurement equivalence is not achieved it is difficult if not impossible to make meaningful comparisons across cultures and countries.

Most cross-cultural surveys aim to reduce bias by finding the right balance between harmonisation and local adaptation of the methods used in each of the stages of the surveys process (e.g. sampling, questionnaire development and translation, fieldwork implementation etc.). Furthermore, an increasing number of research projects are being carried out looking into the determinants measurement equivalence. There are three main approaches to the analysis of measurement equivalence – multigroup confirmatory factor analysis, differential item functioning, and multigroup latent class analysis. These latent variable models are based on different modelling assumptions and are appropriate for different types of data (cf. Kankaraš and Moors, 2010).

This session invites papers about the assessment of measurement equivalence in cross-cultural surveys as well as papers about efforts made to address measurement equivalence in the design and implementation of surveys. The aim is to facilitate an exchange that benefits both the future analysis of measurement equivalence and the future design of cross-national surveys.

Kankaraš, M. & Moors, G.B.D (2010). Researching measurement equivalence in cross-cultural studies. Psyhologija, 43(2) ,121-136

1. Assessing measurement equivalence using data from the European Social Survey: A multigroup confirmatory factor analysis of economic deprivation
Mr Mark Visser (Department of Sociology, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands)
Dr Maurice Gesthuizen (Department of Sociology, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands)
Professor Peer Scheepers (Department of Sociology, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands)

2. Why language attrition and language change need to be considered in the development and adaptation of questionnaires for immigrant populations
Professor Patrick Brzoska (Chemnitz University of Technology, Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences, Institute of Sociology, Dept. of Epidemiology)
Dr Yüce Yilmaz-aslan (Bielefeld University, School of Public Health, Dept. Epidemiology & International Public Health)
Professor Oliver Razum (Bielefeld University, School of Public Health, Dept. Epidemiology & International Public Health)

3. Understanding Within-Group DIF in Survey Response: Evidence from Qatar
Dr Justin Gengler (Social and Economic Survey Research Institute, Qatar University)
Dr Jocelyn Mitchell (Northwestern University in Qatar)

4. On the reliability and cross-national comparability of the self-expression values scale.
Dr Sabrina De Regt (Utrecht University)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-103

Linking survey data and auxiliary data sources: statistical aspects and substantive applications 1

Convenor	Ms Chiara Peroni (STATEC)
Coordinator 1	Mr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC, HSE-LCSR)
Coordinator 2	Mr Wladimir Raymond (STATEC)

Session Details

This session aims to collect contributions from applied research linking survey data with auxiliary data sources. This involves merging various surveys or using information from data collected at different levels, such as macro and individual-level data, administrative data, and other surveys, possibly including those from mobile devices. This permits to address complex research questions, while avoiding the need of long surveys which are costly to run, respond and administer. This strategy, however, poses various methodological challenges concerning the weighting procedure, the computation of standard errors, and the imputation of missing data. These challenges have to be correctly identified and addressed to reach methodologically sound conclusions. We welcome applications to the following topics:

• innovation & social mobility;
• entrepreneurship;
• job and life satisfaction and economic performance;
• migration;

as well as those dealing with methodological issues such as weighting schemes, imputation of missing data and computation of standard errors.

1. Challenges and opportunities of making use of income registers in the EU-SILC weighting procedure
Mr Thomas Glaser (Statistics Austria)

2. Weighting schemes for linking data from various survey sources
Professor Takis Merkouris (Athens University of Economics and Business)

3. Linking survey and aggregated data with crossnational surveys
Miss Rennie Lee (UCLA)

4. Using administrative data about employment status to improve the Austrian LFS estimation
Mr Alexander Kowarik (Statistics Austria)
Ms Angelika Meraner (Statistics Austria)
Dr Daniela Gumprecht (Statistics Austria)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-202

Longitudinal surveys - challenges in running panel studies 1

Convenor   Dr Jutta Von Maurice (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectoires)
Coordinator 1 Ms Joanne Corey (Australian Bureau of Statistics)

Session Details

Longitudinal surveys - challenges in running panel studies.

This session will focus on the organisation of panel studies, including panel maintenance, panel engagement, sample review processes, choice of data items and methodologies, and interviewer training.

The focus is on the particular challenges faced by those running panel studies such as:

. maintaining up-to-date contact information and tracking of respondents, including privacy concerns;

. engaging repsondents over the life of the survey, particularly for different age groups, for example how to keep young people interested as they move from children to young adults and they become the primary consenter;

. how successful are different modes for making contact, e.g. mail, phone, text;

. do targeted approach stategies work, e.g. different approach letters depending on past wave response;

. decision making guidelines about when a respondent should be removed from the sample;

. the debate between longitudinal consistency and using a better/updated measure;

. how to conduct training for a mix of experienced and new interviewers, balanced with the amount of new content and methodologies; and

.testing techniques for longitudinal surveys.

1. Changing panel survey items: the dilemma of stability vs. innovation
Dr Frederic Malter (Max-Planck-Society)

2. Assessing targeted approach letters: effects in different modes on response rates, response speed and sample composition
Professor Peter Lynn (University of Essex)

3. The impact of providing a preferred mode on response rates in a longitudinal design
Mr Yamil Nares (ISER)

4. Changing from CAPI to CAWI in an ongoing household panel – experiences from the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP)
Professor Jürgen Schupp (DIW Berlin/SOEP)
Dr Denise Saßenroth (DIW Berlin/SOEP)

5. Testing Adults' Competences in a Panel Study: Experimental Evidence on Immediate and Long-Term Consequences of Test-Induced Burden on Respondent Engagement
Mr Bernhard Christoph (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Professor Corinna Kleinert (Leibnitz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi))

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-201

Measurement errors in the wealth surveys 3

Convenor   Mr Junyi Zhu (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Coordinator 1 John Sabelhaus (Federal Reserve Board)
Coordinator 2 Brian Bucks (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau)

Session Details

Obtaining a comprehensive picture of households' balance sheets and understanding their wealth accumulation process is of increasing interest to a large audience ranging from poli-cymakers and researchers to the general public. Consequently, more and more wealth surveys have been established worldwide. However, wealth data are susceptible to measurement errors specific to the nature of various asset and liability items. For example, households may not assess the value and amount of their assets constantly. And the valuation of less traded or distinctive assets is not straightforward. The knowledge required to answer some question can be demanding. Financial topics are always sensitive. Typically, questions on ownership of assets or liabilities are answered more accurately than questions on their value and in most cases the reporting quality of the debts outperforms that of the assets. Households from both ends of the wealth distribution are hard to identify and reach. The longitudinal data adds another layer of difficulty in distinguishing true changes from measurement errors. On the other hand, reporting error, the main measurement error, does not have a homogeneous pattern but can be classified.

We would like to invite survey practitioners to discuss how to detect and tackle measurement errors in wealth surveys. Researchers can analyze the missing pattern within the survey as a signal of potential errors. Matching to external surveys or administrative data and utilizing the panel dimension are other options to gauge the plausibility of answers. But then, there have been many prevention and reconciling measures. They include careful design and sequencing of questions, specialized interviewer training, software real-time checks, editing by reviewing the comments, dependent interviewing, etc. Innovative approaches are especially welcome. For example, using tax records, property lien data, online finance websites or other sources can fill the gap in building comprehensive profile of wealth accumulation.

1. Wealth, Pensions, Debt, and Savings: Considerations for a Panel Survey
Mr Brian Bucks (Consumer Financial Protection Burea)
Mrs Karen Pence (Federal Reserve Board)

2. The official personalised pension information and the projection of future pension incomes
Dr Dina Frommert (DRV Bund)

3. Are Homeowners in Denial about their House Values? Comparing Owner Perceptions with Transaction-Based Indexes
Miss Alice Henriques (Federal Reserve Board of Governors)

4. Estimating the Performance of Alternative Multiple Imputation Methods on Longitudinal Wealth Data
Mr Christian Westermeier (DIW Berlin, FU Berlin)
Dr Markus M. Grabka (DIW Berlin, TU Berlin)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N-131

Measuring social relations, social networks and social capital in comparative surveys 1

Convenor   Mr Christof Wolf (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1   Mr Dominique Joye (University Lausanne)

Session Details

The measurement of social relations, social networks and social capital, here understood as resources accessible through one's social relations, has attracted a lot of attention. Dependent on the intended purpose there exists instruments to measure aspects of specific relations (spouse, best friend), instrument capturing "personal communities", i.e. the egocentric network approach, or instruments measuring social capital through, for example, social support questionnaires or the position or resource generators.

While we know a lot about the performance of these measures in a national context we lack information on their performance in comparative studies. This session therefore aims to explore the challenges posed by adapting survey instruments measuring social relations, social networks and social capital to a comparative, cross-national investigation. These challenges include problems of
• equivalence of the meaning of stimuli; e.g. do the terms "friends", "discuss important matters" or "to be close to someone" have the same meaning across countries.
• equivalence of resources; e.g. is knowing a person who can lend me money or who can repair my car equally important in all societies? or
• equivalence of occupations selected for the position generator; e.g. can we find a set of occupations that reflects the entire social structure of different countries equally well?

Of course, these are only few selected examples and there exists many more. We welcome all contributions investigating the challenges encountered when trying to measure social relations, network and capital in cross-national surveys

1. Cross-cultural (and mode-independent) measurement of social networks and social resources in population surveys
Professor Dominique Joye (University of Lausanne, Switzerland)
Dr Marlène Sapin (FORS, Switzerland)
Professor Christof Wolf (GESIS, Germany)

2. Using the Position Generator in Cross-national Surveys: Potentials and Challenges
Professor Yang-chih Fu (Academia Sinica, Taiwan)
Professor Nan Lin (Duke University, U.S.A.)

3. Neighbourhood social capital in cross-national comparative research: measurement equivalence of collective efficacy scales in Australian and German community surveys
Mr Dominik Gerstner (Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law)
Dr Elise Sargeant (University of Queensland)
Dr Dietrich Oberwittler (Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law)

4. „Would you trust and/or can´t you be too careful in dealing with others?" Inconsistencies in measuring generalized trust and its challenges for survey research on trust
Professor Peter Graeff (Kiel University)
Ms Saskia Fuchs (Kiel University)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: L-102

Multifactorial Survey Experiments (Factorial Surveys, Choice Experiments and Conjoint Analysis) 1

Convenor	Professor Katrin Auspurg (Goethe-University Frankfurt)
Coordinator 1	Dr Carsten Sauer (Bielefeld University)
Coordinator 2	Professor Peter M. Steiner (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Session Details

There is a fast growing trend in the social sciences to combine the advantages of multifactorial experimental designs with surveys. Factorial surveys – often labelled as "vignettes studies" – have been used for more than 30 years to gather data on descriptions of hypothetical situations or objects to explore principles of judgment and decision making. Choice experiments help to explore respondents' preferences and willingness to pay. In addition there is increasing use of conjoint analyses in sociology and political sciences. The experimental design provides a high internal validity, while the survey design improves external validity. Computer assisted interviewing that allows implementing many different treatments have made these methods even more popular.

Despite frequent use there are still many open questions concerning design features of multifactorial survey experiments that offer most reliable and valid results. We are interested in methodological research on the design of factorial surveys, choice experiments or conjoint analyses (e.g., validity of tabular vs. text presentations, video-vignettes), sampling techniques to select the experimental treatments (random sampling vs. fractional sampling), analysis strategies (e.g. accounting for the multi-level structure of response data; testing validity in regard to respondents' attitudes, beliefs, and behavior).

Questions could be:
Design of questionnaire: How to present the vignettes to the respondents? What kind of answering scale provides most valid results? How to prevent order effects? How do respondents cope with the information provided on vignettes or choice sets?
Sampling techniques: What are the benefits and drawbacks of fractional versus random sampling? How do sampling techniques like blocking by respondent strata and interviewers influence efficiency of estimates?
Analysis strategies and validity: Which models provide unbiased estimates? How to address possible censoring of responses? Respondents' idiosyncracies? When to use multilevel analyses, and how to validate results?

1. The Factorial Survey: Reliability and Internal Validity of Random and Quota Designs
Dr Hermann Duelmer (University of Cologne)

2. Realism versus Simplicity in Creating Factorial Survey Vignettes: Implications for Analysis
Dr Ruth Ludwick (Kent State University, Robinson Memorial Hospital)
Dr Kristin Baughman (Northeast Ohio Medical University)
Dr David Jarjoura (The Ohio State University)

3. Over- and under-complexity in factorial surveys. A case study on professional judgment
Mrs Marjolijn De Wilde (University of Antwerp - Centre for Social Policy)
Mr Peter Goos (University of Antwerp - Faculty of Applied Statistics & KULeuven - Faculty of Bioscience Engineering)

4. Assessing Dimensions of Integration: A Rating and Ranking Comparison with the Factorial Survey
Dr Sonja Pointner (LMU Munich)
Mrs Ilona Pap (University of Zurich)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-105

Push2Web and Nudge2Web: Combining Mail and Online Survey Modes to Reduce Survey Errors and Survey Cost

Convenor	Professor Henning Best (University of Wuerzburg)
Coordinator 1	Professor Michael Bosnjak (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 2	Mrs Tanja Dannwolf (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

The sharp decline in telephone survey response rates has strongly increased the need for alternative ways for surveying the general public. Web surveys with offline recruiting are a potentially promising option, but at the moment internet use and coverage is still limited. As a possible solution to this problem, Dillman and Colleagues have recently suggested using a sequential mixed-mode design combining mail and web survey modes (see e.g. Messer & Dillman 2011). The key idea is to initially contacting the respondents by mail, ´pushing´ them to the web mode (Push2Web) and finally providing a paper questionnaire as a last resort to avoid unit nonresponse. The type of mode the respondents are expected to participate in is under the control of the researcher. Another conceivable strategy is to leave the mode choice to the respondents, and using various strategies ´nudging´ them to the web mode (Nudge2Web).

While these approaches appear promising, important questions on survey errors and biases (coverage, sampling, nonresponse, measurement) and survey costs, as well as questions of practical survey management remain understudied.

This session is aimed at bringing together pertinent research and recent experiences on combining offline recruitment and mixed-mode (especially mail+web) surveys from Europe, and encourages submissions about the impact of various Push2Web or Nudge2Web strategies on survey errors and costs.

1. Measurement and Cost effects of Pushing Household Survey Respondents to the Web for Surveys of Electricity and Gas Customers in the United States
Professor Don Dillman (Washington State University)
Dr Michael Sullivan (Nexant, Inc.)
Ms Caren Leong (Nexant, Inc.)

2. Combining web and mail sequentially – error and cost advantages in the Swiss context
Professor Caroline Roberts (University of Lausanne)
Dr Michèle Ernst Stähli (FORS - Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences)

3. Sequential Mixed Mode Experiment in the US National Monitoring the Future Study
Dr Megan Patrick (University of Michigan)
Dr Mick Couper (University of Michigan)
Dr John Schulenberg (University of Michigan)

4. Mixed-Mode strategies in Business Surveys: Experimental Results
Professor Henning Best (University of Wuerzburg)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-106

Recent developments in survey metadata capture, discovery and harmonisation

Convenor	Ms Louise Corti (UK Data Archive, University of Essex)
Coordinator 1	Jon Johnson (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)
Coordinator 2	Joachim Wackerow (GESIS)

Session Details

There are increasing numbers of survey metadata search and browse tools available on the web. These tools – question banks, variable searches and the like – are in various states of maturity, adhere to a variety of standards (and none) and provide access to a range of survey metadata. Despite their differences, a key thread running through all of these tools is the need to capture metadata as early on in the survey life-cycle as possible. Not only does this aid survey data management during data collection, it is also crucial to the storage and retrieval of metadata required for accurate and efficient archiving; itself, a pre-requisite for successful resource discovery later on, especially where metadata items are re-used (for example, in continuing survey series or longitudinal studies).

Current versions of CAI software are, however, limited in their ability to provide this metadata, even as a by-product of their primary function of collecting data. This session will address the cultural, logistical and technical barriers to the

contemporaneous capture of these metadata. It will also showcase emerging solutions to the problem, including developments in the extraction of survey metadata from CAI scripts to create XML files compliant with metadata standards such as the Data Documentation Initiative (DDI).

The adoption by fieldwork agencies of metadata standards such as DDI is also dependent upon a critical mass of existing survey metadata upon which to draw. This session will also address recent developments in the UK and elsewhere in Europe where the creation of historical survey metadata repositories could be used to inform the future collection of metadata not only for discovery purposes but also to flag harmonisations and equivalences across surveys/studies.

1. Incentivising the uptake of re-usable metadata in the survey production process
Ms Louise Corti (UK Data Archive)

2. Utilising DDI 3.2 in the Survey Process with IBM SPSS Data Collection
Mr Jon Johnson (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Insititute of Education, UCL)
Mr Robert Pratt (Social Research Institute, Ipsos MORI)

3. The DASISH Questionnaire Design Documentation Tool: Functionalities, DDI usage, and outlook for further work
Miss Yvette Prestage (City University London)
Mr Havard Bakkmoen (Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD))
Ms Hilde Orten (Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD))

4. Rich Metadata: The Collaborative Psychiatric Epidemiology Surveys Case Study
Mrs Nicole Kirgis (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)
Mrs Beth-ellen Pennell (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)
Mrs Gina Cheung (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)
Mr Yu-chieh Lin (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: L-101

Recent developments in the analysis of panel data 2

Convenor   Dr Klaus Pforr (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Professor Josef Brüderl (Department of Sociology, University of Munich)
Coordinator 2 Dr Jette Schröder (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Panel data offer two major advantages compared to cross-sectional data:
1) They allow to identify causal effects under weaker assumptions (within estimation)
2) They allow to estimate individual trajectories over time (growth curve modeling)
Not all model classes that are available for panel data analysis, exploit these advantages fully.
There is much uncertainty amongst users, which kind of models to use. On the other side, there are new model classes, for which it is quite unclear what the assumptions are that they need to identify a causal effect (e.g. structural equation models for panel data, and multi-level models).
Therefore, we especially welcome papers that
1) compare different model classes and their usefulness for panel data analyses, or that
2) apply recently developed model classes and explicate their assumptions.

1. Applying Causal Mediation Analysis Technique in a Study of Positive Youth Development
Dr Youngjo Im (University of Chicago)

2. The Fixed-Effects model with Individual-Specific Slopes (FEIS)
Dr Volker Ludwig (LMU Munich)

3. Multinomial logistic regression with fixed effects
Dr Klaus Pforr (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. Controlling for time-varying omitted variables in panel data models: Evidence from a Monte-Carlo simulation
Mr Yusep Suparman (Universitas Padjajdaran)
Professor Henk Folmer (Groningen University)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: L-103

Survey Research in Developing Countries 3

Convenor Dr Irene Pavesi (Small Arms Survey)

Session Details

This session explores the challenges involved in conducting survey research in developing countries and discuss best practices in sampling, questionnaire design and fieldwork organisation.

Even more often than in developed countries up-to-date data on population size and composition is absent. Mobile populations, scarcely populated areas and areas connected only by low quality roads and security issues complicate the creation of a sampling frame. What strategies have researchers used to deal with these challenges?

Response rates tend to be high in developing countries. This is in part because in rural areas trust tends to be high or a survey is seen as an interesting break from everyday life. However in some cases the consent of village heads or other local leaders is an order to people to participate. How does this fit with the idea of informed consent?

High poverty in some areas raises ethical questions on whether and how respondents should be compensated for their time; if respondents receive cash or in kind compensation this can lead to competition among households for inclusion in the survey. What are appropriate ways to compensate respondents?

Large household with complex structures can make collection of household data a time consuming and error prone process. How can data be collected in an efficient way?

High ethnic and linguistic diversity poses challenges to both questionnaire translation and selection of interviewers. How can these challenges be dealt with?

If the people who design the questionnaire are not from the country of data collection, what procedures can be used to ensure that concepts in the survey resonate with those of the target population?

We welcome papers on these and related topics, such as reaching female respondents, use of ICT in data collection, surveying in (post-)conflict areas, and surveys among populations with high illiteracy rates

1. Geospatial Grid Based Sampling in Developing Nations
Mr Jamie Cajka (RTI International)
Ms Jamie Ridenhour (RTI International)
Ms Safaa Amer (RTI International)

2. Facilitating Survey Sampling in Low- and Middle-Income Contexts Through Satellite Maps and Basic Mobile Computing Technology
Mr Marco Haenssgen (Oxford Department of International Development, Hertford College)

3. Localised Censuses: comparing methods, findings and policy uses of National and Local 'census' surveys in a South African semi-rural near-mining community
Dr Tara Polzer Ngwato (Royal Bafokeng Administration)
Mr Martin Bekker (Royal Bafokeng Administration)

4. Climate Refugees: Survey Research with Bangladeshi and Nepalese Migrant Communities in India
Ms Abigail Blue (UNFCCC)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-104

The impact of questionnaire design on measurements in surveys 4

Convenor	Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Coordinator 1	Ms Kathrin Bogner (GESIS)

Session Details

Questionnaire design is crucial for obtaining high-quality survey data. Still, there is a great need for research that helps to better understand how and under which conditions different design aspects of questionnaires impact measurement process and survey data quality. Therefore, researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with questionnaire design features such as question wording, visual design and answer formats, instructions, introductions and other relevant design aspects of questionnaires. Also, different means of measurement such as questions with nominal answer categories, rankings, ratings,

sematic differentials or vignettes can be addressed or can be matter of comparison. Of interest is the impact of questionnaire design on response behavior, on systematic as well as non-systematic error or on validity. In addition, respondents' cognition or motivation can be in focus of the studies.

1. The impact of answer format and item order on the quality of measurement
Dr Iasonas Lamprianou (University of Cyprus)

2. Measuring attitudes towards immigration with direct questions – can we compare 4 answer categories with dichotomous responses?
Mr Laur Lilleoja (Tallinn University)
Ms Diana Zavala Rojas (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)
Professor Peter Schmidt (University of Giessen)

3. Cross-cultural differences in the impact of number of response categories on response behaviour and data structure of a short scale for Locus of Control
Dr Hilde Tobi (Wageningen University & Research centre)
Mrs Lisette Feijen (Wageningen University)
Dr Ruud Zaalberg (Wageningen University & Research centre)

4. The optimal number of categories in item specific scales
Ms Anna De Castellarnau (RECSM, UPF)

5. Midpoint and visual layout in unipolar fully labeled questions
Dr Mario Callegaro (Google London)
Dr Ivano Bison (University of Trento)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-102

Unit and item nonresponse 2

Convenor Mr Peter Linde (Statistics Denmark)

Session Details

Greater response for less money
Quality improvements frequently result in increased costs, e.g. in order to reduce nonresponse. However, nonresponse does not only depend on the number of attempts at making contact and mode, but also on the actual and experienced burden. Consequently, increased focus on reducing the experienced burden can be instrumental in increasing the achievement. The theme is discussed by examples from Statistics Denmark, where new digital solutions, better letters, prizes, reminders as to agreements, follow-up and interview training resulted in a higher degree of achievement as well as lower total costs. Concrete 6% less nonresponse and 10% less interview cost.

1. The postal survey is dead, long live the postal survey! Part one: Spending more to save money.
Ms Gerry Nicolaas (Ipsos MORI)
Dr Patten Smith (Ipsos MORI)
Mr Kevin Pickering (Ipsos MORI)

2. The postal survey is dead, long live the postal survey! Part two: Is more always better?
Ms Gerry Nicolaas (Ipsos MORI)
Dr Patten Smith (Ipsos MORI)
Mr Kevin Pickering (Ipsos MORI)

3. Greater response for less money
Mr Peter Linde (Statistics Denmark)

4. Impact of Advance Letters on Unit-Nonresponse Surveying Sensitive Topics
Dr Susanne Vogl (University of Vienna, Department of Sociology)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-101

Using Survey Data for Spatial Analysis 1

Convenor   Professor Nina Baur (Technische Universität Berlin)

Coordinator 1 Ms Linda Hering (Technische Universität Berlin)
Coordinator 2 Ms Cornelia Thierbach (Technische Universität Berlin)

Session Details

The session aims at exploring new developments in spatial methids, seeing space either as dependent or independent variable: Researchers can ask how people think about space and construct space or they can see space as a relevant frame for social action that influences social life. Papers address one of the questions below either at a more general methodological level or using a concrete example in a specific research project:

(1) How can survey data be used for spatial analysis? Can they be used by themselves, or do they have to be mixed with other data, e.g. geodata, qualitative data?

(2) What methodological innovations concerning the spatial can be observed? (How) can traditional sociological or geographical methods be adjusted to address spatial problems within sociology?

(3) Which sampling strategies are appropriate for spatial problems?

(4) Which strategies of data analysis are appropriate for spatial analysis?

1. Place identity in a European Border Region
Professor Annette Spellerberg (University of Kaiserslautern)

2. Lifestyle research and spatial microsimulation: joining survey data and census statistics to infer health milieu geographies
Mr Jens Kandt (University College London)

3. Statview : Statistica Spazial Analisys and Data Visualization
Mr Alessandro Capezzuoli (ISTAT - National Institute of Dtatistics Italy)
Miss Cinzia Conti (ISTAT - national institute of statistics italy)

Thursday 16th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N-132

Values and Value Change in a Changing World 2

Convenor   Dr Malina Voicu (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Dr Hermann Dülmer (University of Cologne)

Session Details

Values are socialized during formative years and deeply rooted in individual personality. However, people do not always strictly follow their value priorities acquired during early socialization and do not ignore changing in their living environment. Ronald Inglehart assumed that economic and physical security during one's formative years has an important influence on his /her value orientation (socialization hypothesis). On the other hand, values may also adapt to changes in environment (scarcity hypothesis). People who grown up in affluent societies become more tolerant towards minorities or with respect to family norms and sexuality and are more interested and more engaged in politics. What are the long term consequences on values of decreasing affluence due to the economic crisis experienced by many European countries during last years? Do people become less tolerant and less politically engaged? What is the impact of changing in living conditions on different values like universalism, conformity, or security as distinguished by Shalom Schwartz? Does changing in living conditions impact in the same way on values' structure distinguished by Inglehart and Schwartz? Can similarities and differences be identified?

This session welcomes contributions that try to investigate empirically the impact of changing environment conditions on values and attitudes. We particularly encourage submissions based on international comparisons, using comparative survey data such as European Values Study, World Values Survey, European Social Survey, or International Social Survey Program. Substantive contributions, approaching the impact of changing in living conditions on values as well as innovative methodological approaches, which, by instance, help disentangling age, cohort and period effects, are equally welcomed.

1. Trends of family attitudes and obligations in Europe
Mrs Malgorzata Mikucka (Université catholique de Louvain (UCL), Belgium)
Mr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC, Luxembourg)

2. Recent evolution of gender cultures among European countries
Dr Celia Munoz-goy (University of A Coruna, Spain)

3. Changes in attitudes towards gender roles under the impact of partners' status on labour market
Dr Malina Voicu (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Miss Andreea Constantin (University of Cologne)

4. After the Great Recession: Perception of Mutual Help among Single Europeans
Dr Anna Shirokanova (Belarus State University)

5. Parental family and cultural context as predictors of individual level of sexual liberalization in Europe
Dr Natalia Soboleva (Laboratory for Comparative Social Research Higher School of Economics)
Dr Vladimir Kozlov (Demographic Department Higher School of Economics)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N-132

Advancements of survey design in election polls and surveys 1

Convenor   Ms Vilma Agalioti-sgompou (ISER University of Essex)

Session Details

Political attitudes and behaviour are the main objects of measurement of Polls and Election Surveys. However, as it happens with surveys, they are affected from different types of error; for example, coverage error, questionnaire design effects, mode effects. Measurement error in political polls and election surveys can create different results between surveys. A distinct challenge for the researchers that aim at predicting electoral behaviour is that the reliability of the survey measurement is 'tested' with real electoral outcomes. This provides a unique opportunity for the validation of survey findings and examination of survey research quality.
The aim of this session is to provide a space for the latest advances in the design and development of polls and election surveys.

We welcome papers that investigate any methodological aspect of polls or surveys that:
a) measure political behaviour and/or attitudes, and,
b) provide validated information through administrative data or election outcomes.

1. Designing Effective Likely Voter Models in Pre-election Surveys
Mr David Vannette (Stanford University)

2. Polls on National Independence: The Scottish Case in a Comparative Perspective
Professor Claire Durand (Université de Montréal)

3. How good are surveys at measuring past electoral behaviour? Lessons from an experiment in a French online panel study
Dr Anne Jadot (Université de Lorraine and CEVIPOF)
Dr Pierre Lefébure (Université Paris 13 and LCP)

4. Methodological issues in measuring vote recall: an analysis of the individual consistency of vote recall in two election longitudinal surveys"
Dr Mónica Méndez Lago (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas)
Mr Jaime Balaguer (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas)

5. Whom and what are Germans electing? Policy representation in the 2013 Bundestag election
Professor Andranik Tangian (Institute of Economic and Social Research in the Hans-Boeckler-Foundation)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-206

Analysis of Cognitive Interview Data 2

Convenor   Dr Kristen Miller (National Center for Health Statistics)
Coordinator 1 Kristen Miller
Coordinator 2 Gordon Willis (National Cancer Institute)

Session Details

While researchers have analyzed cognitive interviews in a variety of ways, there has been little discussion regarding the process

of analysis in cognitive interview literature. That is, there has been little explanation as to how cognitive interviews should be examined and studied to produce reputable findings. In the past year, however, this void has begun to be addressed by publications presenting various analytic techniques for producing cognitive interview findings. Additionally, it has just recently been recognized that cognitive interviewing studies can serve multiple functions toward understanding the performance of a survey question. As traditionally understood, cognitive interviewing studies can identify various difficulties that respondents may experience when attempting to answer a survey question. Cognitive interviewing studies may also examine construct validity in that they can identify the content or experiences that respondents consider and ultimately include in their answer. Finally, cognitive interviewing studies can examine issues of comparability, for example, the accuracy of translations or equivalence across socio-cultural groups. The type of analytic processes employed within a cognitive interviewing study guides the types of conclusions that can be made. This session will focus specifically on issues related to the analysis of cognitive interviews. Topics include analytic techniques, specific methods for addressing study goals (e.g. accuracy of translations and cross-cultural comparability), practices to support study transparency and believability, and ways of assessing and addressing varying levels of data quality,

1. Cognitive Interviewing for new survey of U.S. Microbusinesses
Ms Audrey Kindlon (National Science Foundation)
Dr Jennifer Crafts (Westat)
Dr Brad Chaney (Westat)

2. Analytic Techniques to Examine Construct Validity in Cognitive Interviewing Studies
Dr Kristen Miller (National Center for Health Statistics)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-101

Assessing and addressing measurement equivalence in cross-cultural surveys 2

Convenor	Dr Gijs Van Houten (Eurofound)
Coordinator 1	Dr Milos Kankaras (Eurofound)

Session Details

Over the past decades the number of cross-cultural surveys has increased dramatically. A major challenge in cross-cultural surveys is to ensure that the answers of different respondents to survey items measure the same concepts. If measurement equivalence is not achieved it is difficult if not impossible to make meaningful comparisons across cultures and countries.

Most cross-cultural surveys aim to reduce bias by finding the right balance between harmonisation and local adaptation of the methods used in each of the stages of the surveys process (e.g. sampling, questionnaire development and translation, fieldwork implementation etc.). Furthermore, an increasing number of research projects are being carried out looking into the determinants measurement equivalence. There are three main approaches to the analysis of measurement equivalence – multigroup confirmatory factor analysis, differential item functioning, and multigroup latent class analysis. These latent variable models are based on different modelling assumptions and are appropriate for different types of data (cf. Kankaraš and Moors, 2010).

This session invites papers about the assessment of measurement equivalence in cross-cultural surveys as well as papers about efforts made to address measurement equivalence in the design and implementation of surveys. The aim is to facilitate an exchange that benefits both the future analysis of measurement equivalence and the future design of cross-national surveys.

Kankaraš, M. & Moors, G.B.D (2010). Researching measurement equivalence in cross-cultural studies. Psyhologija, 43(2) ,121-136

1. Testing the Invariance of the Value Typology of Europeans Across Time Points
Dr Maksim Rudnev (National Research university Higher School of Economics)
Dr Vladimir Magun (National Research university Higher School of Economics)
Professor Peter Schmidt (University of Giessen)

2. The Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ): How many factor structures, and are these invariant over time?
Dr Edward Sosu (University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK)
Professor Peter Schmidt (Justus Liebig University, Giessen, Germany)

3. Measurement equivalence in cross-cultural surveys: multigroup latent class analysis and MIMIC-models in prejudice research
Ms Ekaterina Lytkina (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Laboratory for Comparative Social Research, Department of Sociology)

4. Institutional Trust and crisis: A comparative analysis across time.
Dr Edurne Bartolomé Peral (University of Deusto)

Dr Lluis Coromina Soler (University of Girona)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-201

Discussion and/or applications of SQP2.0

Convenor   Professor Willem Saris (RECSM, UPF)
Coordinator 1 Dr Melanie Revilla (RECSM, UPF)

Session Details

Recently, the first organizer of this session and Daniel Oberski received the Warren J. Mitofsky Innovators Award for the Survey Quality Predictor SQP 2.0 and its contribution to the improving questionnaire design. Although we appreciate very much this award, we think that there is still a lot of work to be done so that this tool can really play the role we hope it can play in survey research with respect to design of questionnaires and to correct for measurement errors in survey analysis.
In order to go further with this work, we invite all interested people, who have studied the SQP approach and would like to comment on its design or have applied the program and like to share their experience with others, to provide an abstract of a paper about their work for our session at the ESRA conference 2015. Papers about all different steps that are required to achieve the SQP program are welcome: MTMM estimation, meta-analysis of quality estimates, program itself and applications to improve surveys or correct for measurement errors…

1. Appling SQP 2.0 for researching the structure of basic values.
Mr Laur Lilleoja (Tallinn University)

2. An application of SQP 2.0 to evaluate a self-control scale with data from the Cali Juvenile Delinquency Study, 2010.
Dr Alfonso Serrano-maillo (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-103

Linking survey data and auxiliary data sources: statistical aspects and substantive applications 2

Convenor   Ms Chiara Peroni (STATEC)
Coordinator 1   Mr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC, HSE-LCSR)
Coordinator 2   Mr Wladimir Raymond (STATEC)

Session Details

This session aims to collect contributions from applied research linking survey data with auxiliary data sources. This involves merging various surveys or using information from data collected at different levels, such as macro and individual-level data, administrative data, and other surveys, possibly including those from mobile devices. This permits to address complex research questions, while avoiding the need of long surveys which are costly to run, respond and administer. This strategy, however, poses various methodological challenges concerning the weighting procedure, the computation of standard errors, and the imputation of missing data. These challenges have to be correctly identified and addressed to reach methodologically sound conclusions. We welcome applications to the following topics:

• innovation & social mobility;
• entrepreneurship;
• job and life satisfaction and economic performance;
• migration;

as well as those dealing with methodological issues such as weighting schemes, imputation of missing data and computation of standard errors.

1. Linking web-survey data and information via Facebook
Professor Peter Kriwy (Sociology, University of Technology, Chemnitz, Germany)
Dr Carolin Durst (Business Informatics, University Erlangen Nuremberg, Germany)

2. Searching unknown territory. How to find new occupational requirements and tasks.
Dr Michael Tiemann (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)
Dr Robert Helmrich (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

3. Contextual determinants of attitudes towards emigration. A multilevel approach
Dr Bogdan Voicu (Romanian Academy)
Dr Monica ?erban (Romanian Academy)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-202

Longitudinal surveys - challenges in running panel studies 2

Convenor   Dr Jutta Von Maurice (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectoires)
Coordinator 1 Ms Joanne Corey (Australian Bureau of Statistics)

Session Details

Longitudinal surveys - challenges in running panel studies.

This session will focus on the organisation of panel studies, including panel maintenance, panel engagement, sample review processes, choice of data items and methodologies, and interviewer training.

The focus is on the particular challenges faced by those running panel studies such as:

. maintaining up-to-date contact information and tracking of respondents, including privacy concerns;

. engaging repsondents over the life of the survey, particularly for different age groups, for example how to keep young people interested as they move from children to young adults and they become the primary consenter;

. how successful are different modes for making contact, e.g. mail, phone, text;

. do targeted approach stategies work, e.g. different approach letters depending on past wave response;

. decision making guidelines about when a respondent should be removed from the sample;

. the debate between longitudinal consistency and using a better/updated measure;

. how to conduct training for a mix of experienced and new interviewers, balanced with the amount of new content and methodologies; and

.testing techniques for longitudinal surveys.

1. What drives the participation in a monthly research web panel? The experience of ELIPSS, a French random web panel in the general population
Mr Stéphane Legleye (INED)
Mr Nirintsoa Razakamanana (INED)
Miss Anne Cornilleau (Sciences-Po)

2. How to predict (and to prevent) panel attrition in different age groups: Newer and older aspects of panel dropout
Dr Bettina Langfeldt (Helmut-Schmidt-University, Germany)

3. Tracking of respondents in the Russian panel study of educational and occupational trajectories
Mrs Valeriya Malik (HSE (Higher School of Economics, Russia))

4. The effect of cross-wave incentives on panel stability and loyalty of school leavers to the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS)
Ms Anne Kersting (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences, Bonn, Germany)
Professor Reinhard Pollak (WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin, Germany / Freie Universität Berlin)
Mr Michael Ruland (WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin, Germany)

5. Effectiveness of a Time-Limited Incentive on Participation by Hard-to-Reach Respondents in a Panel Study
Dr Paula Fomby (University of Michigan)
Dr Narayan Sastry (University of Michigan)
Dr Katherine Mcgonagle (University of Michigan)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N-131

Measuring social relations, social networks and social capital in comparative surveys 2

Convenor	Mr Christof Wolf (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1	Mr Dominique Joye (University Lausanne)

Session Details

The measurement of social relations, social networks and social capital, here understood as resources accessible through one's social relations, has attracted a lot of attention. Dependent on the intended purpose there exists instruments to measure aspects of specific relations (spouse, best friend), instrument capturing "personal communities", i.e. the egocentric network approach, or instruments measuring social capital through, for example, social support questionnaires or the position or resource generators.

While we know a lot about the performance of these measures in a national context we lack information on their performance in comparative studies. This session therefore aims to explore the challenges posed by adapting survey instruments measuring social relations, social networks and social capital to a comparative, cross-national investigation. These challenges include problems of
• equivalence of the meaning of stimuli; e.g. do the terms "friends", "discuss important matters" or "to be close to someone" have the same meaning across countries.
• equivalence of resources; e.g. is knowing a person who can lend me money or who can repair my car equally important in all societies? or
• equivalence of occupations selected for the position generator; e.g. can we find a set of occupations that reflects the entire social structure of different countries equally well?

Of course, these are only few selected examples and there exists many more. We welcome all contributions investigating the challenges encountered when trying to measure social relations, network and capital in cross-national surveys

1. Household Level Measurement of Social Capital in Rural Punjab
Mr Shiv Kumar (A.S. College, Khanna, India, Pincode-141401)

2. The Ties that Bind, or Don't: How Post-conflict Development Outcomes are Conditioned by Levels of Social Capital
Miss Carli Steelman (University of New Mexico)

3. INGROUP TIES AND FORMATION OF GENERALIZED TRUST
Dr Anna Almakaeva (NRU Higher School of Economics)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-102

Multifactorial Survey Experiments (Factorial Surveys, Choice Experiments and Conjoint Analysis) 2

Convenor	Professor Katrin Auspurg (Goethe-University Frankfurt)
Coordinator 1	Dr Carsten Sauer (Bielefeld University)
Coordinator 2	Professor Peter M. Steiner (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Session Details

There is a fast growing trend in the social sciences to combine the advantages of multifactorial experimental designs with surveys. Factorial surveys – often labelled as "vignettes studies" – have been used for more than 30 years to gather data on descriptions of hypothetical situations or objects to explore principles of judgment and decision making. Choice experiments help to explore respondents' preferences and willingness to pay. In addition there is increasing use of conjoint analyses in sociology and political sciences. The experimental design provides a high internal validity, while the survey design improves external validity. Computer assisted interviewing that allows implementing many different treatments have made these methods even more popular.

Despite frequent use there are still many open questions concerning design features of multifactorial survey experiments that offer most reliable and valid results. We are interested in methodological research on the design of factorial surveys, choice experiments or conjoint analyses (e.g., validity of tabular vs. text presentations, video-vignettes), sampling techniques to select the experimental treatments (random sampling vs. fractional sampling), analysis strategies (e.g. accounting for the multi-level structure of response data; testing validity in regard to respondents' attitudes, beliefs, and behavior).

Questions could be:
Design of questionnaire: How to present the vignettes to the respondents? What kind of answering scale provides most valid

results? How to prevent order effects? How do respondents cope with the information provided on vignettes or choice sets?
Sampling techniques: What are the benefits and drawbacks of fractional versus random sampling? How do sampling techniques like blocking by respondent strata and interviewers influence efficiency of estimates?
Analysis strategies and validity: Which models provide unbiased estimates? How to address possible censoring of responses? Respondents' idiosyncracies? When to use multilevel analyses, and how to validate results?

1. Interval level measurement of preferences using factorial surveys with attribute difference scaling
Mr Volker Lang (Bielefeld University)
Professor Martin Groß (University of Tübingen)

2. Hiding Sensitive Topics by Design? An Experiment on the Reduction of Social Desirability Bias in Factorial Surveys
Professor Thomas Hinz (University of Konstanz)
Mrs Sandra Walzenbach (University of Konstanz)

3. Using Factorial Surveys and Stated Choice Experiments to Investigate Discriminatory Attitudes and Preferences
Dr Heiko Beyer (University of Wuppertal)
Professor Ulf Liebe (University of Bern)

4. Elimination and Selection by aspects decision rules in discrete choice experiments
Dr Seda Erdem (University of Stirling)
Dr Danny Campbell (University of Stirling)
Professor Carl Thompson (University of York)

5. Aspects of Validity: Scenario-Technique, Self-Report & Social Desirability
Mrs Lena Verneuer (University of Bielefeld)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-101

Recent developments in the analysis of panel data 1

Convenor   Dr Klaus Pforr (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Professor Josef Brüderl (Department of Sociology, University of Munich)
Coordinator 2 Dr Jette Schröder (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Panel data offer two major advantages compared to cross-sectional data:
1) They allow to identify causal effects under weaker assumptions (within estimation)
2) They allow to estimate individual trajectories over time (growth curve modeling)
Not all model classes that are available for panel data analysis, exploit these advantages fully.
There is much uncertainty amongst users, which kind of models to use. On the other side, there are new model classes, for which it is quite unclear what the assumptions are that they need to identify a causal effect (e.g. structural equation models for panel data, and multi-level models).
Therefore, we especially welcome papers that
1) compare different model classes and their usefulness for panel data analyses, or that
2) apply recently developed model classes and explicate their assumptions.

1. Modelling change as an event or as discrete state? A comparison of event-history analysis and panel regression
Professor Marco Giesselmann (DIW Berlin / University of Bielefeld)
Professor Michael Windzio (University of Bremen)

2. Can Panel Data Resolve Questions of Causal Ordering–and If So, How?
Mr Lars Leszczensky (MZES, University of Mannheim)

3. Parenthood and life satisfaction in Switzerland. Methodological challenges and substantive results.
Mrs Malgorzata Mikucka (Université catholique de Louvain)
Mrs Ester Rizzi (Université catholique de Louvain)

4. Statistical analysis of multivariate longitudinal data
Dr Xin-yuan Song (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-106

Structured Metadata: applications, processes, perspectives

Convenor   Mr Knut Wenzig (DIW Berlin / GSOEP)
Coordinator 1   Mr Daniel Bela (LIfBi / NEPS)

Session Details

Various metadata systems for different sections of the data management lifecycle (e.g. questionnaire development, data preparation, documentation, data dissemination) are in use at institutions dealing with survey research. Resulting benefits are manifold: Data users can take advantage of metadata driven portals which make it easy to search for variables; instrument developers can quickly find questions used in other surveys.

Some of these metadata systems make use of evolving metadata standards (such as DDI or SDMX), some others are developed independently as custom-tailored solutions. Most of them have one idea in common: Structured metadata, stored in relational databases, make it possible to have one single source of information for data on data.

While metadata infrastructure in the first instance sets up the framework, processes have to be established to deploy these systems. As this fact seems to be underexposed in the academic discussion, this session aims to focus on systems which are already implemented and in productive use.

Papers presented in the session should focus on the features of metadata systems, e.g. on the re-use of information on objects, the capability to deal with multilingual content or to drive data preparation, and their practical implementation.
We also want to promote transfer of knowledge about distinct (e.g. serial versus simultaneous) work-flows in using and implementing approaches of managing and making use of metadata.

Finally, this session gives the possibility to discuss the perspectives of different systems concerning deployment in other environments, interfaces to standards or lessons learned during software development.

1. Metadata Begins At The Moment Of Instrument Design
Mr Shane Mcchesney (Nooro Online Research)

2. Using Metadata For Rules-Based Data Ingestion In A Secure Data Repository
Mr Shane Mcchesney (Nooro Online Research)

3. Metadata Driven Integrated Statistical Data Management System
Mr Norberts Talers (Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia)

4. Rogatus - an open source framework to cover the whole data management lifecycle
Mr Ingo Barkow (DIPF)

5. Using a generic process model to implement metadata-driven applications -- the example of DDI on Rails
Mr Marcel Hebing (DIW Berlin)

6. Automated construction of flexible metadata models in data archives
Mr Ihor Reshetnov (KIIS)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-103

Surveying children and young people 2

Convenor   Miss Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)
Coordinator 1 Ms Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)

Session Details

Many large-scale surveys successfully collect a variety of different types of data from children and young people. However, there is relatively little methodological evidence in this area. Much of the literature relating to children and young people's participation in research focuses on small-scale qualitative studies and tends to concentrate on ethical issues relating to the rights of children and young people in research. This session will cover experiences of including children and young people in surveys, and related survey design issues. The session aims to explore a variety of methodological issues around surveying children and young people. Submissions are particularly welcomed on:
- designing questionnaires for children and young people, including question testing methods
- collecting sensitive data from children and young people, including methods for ensuring privacy and encouraging accurate

reporting
- collecting different types of data from children and young people, including physical measurements, cognitive assessments, biological samples and time use data
- using different methods of data collection, including the use of innovative technology such as the web and mobile phones
- inclusivity in data collection methods, including facilitating the participation of young people with lower literacy levels
- assessing the reliability and validity of young people's self-reports
- preventing non-response by engaging young people in research, including designing survey materials to appeal to young people and using new technology and digital media for participant engagement
- ethical issues in involving children and young people in surveys, including gaining informed consent and protecting children's rights and well-being

1. Benefits of the Transfer of Laboratory Assessments into Household-Settings for Non-Completion and Data-Quality in a Large-Scale Infant-Study
Mr Jan-david Freund (Otto-Friedrich-University Bamberg)

2. Telephone interviews with 5 to 11 year old children
Dr Susanne Vogl (University of Vienna, Department of Sociology)

3. Developing an Audio-CASI questionnaire for children at ages 8 and 10 in the Growing up in Scotland study: Our experiences of testing mode and individual question items.
Ms Judith Mabelis (ScotCen Social Research)

4. Determinants of children's and young adult's participation in web surveys
Dr Annemieke Luiten (CBS- Statistics Netherlands)
Mr Jeldrik Bakker (CBS- Statistics Netherlands)
Dr Barry Schouten (CBS- Statistics Netherlands)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-104

The impact of questionnaire design on measurements in surveys 5

Convenor	Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Coordinator 1	Ms Kathrin Bogner (GESIS)

Session Details

Questionnaire design is crucial for obtaining high-quality survey data. Still, there is a great need for research that helps to better understand how and under which conditions different design aspects of questionnaires impact measurement process and survey data quality. Therefore, researchers are invited to submit papers dealing with questionnaire design features such as question wording, visual design and answer formats, instructions, introductions and other relevant design aspects of questionnaires. Also, different means of measurement such as questions with nominal answer categories, rankings, ratings, sematic differentials or vignettes can be addressed or can be matter of comparison. Of interest is the impact of questionnaire design on response behavior, on systematic as well as non-systematic error or on validity. In addition, respondents' cognition or motivation can be in focus of the studies.

1. Rounding in household financial surveys: the roles of survey design and individual characteristics
Dr Joanne Hsu (Federal Reserve Board)
Dr Michael Gideon (NORC)
Dr Brooke Mcfall (University of Michigan)

2. The Influence of an Up-Front Experiment on Respondents' Recording Behaviour in Payment Diaries: Evidence from Germany
Dr Tobias Schmidt (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Ms Susann Kuehn (Deutsche Bundesbank)

3. Numeric Codes in Questionnaires - The Influence on Unit Nonresponse, Item Nonresponse, and Misreporting
Mr Johannes Bauer (Ludwig-Maximilians University of Munich)
Mr Felix Bader (Ludwig-Maximilians University of Munich)
Mr Patrick Riordan (Ludwig-Maximilians University of Munich)

4. How can we solve problem of "telescoping effect" with using landmark events in questionnaire design: case of dog bites survey
Mr Eugen Bolshov (Kiev center of political and conflict studies)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-102

Unit and item nonresponse 1

Convenor Mr Peter Linde (Statistics Denmark)

Session Details

Greater response for less money
Quality improvements frequently result in increased costs, e.g. in order to reduce nonresponse. However, nonresponse does not only depend on the number of attempts at making contact and mode, but also on the actual and experienced burden. Consequently, increased focus on reducing the experienced burden can be instrumental in increasing the achievement. The theme is discussed by examples from Statistics Denmark, where new digital solutions, better letters, prizes, reminders as to agreements, follow-up and interview training resulted in a higher degree of achievement as well as lower total costs. Concrete 6% less nonresponse and 10% less interview cost.

1. Unit non-response in household wealth surveys: experience from the Eurosystem's Household Finance and Consumption Survey
Mr Guillaume Osier (European Central Bank)

2. Unit-Nonresponse in the IAB-Establishment Panel: The influence of the interaction between interviewer and respondent
Dr Susanne Kohaut (Institute for Labour Market Research)
Mr Peter Ellguth (Institute for Labour Market Research)

3. Individual, Family, Interviewer and Survey Effects on Nonresponse and Bio-specimen Quality in Five Representative US Studies
Dr Colter Mitchell (University of Michigan)
Dr Jessica Faul (University of Michigan)

4. MI Double Feature: Multiple Imputation to Address Nonresponse and Rounding Errors in Income Questions
Dr Jörg Drechsler (Institute for Employment Research)
Professor Hans Kiesl (Ostbayerische Technische Hochschule Regensburg)
Mr Matthias Speidel (Institute for Employment Research)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-101

Using Survey Data for Spatial Analysis 2

Convenor Professor Nina Baur (Technische Universität Berlin)
Coordinator 1 Ms Linda Hering (Technische Universität Berlin)
Coordinator 2 Ms Cornelia Thierbach (Technische Universität Berlin)

Session Details

The session aims at exploring new developments in spatial methids, seeing space either as dependent or independent variable: Researchers can ask how people think about space and construct space or they can see space as a relevant frame for social action that influences social life. Papers address one of the questions below either at a more general methodological level or using a concrete example in a specific research project:

(1) How can survey data be used for spatial analysis? Can they be used by themselves, or do they have to be mixed with other data, e.g. geodata, qualitative data?

(2) What methodological innovations concerning the spatial can be observed? (How) can traditional sociological or geographical methods be adjusted to address spatial problems within sociology?

(3) Which sampling strategies are appropriate for spatial problems?

(4) Which strategies of data analysis are appropriate for spatial analysis?

1. Does Context Matter? Xenophobia in Eastern Germany.
Dr Ronald Gebauer (Friedrich Schiller University of Jena)

2. Modeling Spatial Externalities—An Application to Individual Labor Market Outcomes
Ms Alexandra Wicht (University of Siegen)

Professor Alexandra Nonnenmacher (University of Siegen)

3. Explaining preferences for co-ethnic physicians while controling for the local opportunity structure. A study conducted in in Germany using the example of Turkish migrants.
Ms Marieke Volkert (no)

4. School's 'normative climate': more than students' and parents' mean attitudes?
Professor Alexandra Nonnenmacher (University of Siegen)
Miss Alexandra Wicht (University of Siegen)

Thursday 16th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-105

Web and mixed-mode data collection in National Statistics 1

Convenor   Mrs Karen Blanke (FSO Germany)
Coordinator 1   Mrs Annemieke Luiten (Statistics Netherlands)

Session Details

Many countries within the European Statistical System (ESS) are considering web-based data collection in a system of multiple mode data collection. Eurostat initiated the ESSnet project "Data Collection in Social Surveys Using Multiple Modes" with the purpose to support Member States in their development and implementation efforts. A consortium of five NSIs has done extensive research on the development of web-based data collection tools for NSIs, specifically the Labour Force Survey, and the impact of implementing multimode data collection.
Concerning the web questionnaire, much of the work was aimed at finding out how severe the challenges in switching to self-completion actually are and if/how interviewer-assistance can be adequately replaced in web questionnaires, in view of the complicated concepts measured. The second aim was how to design functionalities in web questionnaires like instructions, routing, edit checks, customised wording or the variety of question types.
Concerning mixed mode data collection, we focussed on three issues: the organisation of mixed mode data collection, mode effects and adjustment for mode and measurement effects. In 'organisation' we focus on mode strategies: which modes in which sequence, response rates and measures to heighten web response. Attention is also given to the important subject of case management systems: software systems that are able to support all modes and allow flexible transitions from one mode to another. Concerning mode effects, several studies were performed on mode effects in mixed mode LFS designs. The final research topic was estimation and adjustment: given that there are mode effects, can we adjust for them, and how should that be performed.
We propose either one session where the partners in this research project discuss the findings on the topics or alternatively, we could have a double session where a number of speakers are invited to present.

1. Web questionnaires in official statistics: Methodological challenges - Lessons from the ESSnet DCSS
Mrs Karen Blanke (FSO Germany)

2. Online data collection at the Office for National Statistics
Miss Laura Wilson (Office for National Statistics)
Miss Louise Morris (Office for National Statistics)

3. Refining the Web Response Option in the Multiple Mode Collection of the American Community Survey
Mr Todd Hughes (U.S. Census Bureau)
Mrs Jennifer Tancreto (U.S. Census Bureau)

4. The Analysis of Respondent's Behavior toward Edit Messages in a Web Survey
Miss Youngshil Park (Statistics Korea)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N-132

Advancements of survey design in election polls and surveys 2

Convenor   Ms Vilma Agalioti-sgompou (ISER University of Essex)

Session Details

Political attitudes and behaviour are the main objects of measurement of Polls and Election Surveys. However, as it happens with surveys, they are affected from different types of error; for example, coverage error, questionnaire design effects, mode

effects. Measurement error in political polls and election surveys can create different results between surveys. A distinct challenge for the researchers that aim at predicting electoral behaviour is that the reliability of the survey measurement is 'tested' with real electoral outcomes. This provides a unique opportunity for the validation of survey findings and examination of survey research quality.

The aim of this session is to provide a space for the latest advances in the design and development of polls and election surveys.

We welcome papers that investigate any methodological aspect of polls or surveys that:
a) measure political behaviour and/or attitudes, and,
b) provide validated information through administrative data or election outcomes.

1. Exit Polling in condition of Separatist conflict: The Ukrainian 2014 early elections
Mrs Natalia Kharchenko (Kiev International Institute of Sociology)
Professor Volodymyr Paniotto (Kiev International Institute of Sociology)
Mr Myhailo Myschenko (Razumkov Centre)

2. 2014 election forecasting failure in Ukraine: possible sources of error and experience of mathematical modeling of the behavior of undecided voters
Mr Eugen Bolshov (Kiev center of political and conflict studies)

3. Forecasting Turnout at UK Elections
Mr Simon Munzert (University of Konstanz)
Dr Andreas E. Murr (University of Oxford)

4. Predicting election outcomes from internet biased polls
Professor Jose M. Pavia (Universitat de Valencia)
Dr Salvador Carrasco (Universitat de Valencia)
Miss Elsa Olmeda (Universitat de Valencia)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N-131

Analyzing sexual prejudice and sexual orientation with survey data 1

Convenor	Mrs Anabel Kuntz (University of Cologne)
Coordinator 1	Dr Stephanie Steinmetz (University of Amsterdam)

Session Details

In past decades, the acceptance of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) people has increased in Europe. Nevertheless, sexual prejudice considerably varies within and between European countries. Although Europe is a place where many national laws prohibit at least the incitement to discrimination based on sexual orientation, countries also differ in granting rights to LGBT people and in protecting them from discrimination. Moreover, LGBT rights are hotly debated in the European public and politics. Compared to research on other minority groups, such as ethnic minorities, sexual prejudice has been studied quantitatively much less in the social sciences. Therefore, this session aims to increase the understanding of situation of LGBT people within Europe on the basis of quantitative studies and to evaluate also the methodological challenges researchers face when using existing data sources. Contributions are welcome focusing on sexual prejudice and rights of LGBT people as well as issues relating to sexual orientation both from a substantive and methodological perspective.

1. LGBT lives in Europe – findings from the EU LGBT survey
Dr Sabine Springer (FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights)
Dr Vida Beresneviciute (FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights)

2. Sexual orientation in Northern Ireland: equality, attitudes and policy
Dr Paula Devine (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)

3. Are the upper classes more gay-friendly? Acceptance of homosexuality in France: the roles of social status and biographical trajectory
Mr Wilfried Rault (Ined)

4. Homophobia and Atheism
Ms Jara Kampmann (none)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: O-101

Assessing and addressing measurement equivalence in cross-cultural surveys 3

Convenor   Dr Gijs Van Houten (Eurofound)
Coordinator 1   Dr Milos Kankaras (Eurofound)

Session Details

Over the past decades the number of cross-cultural surveys has increased dramatically. A major challenge in cross-cultural surveys is to ensure that the answers of different respondents to survey items measure the same concepts. If measurement equivalence is not achieved it is difficult if not impossible to make meaningful comparisons across cultures and countries.

Most cross-cultural surveys aim to reduce bias by finding the right balance between harmonisation and local adaptation of the methods used in each of the stages of the surveys process (e.g. sampling, questionnaire development and translation, fieldwork implementation etc.). Furthermore, an increasing number of research projects are being carried out looking into the determinants measurement equivalence. There are three main approaches to the analysis of measurement equivalence – multigroup confirmatory factor analysis, differential item functioning, and multigroup latent class analysis. These latent variable models are based on different modelling assumptions and are appropriate for different types of data (cf. Kankaraš and Moors, 2010).

This session invites papers about the assessment of measurement equivalence in cross-cultural surveys as well as papers about efforts made to address measurement equivalence in the design and implementation of surveys. The aim is to facilitate an exchange that benefits both the future analysis of measurement equivalence and the future design of cross-national surveys.

Kankaraš, M. & Moors, G.B.D (2010). Researching measurement equivalence in cross-cultural studies. Psyhologija, 43(2) ,121-136

1. Multigroup-PCA and –PLS: new methods for assessing the structural invariance of a scale. The example of the CAST (Cannabis abuse screening test) in 13 countries
Mr Stéphane Legleye (INED)
Miss Aida Eslami (ANSES)
Miss Stéphanie Bougeard (ANSES)

2. Cross-Cultural Equivalence of Survey Response Latencies
Professor Timothy Johnson (University of Illinois at Chicago)
Professor Allyson Holbrook (University of Illinois at Chicago)
Miss Marina Stavrakantonaki (University of Illinois at Chicago)

3. Issues in multilingual cross-cultural scales: Applying the AICS to Arabs and Jews in Hebrew and Arabic
Dr Boaz Shulruf (University of New South Wales)

4. Comparing Survey Data Quality from Native and non-Native English Speakers
Ms Annie Pettit (Peanut Labs)

5. 'Trust in physicians' or 'trust in physician'? Testing measurement invariance of trust in physicians in different (health care) cultures.
Ms Mira Hassan (Research assistant)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: O-201

Big Data and Survey Research

Convenor   Mr Yamil Nares (Institute for Social & Economic Research (ISER))
Coordinator 1 Dr Tarek Al Baghal (Institute for Social & Economic Research (ISER))

Session Details

As the demand for data has increased in recent years, so has the potential amount of information produced by new technologies. The volume of additional behavioural data produced through people's interactions with technological innovations (smartphones, tablets, laptops), as well as the trace of people activities through emails, financial measurements, real time posts images, and videos sharing on social media (Twitter, Facebook, Google Plus, Instagram, YouTube) has garnered the name "Big Data". As the potential uses of "Big Data" seemingly provide a great opportunity to examine and study social behaviour, including changes over time, many have argued that such "Big Data" can largely replace surveys, and may be of better quality, given the problems surveys face such as increasing nonresponse. However, "Big Data" is frequently used at the macro-level,

while surveys also provide micro-level data, and has more constraint on the types of information collected. To date, there have been few empirical examinations of the comparative efficacy of "Big Data" and surveys, or how these may supplement or replace the other. With the emergence of the arguments surrounding "Big Data", given the limited amount of research conducted, it is important for social researchers to better understand the comparative and complementary aspects of these data sources, as well as data protection and privacy policies. The current panel calls for papers that examine these issues, particularly those using survey and "Big Data" in a comparative or complementary manner, examining likely sources of error and best practices. While empirical analysis will help further gain a scientific base for deciding on how to use these data better, so will papers discussing these issues theoretically. Possible issues include those of coverage, measurement, and other sources of error; examinations of how to use "Big Data" in combination with surveys; and issues of data protection.

1. Big Data Analytics: Enumerating the Risks to Data Quality
Dr Craig Hill (RTI International)
Dr Paul Biemer (RTI International)

2. Mode Preferences in Business Surveys: Evidence from Germany
Dr Christian Seiler (Ifo Institute)

3. Extracting time measures from log-data of questionnaires and complex tests: Comparing Response times in the PISA 2015 Field Trial context assessment between countries
Dr Ulf Kroehne (German Institute for International Educational Research (DIPF), Frankfurt am Main (Germany))
Dr Susanne Kuger (German Institute for International Educational Research (DIPF), Frankfurt am Main (Germany))
Professor Frank Goldhammer (German Institute for International Educational Research (DIPF), Frankfurt am Main (Germany) and Centre for International Student Assessment (ZIB), Germany)

4. SKEY - Statistical Key Value Data Model
Mr Alessandro Capezzuoli (ISTAT)

5. Linking Social Media to Survey Responses: Possible Issues and Potential Uses
Dr Tarek Al Baghal (University of Essex)
Mr Yamil Nares (University of Essex)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: O-106

Coding with ISCO, problems and solutions

Convenor   Professor Dominique Joye (University of Lausanne)
Coordinator 1 Dr Evi Scholz (GESIS)
Coordinator 2 Mrs Cornelia Zuell (GESIS)

Session Details

ISCO is the mostly accepted international standard classification of occupational codings, often used in long-standing high quality cross-national surveys. ISCO serves to classify jobs into a clearly defined set of groups according to the tasks and duties in jobs. Due to the long list of hundreds of categories and definitions reflected in the four digits needed for classification, coding of occupations is a challenging enterprise. While categories are exactly defined and mutual exclusive, coding is difficult due to the unclear or incomplete answers of respondents who are not familiar with ISCO, in particular at the most detailed level. ISCO is used to attribute people in class schema as well as attribute scores describing respondents' position in society.

The proposed session aims at bringing together national and comparative researchers interested in
- the measurement of occupations (mode, question design, etc.);
- techniques of coding ISCO (automatic coding, semi-automatic coding, manual coding);
- problems of coding ISCO (costs, validity, reliability, etc.);
- alternative occupational ISCO coding (e.g., pseudo-ISCO);
- cross-national issues and links to national classification or national tradition;
- ISCO in longitudinal perspective;
- other methodological aspects related to ISCO coding, including coding and measuring of social position in national contexts.

The core of the discussion will be on ISCO08 but contributions based on ISCO88 or earlier are also wellcome.

1. Field Coding the International Standard Classification of Occupations, ISCO 1988
Dr Juergen H.p. Hoffmeyer-zlotnik (University of Giessen)
Mrs Doris Hess (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences)
Dr Uwe Warner (Perl)

2. Occupational Coding Using the ISCO-08 Classification Scheme: Challenges and Problems
Mrs Cornelia Zuell (GESIS)

3. Asking for Occupation during the Interview: Experimental Results
Mr Malte Schierholz (Mannheim Centre for European Social Research, University of Mannheim)

4. The ISCO 2008 and the new German Classification of Occupations 2010
Dr Britta Matthes (Institute for Employment Research)
Mrs Wiebke Paulus (Federal Employment Agency, Statistics)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: O-206

Cognition in surveys 1

Convenor Dr Bregje Holleman (Utrecht University)
Coordinator 1 Dr Naomi Kamoen (Utrecht University/ Tilburg University)

Session Details

Cognitive research in surveys covers a wide range of approaches. In recent years, various models describing the cognitive processes underlying question answering in standardized surveys have been proposed. A lot of research is guided by the model of question answering by Tourangeau, Rips and Rasinski (2000). This model distinguishes four stages in question answering: (1) comprehension of the question, (2) retrieval of information, (3) deriving a judgment, and (4) formulating a response. In addition, there are dual-process models, such as the satisficing model proposed by Krosnick (1991). In this model, two groups of respondents are distinguished: those who satisfice, and try to do just enough to give a plausible answer versus those who optimize, and do their best to give a good answer.

Cognitive models such as the two described above, have many applications. For example, they help in understanding what is measured when administering surveys, and they provide a point of departure in explaining the wide range of method effects survey researchers observe. Also, cognitive theory in surveys is used by psychologists, linguists and other scholars to obtain a deeper understanding of, for example, language processing, the nature of attitudes, and memory.

Recently, similar cognitive approaches are also used to describe the ways attitudes are formed using standardized surveys. In this type of research, so-called 'decision aids', such as Voting Advice Applications (VAAs), are studied. In VAAs, users answer attitude questions about political issues in order to obtain a voting advice. How do design choices in these decision aids affect users' answers, attitudes and behavioral intentions?

We cordially invite researchers addressing one or more of these topics to submit their papers to this session.

1. Cognitive processes underlying the answers to Voting Advice Applications. Think aloud studies
Dr Bregje Holleman (Utrecht University)
Dr Naomi Kamoen (Utrecht University/ Tilburg University)

2. What do respondents mean by selecting non-substantive or middle alternatives?
Ms Franziska Gebhard (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim, Germany)
Professor Annelies G. Blom (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim, Germany)

3. Analysis of interviewer-respondent interaction on subjective probability questions
Dr Sunghee Lee (Michigan Program in Survey Methodology)
Ms Colleen Mcclain (Michigan Program in Survey Methodology)

4. Attitude towards surveys as a general predictor of data quality in dual-process models of response behavior
Mr Christoph Giehl (Technische Universität Kaiserslautern)
Professor Jochen Mayerl (Technische Universität Kaiserslautern)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-104

Going beyond the basics of questionnaire design: new and innovative approaches to instrument design in web surveys 1

Convenor Dr Femke De Keulenaer (Ipsos)
Coordinator 1 Professor Edith De Leeuw (Utrecht University)
Coordinator 2 Mr Arnaud Wijnant (CentERdata / Tilburg University)

Session Details

Web questionnaires can differ substantially from questionnaires in traditional modes; nonetheless, most web-based instruments are based on classic text-based questionnaire principles. Rather than simply applying the design principles for paper questionnaires, researchers could capitalize on the unique properties of the web interaction. In web surveys, the medium can be fully exploited to produce better ways of asking and answering questions, and to introduce new approaches to surveying (i.e. going beyond "asking questions").

In this session, we would like to focus on the potential for advanced questionnaire design in web surveys and innovative approaches to surveying respondents. Topics could include, but are not limited to the following:

- The unique properties of web interaction can be used to design web questionnaire interfaces that adapt or tailor themselves to respondents' behaviour, diagnose respondents' need for clarification, detect respondents' lack of effort, etc.

- A difference between web surveys and traditional surveys can be the focus on (audio-)visual communication. The dynamic and graphical nature of the web has led to the creation of a wide range of measurement tools that previously could not be done on paper; examples include card sort tasks, interactive maps and verbal information.

- Web surveys also offer possibilities for innovative approaches to surveying; for example, behavioural experiments have made the switch from asking respondents to report on their behaviour (via survey questions) to actually observing respondent behaviour (e.g. using game-enhanced instruments or facial expression devices).

- This type of innovative approaches to web instrument design, however, can also lead to a variety of unpredicted effects that reduce the quality of web-based surveys. Researchers are also invited to present empirical evaluations and split ballot experiments. Only by fully understanding both the benefits - and the drawbacks – of innovations can we fully exploit the potential of web surveys.

1. Developing a web-administered Event History Calendar: Lessons learned from user-testing
Mr Matt Brown (Centre for Longitudinal Studies - UCL Institute of Education)
Ms Joanna Dardenne (NatCen Social Research)

2. New generation of online questionnaires?
Dr Melanie Revilla (RECSM-UPF)
Mr Carlos Ochoa (Netquest)
Mr Albert Turbina (Netquest)

3. New Rating Scale Designs Using Dynamic Drag-and-Drop
Ms Tanja Kunz (Darmstadt University of Technology)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: O-202

Longitudinal surveys - challenges in running panel studies 3

Convenor   Dr Jutta Von Maurice (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectoires)
Coordinator 1 Ms Joanne Corey (Australian Bureau of Statistics)

Session Details

Longitudinal surveys - challenges in running panel studies.

This session will focus on the organisation of panel studies, including panel maintenance, panel engagement, sample review processes, choice of data items and methodologies, and interviewer training.

The focus is on the particular challenges faced by those running panel studies such as:

. maintaining up-to-date contact information and tracking of respondents, including privacy concerns;

. engaging repsondents over the life of the survey, particularly for different age groups, for example how to keep young people interested as they move from children to young adults and they become the primary consenter;

. how successful are different modes for making contact, e.g. mail, phone, text;

. do targeted approach stategies work, e.g. different approach letters depending on past wave response;

. decision making guidelines about when a respondent should be removed from the sample;

. the debate between longitudinal consistency and using a better/updated measure;

. how to conduct training for a mix of experienced and new interviewers, balanced with the amount of new content and

methodologies; and

.testing techniques for longitudinal surveys.

1. Interviewer and respondent behaviours when measuring change with dependent interviewing
Dr Annette Jäckle (University of Essex)
Dr Tarek Al Baghal (University of Essex)

2. Who, why, and how get panelist back to survey panel managers? Evidence from the GESIS Panel
Dr Tanja Dannwolf (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Ms Gabriele Wahlig (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Mr Kai Böge (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Professor Michael Bosnjak (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. What strategies should be followed with interviewers and field processing in order to avoid panel attrition?
Mrs Birgit Jesske (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences)
Mr Martin Kleudgen (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences)

4. The influence of interviewer change and interviewer's characteristics on item nonresponse
Ms Kristin Hajek (Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich)
Ms Nina Schumann (Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich)

5. Straightlining in Web survey panels over time
Dr Vera Toepoel (utrecht university)
Professor Matthias Schonlau (university of waterloo)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-101

Measuring Social Networks in Large-Scale Surveys: Challenges and Practice of Ego-Centred and Complete Network Approaches 1

Convenor Mr Benjamin Schulz (Mannheim Centre for European Social Research and WZB Berlin Social Science Center)
Coordinator 1 Mrs Kerstin Hoenig (Leibniz-Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi), Bamberg)
Coordinator 2 Professor Reinhard Pollak (WZB Berlin Social Science Center and Freie Universität Berlin)

Session Details

Survey researchers measure social networks in two fundamental ways: i) in an ego-centred manner that captures an actor's ties and related characteristics, ii) in a broader way that captures complete networks within predefined boundaries. The latter approach gains increasing attention as recent projects in many countries and fields collect complete network data.
This increase largely follows from advances in survey instruments for complete networks and in statistical modelling, especially for network dynamics. Methodologically, complete network analysis makes it possible to separate selection and influence processes. These surveys, however, are mainly conducted in schools as meaningful network boundaries are easy to implement in this context.
Ego-centred measures offer the chance to collect network data in contexts where a complete network measurement is not feasible. To meet the challenge of reversed causality and endogeneity as a consequence of the non-random, often homophilous, formation of social ties, panel data including repeated, or prospective and retrospective, measures are promising. Several international large-scale surveys made significant progress in this domain.
By bringing together researchers from both camps, we seek to promote a discussion that allows for a better evaluation of the advantages and pitfalls of each approach. The session's focus shall be on longitudinal measurements and statistical modelling of social networks, especially on means to identify causal network effects. The second focus shall be on ways to assess the reliability and validity of ego-centred and complete network measures. For ego-centred network measures, such as name or resource generators, the reliability of these instruments will be of central interest. For complete network measures, the specification of network boundaries is a heavily debated issue. Contributions might also include studies on how to identify and deal with compositional changes or on inference errors that may follow from insufficiently specified boundaries.

1. Introduction: Measuring Social Networks in Large-Scale Surveys
Mr Benjamin Benjamin (Mannheim Centre for European Social Research and WZB Berlin Social Science Center)
Mrs Kerstin Hoenig (Leibniz-Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi), Bamberg)
Professor Reinhard Pollak (WZB Berlin Social Science Center and Freie Universität Berlin)

2. Where should I sit? The desk-mate effect on academic achievement and its importance in Roma-integration
Dr Tamás Keller (TÁRKI Social Research Inc.)
Dr Károly Takács (Research Center for Educational and Network Studies (RECENS))

3. Ethnic Segregation of Friendship Networks in School
Mr Lars Leszczensky (University of Mannheim)

Mr Sebastian Pink (University of Mannheim)

4. Residential segregation, school segregation and the high-status contacts of low-status adolescents in Hungary
Dr Kertesi Gábor (Institute of Economics, CERS Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest)
Dr Hajdu Tamás (Institute of Economics, CERS Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest)
Professor Kézdi Gábor (Dept. of Economics, Central European University, Budapest)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-103

Methodological issues of using administrative data to improve the quality of survey data 1

Convenor   Dr Emanuela Sala (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di MIlano Bicocca)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jonathan Burton (ISER, University of Essex)
Coordinator 2 Dr Gundi Knies (ISER, University of Essex)

Session Details

There is a body of research on eliciting respondents' consent to link their survey data to their administrative records. However, the process of linking survey and administrative data is complex and the issues that survey practitioners need to tackle go beyond the asking for respondents' consent. Furthermore, using that linked data also provides potential for further methodological research. The aim of this session is to foster discussion on i) methodological issues that concern the data linkage process, ii) the research potential of the linked data,
iii) use of administrative data to improve the quality of survey data

We welcome papers on the following topics:

1. Analysis of mis-reporting
2. Measurement 'bias' using linked data
3. Impact on research findings compared to using survey data only
4. Validation studies
5. Methodological lessons from linkage process
6. Implications of consent bias

Relevant papers on other aspects of data linkage will also be considered.

1. Interviewers' influence on bias in reported income
Dr Manfred Antoni (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Ms Basha Vicari (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Mr Daniel Bela (LIfBi / NEPS)

2. Using Information from Credit Records to Improve Survey Data
Mr Brian Bucks (Consumer Financial Protection Bureau)
Mr Mick Couper (University of Michigan)

3. Recall Error in the Year of Retirement
Ms Julie Korbmacher (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging)

4. Recall error in life course data – a comparison of survey data and administrative data
Dr Dina Frommert (DRV Bund)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: L-102

Mixed methods designs combining survey data and qualitative data 1

Convenor   Professor Mark Trappmann (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Coordinator 1 Dr Andreas Hirseland (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))

Session Details

In social science research there is a long tradition of research combining survey data with qualitative data. There can be various reasons why this integration of approaches provides advantages compared to a single method approach and how it is

implemented in a research design. Greene et al. (1989) propose a typology consisting of five types of mixed-method designs. Triangulation involves investigating the same aspect of the same phenomenon. If research methods bias results, there is a chance of detecting this bias by using different methods independently. In contrast, complementarity involves investigating different aspects of the same phenomenon by different methods. Results from one method are used to elaborate, enhance, or illustrate results from the other. Development designs sequentially use one method to develop or support the other method. Examples include using qualitative interviews in questionnaire design or residual diagnostics or to use quantitative survey data for theoretical sampling in qualitative research. Initiation designs aim at uncovering paradox or contradictions to initiate new insights. Finally, expansion designs extend the scope of a study by mixing methods. One typical example of this last approach is the combination of quantitative evaluation of programme outcomes with qualitative studies of programme implementation. We encourage submissions dealing with designs of mixed-methods studies combining survey research and qualitative research. Presentations should focus on methodological issues of research designs or analysis of such data.

1. Understanding the added worker effect: a mixed methods approach
Professor Heather Laurie (ISER, University of Essex)
Dr Karon Gush (ISER, University of Essex)
Dr Mark Bryan (ISER,University of Essex)

2. Advantages of a complementary and development research design to analyze temporary layoffs
Mr Tobais Gebel (Bielefeld University)
Mrs Andrea Hense (Bielefeld University)
Mrs Franziska Schork (Bielefeld University)

3. Ethnography meets Survey - Perspectives of a Mixed Method Research on University Students
Mrs Alexa Maria Kunz (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT))
Miss Stefanie Enderle (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT))

4. Coding qualitative data to use in quantitative studies
Dr Iasonas Lamprianou (University of Cyprus)
Dr Thekla Afantiti Lamprianou (Miistry of Education, Cyprus)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-102

Response rates and nonresponse bias in comparative surveys 1

Convenor	Dr Koen Beullens (KU Leuven)
Coordinator 1	Dr Ineke Stoop (SCP)

Session Details

Comparing response rates and possibly associated nonresponse bias can be hard in the context of cross-national surveys. First, response rates objectives may be set differently. In this respect, the European Social Survey sets a 70% response rate objective, without really penalizing countries that do not achieve this objective. PIAAC, on the other hand, also sets a target response rate of of 70%, but accepts response rates in between 50% to 70%, whereas when response rates below 50% occur a nonresponse analysis has to be provided. Second, response rates have to be calculated in a comparable ways. Response rates from EU-SILC and the LFS, for instance, are sometimes hard to compare because the numerator and/or denominator may be calculated in different ways. Third, and even more complicated, are the national differences regarding survey design features (e.g. sampling design) that have diverse implication for the response and the nonresponse bias.

Not only is it hard to determine nonresponse bias for a single survey, the cross-national context even adds more complexity, probably strongly jeopardizing the comparability between countries or surveys. The survey climate in different countries, the related nonresponse mechanisms, strategies to minimize nonresponse (bias) or adjustment methods are not likely to be considered as uniform over different countries or surveys.

Therefore, this session welcomes papers on (1) enhancing response, (2) fieldwork strategies minimising nonresponse bias and (3) nonresponse adjustment methods, all providing better comparability for cross-national surveys.

1. 25 years of nonresponse research and comparative surveys
Dr Ineke Stoop (The Netherlands Institute for Social Research/SCP)

2. Toward Minimizing the Impact of Missing Data That Are Highly Correlated with Literacy in a Cross-National Literacy Assessment
Mr Tom Krenzke (Westat)
Dr Leyla Mohadjer (Westat)
Ms Lin Li (Westat)

3. Response Rates and Nonresponse/Noncoverage Bias in PIAAC
Dr Leyla Mohadjer (Vice President, Westat)

Mr Tom Krenzke (Associate Director, Westat)

4. What can we learn from the European Social Survey (ESS) by comparing the response rates, refusal rates and non-contact rates in individual name, address and household samples?
Dr Piotr Jabkowski (University of Poznan, Poland)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: L-103

Surveying children and young people 1

Convenor   Miss Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)
Coordinator 1 Ms Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)

Session Details

Many large-scale surveys successfully collect a variety of different types of data from children and young people. However, there is relatively little methodological evidence in this area. Much of the literature relating to children and young people's participation in research focuses on small-scale qualitative studies and tends to concentrate on ethical issues relating to the rights of children and young people in research. This session will cover experiences of including children and young people in surveys, and related survey design issues. The session aims to explore a variety of methodological issues around surveying children and young people. Submissions are particularly welcomed on:
- designing questionnaires for children and young people, including question testing methods
- collecting sensitive data from children and young people, including methods for ensuring privacy and encouraging accurate reporting
- collecting different types of data from children and young people, including physical measurements, cognitive assessments, biological samples and time use data
- using different methods of data collection, including the use of innovative technology such as the web and mobile phones
- inclusivity in data collection methods, including facilitating the participation of young people with lower literacy levels
- assessing the reliability and validity of young people's self-reports
- preventing non-response by engaging young people in research, including designing survey materials to appeal to young people and using new technology and digital media for participant engagement
- ethical issues in involving children and young people in surveys, including gaining informed consent and protecting children's rights and well-being

1. Let's talk about sex: asking 14 year olds about their lives in a home setting
Ms Kate Smith (Centre for Longitudinal Studies)
Ms Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies)
Miss Sarah Knibbs (Ipsos MORI)

2. How does the interview-mode effect unit non-response and social desirability in health surveys with young people?
Mr Philip Adebahr (University of Technologie Chemnitz)

3. Awareness Raising Among Interviewees: From Written to Video Information
Dr Geraldine Vivier (National Institute for Demographic Studies (INED))
Mrs Françoise Courtel (National Institute for Demographic Studies (INED))
Miss Zoe Perron (National Institute for Demographic Studies (INED))
Ms Pauline Sage (National Institute for Demographic Studies, INED)
Ms Isabelle Frechon (Printemps lab, National Center for Scientific Research, CNRS)

Thursday 16th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: HT-105

Web and mixed-mode data collection in National Statistics 2

Convenor   Mrs Karen Blanke (FSO Germany)
Coordinator 1   Mrs Annemieke Luiten (Statistics Netherlands)

Session Details

Many countries within the European Statistical System (ESS) are considering web-based data collection in a system of multiple mode data collection. Eurostat initiated the ESSnet project "Data Collection in Social Surveys Using Multiple Modes" with the purpose to support Member States in their development and implementation efforts. A consortium of five NSIs has done extensive research on the development of web-based data collection tools for NSIs, specifically the Labour Force Survey, and

the impact of implementing multimode data collection.

Concerning the web questionnaire, much of the work was aimed at finding out how severe the challenges in switching to self-completion actually are and if/how interviewer-assistance can be adequately replaced in web questionnaires, in view of the complicated concepts measured. The second aim was how to design functionalities in web questionnaires like instructions, routing, edit checks, customised wording or the variety of question types.

Concerning mixed mode data collection, we focussed on three issues: the organisation of mixed mode data collection, mode effects and adjustment for mode and measurement effects. In 'organisation' we focus on mode strategies: which modes in which sequence, response rates and measures to heighten web response. Attention is also given to the important subject of case management systems: software systems that are able to support all modes and allow flexible transitions from one mode to another. Concerning mode effects, several studies were performed on mode effects in mixed mode LFS designs. The final research topic was estimation and adjustment: given that there are mode effects, can we adjust for them, and how should that be performed.

We propose either one session where the partners in this research project discuss the findings on the topics or alternatively, we could have a double session where a number of speakers are invited to present.

1. Mixed mode data collection in National Statistics. Findings from the ESSnet DCSS
Mrs Annemieke Luiten (Statistics Netherlands)

2. Results and Data Analysis for the 2016 Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation Survey's Mixed-Mode, Pre-Screener Test
Mr Matthew Herbstritt (United States Census Bureau)

3. Data Collection in Social Surveys in Latvia Using Multiple Modes Data collection
Mrs Maranda Behmane (CSB of Latvia)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N-131

Analyzing sexual prejudice and sexual orientation with survey data 2

Convenor	Mrs Anabel Kuntz (University of Cologne)
Coordinator 1	Dr Stephanie Steinmetz (University of Amsterdam)

Session Details

In past decades, the acceptance of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) people has increased in Europe. Nevertheless, sexual prejudice considerably varies within and between European countries. Although Europe is a place where many national laws prohibit at least the incitement to discrimination based on sexual orientation, countries also differ in granting rights to LGBT people and in protecting them from discrimination. Moreover, LGBT rights are hotly debated in the European public and politics. Compared to research on other minority groups, such as ethnic minorities, sexual prejudice has been studied quantitatively much less in the social sciences. Therefore, this session aims to increase the understanding of situation of LGBT people within Europe on the basis of quantitative studies and to evaluate also the methodological challenges researchers face when using existing data sources. Contributions are welcome focusing on sexual prejudice and rights of LGBT people as well as issues relating to sexual orientation both from a substantive and methodological perspective.

1. The Evaluation of Attitudes toward Same-Sex Parenting
Ms Katrin Scholz (SOCLIFE University of Cologne)

2. Testing refined survey measures of sexual prejudice: The effects of conservatism and hostile sexism on two dimensions of gay and lesbian parenthood
Dr Tilo Beckers (Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf)
Ms Anne-katrin Henseler (Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf)
Ms Mira Hassan (Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf)

3. Identifying same-sex couples in cross-national representative survey data: evidence from the ESS and the GGS
Ms Mirjam Fischer (University of Amsterdam)
Mr Matthijs Kalmijn (University of Amsterdam)
Mrs Stephanie Steinmetz (University of Amsterdam)

4. Counting gay and lesbian couples: Can a new question and edit check reduce measurement error?
Ms Nancy Bates (U.S. Census Bureau)
Ms Jamie Lewis (U.S. Census Bureau)
Ms Daphne Lofquist (U.S. Census Bureau)

5. Measurement of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in a District of Columbia Health Survey
Ms Angelina Kewalramani (American Institutes for Research)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-206

Cognition in surveys 2

Convenor   Dr Bregje Holleman (Utrecht University)
Coordinator 1 Dr Naomi Kamoen (Utrecht University/ Tilburg University)

Session Details

Cognitive research in surveys covers a wide range of approaches. In recent years, various models describing the cognitive processes underlying question answering in standardized surveys have been proposed. A lot of research is guided by the model of question answering by Tourangeau, Rips and Rasinski (2000). This model distinguishes four stages in question answering: (1) comprehension of the question, (2) retrieval of information, (3) deriving a judgment, and (4) formulating a response. In addition, there are dual-process models, such as the satisficing model proposed by Krosnick (1991). In this model, two groups of respondents are distinguished: those who satisfice, and try to do just enough to give a plausible answer versus those who optimize, and do their best to give a good answer.

Cognitive models such as the two described above, have many applications. For example, they help in understanding what is measured when administering surveys, and they provide a point of departure in explaining the wide range of method effects survey researchers observe. Also, cognitive theory in surveys is used by psychologists, linguists and other scholars to obtain a deeper understanding of, for example, language processing, the nature of attitudes, and memory.

Recently, similar cognitive approaches are also used to describe the ways attitudes are formed using standardized surveys. In this type of research, so-called 'decision aids', such as Voting Advice Applications (VAAs), are studied. In VAAs, users answer attitude questions about political issues in order to obtain a voting advice. How do design choices in these decision aids affect users' answers, attitudes and behavioral intentions?

We cordially invite researchers addressing one or more of these topics to submit their papers to this session.

1. Valence framing in Voting Advice Applications (VAAs). Effects on substantive and non-substantive answers.
Dr Naomi Kamoen (Utrecht University)
Mr Jasper Van De Pol (Amsterdam University)
Dr André Krouwel (VU University)
Professor Claes De Vreese (Amsterdam University)
Dr Bregje Holleman (Utrecht University)

2. Cognitive processes behind question order effects: the case of questions that evaluate similar objects
Ms Vilma Agalioti-sgompou (ISER, University of Essex, UK)

3. Asked, not answered: on the contextual factors of not declaring a vote choice in a survey context. The case of the Italian General Election of 2013
Dr Stefano Camatarri (University of Milano)

4. Respondents' cognitive processing on school self-evaluation surveys
Mr Jerich Faddar (University of Antwerp, Belgium)
Professor Jan Vanhoof (University of Antwerp, Belgium)
Professor Sven De Maeyer (University of Antwerp, Belgium)

5. Issue framing in online Voting Advice Applications
Mr Jasper Van De Pol (Amsterdam University)
Dr Naomi Kamoen (Utrecht University)
Dr André Krouwel (VU University)
Professor Claes De Vreese (Amsterdam University)
Dr Bregje Holleman (Utrecht University)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-101

Cultural Response Styles

Convenor   Professor Martin Weichbold (University of Salzburg)
Coordinator 1 Professor Nina Baur (TU Berlin)
Coordinator 2 Dr Wolfgang Aschauer (University of Salzburg)

Session Details

Cross-national and cross-cultural surveys are facing numerous challenges at different stages of the research process. Despite

the broad research on potential methodological biases during fieldwork, there are still some fields which gain less attention although they contain a considerable risk of biasing survey data. Various measurement errors (such as social desirability or acquiescence) have been high on the research agenda in survey methodology for a long time, but there are only a few studies on differences of these effects between cultures or nations.

Cultural imprints are a particular threat to the comparability of scales and indicators because we have to assume different levels and/or patterns of response styles in different countries. Challenges posed by cultural response styles have always been highly relevant in the increasing amount of cross-national research but there is growing importance of those potential biases for surveys in single nations as well – due to the growing number of people with immigrant background (at least in European countries). It seems obvious that the prevalence of response styles is related to other cultural patterns and certain contextual data, but there is hardly any systematic research and only sporadic empirical findings.

For the proposed session on cultural response styles we ask researchers for contributions covering one or more of the following topics:
- Providing empirical evidence of differences of response styles in surveys between countries or within countries (between different cultures)
- Searching for certain explanations for this differences (at the individual or contextual level)
- Looking for strategies how to deal with cultural response styles in cross-national surveys

1. Cultural Response Style and Political Knowledge Measurement
Dr Pat Lyons (Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences)

2. Developing a diagnostic tool for detecting response styles, and a demonstration of its use in comparative research of single item measurements
Ms Eva Van Vlimmeren (Tilburg University)
Mr Guy Moors (Tilburg University)
Mr John Gelissen (Tilburg University)

3. Asessment of Standard Measurement of Authoritarianism in a Post-communist Country and Response Style analysis
Mrs Johana Chylíková (The Czech Social Science Data, The Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences)
Mr Martin Buchtík (The Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences)

4. Data collection in ergonomics research in Indian Context
Dr Prabir Mukhopadhyay (Indian Institute of Information Technology Design and Manufacturing Jabalpur, India)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: O-202

Effects of respondent incentives in Health Interview Surveys. Differences according to survey modes, incentive strategies and incentive values 1

Convenor	Dr Elena Von Der Lippe (Robert Koch Institute)
Coordinator 1	Mr Patrick Schmich (Robert Koch Insitute)
Coordinator 2	Mr Matthias Wetzstein (Robert Koch Institute)

Session Details

Respondent incentives as one possible mean of raising response rates is broadly used in social science. It is often reported that the respondent incentives have different impact on various sub-population groups under study. Also, incentive effects vary according to the survey modes and strategies applied. Research shows that the value of the respondent incentives has to be well considered, as not always higher values lead to higher response rates.

The aim of this session is to gather and exchange experiences in applying incentive strategies in health interview surveys and also other population based surveys. One of the sample biases that are often faced in health interview surveys is the higher participation of respondents with high education level. Applying any incentive strategy would aim at reaching the population that otherwise is not willing to participate in health interview surveys.

We would like to welcome presentations dealing with the application of any kind of incentive strategies in health interview surveys, regardless of the survey mode used. In particular, we are interested in reporting: what kind of incentive strategies (e.g. monetary or non-monetary) show significant effects on the response rates; did the incentives have the same effects for different sub-population groups (e.g. urban/rural, young/old population); did the usage of incentives lead also to a better sample composition and reduction in the sample bias; what incentive strategies and values are balancing best between costs and effects?

1. Different Types of Incentives in Health Examination Surveys and the Effects on Survey Response. Findings from the German Health Interview and Examination Survey for Children and Adolescents (KiGGS)
Mr Robin Houben (Robert Koch Institute)
Mr Panagiotis Kamtsiuris (Robert Koch Institute)

2. Testing different incentive strategies in a German Health Interview Survey
Mr Patrick Schmich (Robert Koch-Institute)

Mrs Elena Von Der Lippe (Robert Koch-Institute)
Mr Matthias Wetzstein (Robert Koch-Institute)

3. What is more effective - prepaid or promised incentives? An experiment in the German General Social Survey 2014.
Mr Michael Blohm (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Mr Achim Koch (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. Effects of respondent incentives on response rates in CINDI Health Monitoring Survey 2012
Mrs Tina Zupani? (National Institute of Public Health (NIJZ), Slovenia)
Mrs Darja Lavtar (National Institute of Public Health (NIJZ), Slovenia)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-104

Going beyond the basics of questionnaire design: new and innovative approaches to instrument design in web surveys 2

Convenor	Dr Femke De Keulenaer (Ipsos)
Coordinator 1	Professor Edith De Leeuw (Utrecht University)
Coordinator 2	Mr Arnaud Wijnant (CentERdata / Tilburg University)

Session Details

Web questionnaires can differ substantially from questionnaires in traditional modes; nonetheless, most web-based instruments are based on classic text-based questionnaire principles. Rather than simply applying the design principles for paper questionnaires, researchers could capitalize on the unique properties of the web interaction. In web surveys, the medium can be fully exploited to produce better ways of asking and answering questions, and to introduce new approaches to surveying (i.e. going beyond "asking questions").

In this session, we would like to focus on the potential for advanced questionnaire design in web surveys and innovative approaches to surveying respondents. Topics could include, but are not limited to the following:

- The unique properties of web interaction can be used to design web questionnaire interfaces that adapt or tailor themselves to respondents' behaviour, diagnose respondents' need for clarification, detect respondents' lack of effort, etc.

- A difference between web surveys and traditional surveys can be the focus on (audio-)visual communication. The dynamic and graphical nature of the web has led to the creation of a wide range of measurement tools that previously could not be done on paper; examples include card sort tasks, interactive maps and verbal information.

- Web surveys also offer possibilities for innovative approaches to surveying; for example, behavioural experiments have made the switch from asking respondents to report on their behaviour (via survey questions) to actually observing respondent behaviour (e.g. using game-enhanced instruments or facial expression devices).

- This type of innovative approaches to web instrument design, however, can also lead to a variety of unpredicted effects that reduce the quality of web-based surveys. Researchers are also invited to present empirical evaluations and split ballot experiments. Only by fully understanding both the benefits - and the drawbacks – of innovations can we fully exploit the potential of web surveys.

1. Comparing Interface Designs of Database Lookups with Traditional Measurements
Ms Jessica Herzing (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim and GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Germany)

2. Survey Wizard 2.0: Addressing implicit response tasks in a census of businesses
Mr Alfred Tuttle (US Census Bureau)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N-132

How to measure political participation?

Convenor	Dr Christina Eder (GESIS)
Coordinator 1	Professor Isabelle Stadelmann-steffen (Universität Bern)

Session Details

Political participation is the heart of modern democracy. From voting to writing to one's representative, wearing a badge, becoming a party member, attending a demonstration to boycotting a product or occupying a building, each citizen has various opportunities to voice her opinion. Hence, there is a correspondingly rich literature on all kinds of political participation. Yet, (comparative) researchers in this area are often faced by at least one of the following challenges: a) relevant questions are not included in the survey program(s) one employs or the question wording varies across surveys, countries and/or time. This is particularly true for the more unconventional, elite-challenging and bottom-up forms of citizen involvement. b) Cross-national surveys encounter the difficulty of some kinds of participation, like 'signing a petition' for instance, meaning different things in different countries. c) Survey responses might be biased by social desirability, with the participants tending to claim that they have used more means than they actually did.

The proposed session is a forum to discuss and evaluate ways to deal with these challenges from different perspectives. It strives to bring together primary investigators, data collectors and users of secondary data. We therefore welcome papers investigating the above mentioned aspects from a theoretical or methodological angle as well as manuscripts using a more applied or experimental approach.

1. Behind the Scenes of Usual Answers: Refining the Measurement of Intensity and Range of Political Participation
Dr Eva-maria Trüdinger (University of Stuttgart)
Mr Uwe Remer-bollow (University of Stuttgart)

2. Measuring Political Participation in Europe: a cross-national and longitudinal equivalence assessment
Mr André Pirralha (RECSM - Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

3. A Validation Study on Voter Turnout Bias in Switzerland
Professor Ben Jann (University of Bern)
Mr Simon Hugi (University of Bern)

4. Different questions, different answers, same results? The measurement of political participation in German surveys
Dr Christina Eder (GESIS Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

5. Taking turns at the ballot box. Selective participation as a new perspective on low turnout
Mr Clau Dermont (University of Bern)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-101

Measuring Social Networks in Large-Scale Surveys: Challenges and Practice of Ego-Centred and Complete Network Approaches 2

Convenor Mr Benjamin Schulz (Mannheim Centre for European Social Research and WZB Berlin Social Science Center)
Coordinator 1 Mrs Kerstin Hoenig (Leibniz-Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi), Bamberg)
Coordinator 2 Professor Reinhard Pollak (WZB Berlin Social Science Center and Freie Universität Berlin)

Session Details

Survey researchers measure social networks in two fundamental ways: i) in an ego-centred manner that captures an actor's ties and related characteristics, ii) in a broader way that captures complete networks within predefined boundaries. The latter approach gains increasing attention as recent projects in many countries and fields collect complete network data.
This increase largely follows from advances in survey instruments for complete networks and in statistical modelling, especially for network dynamics. Methodologically, complete network analysis makes it possible to separate selection and influence processes. These surveys, however, are mainly conducted in schools as meaningful network boundaries are easy to implement in this context.
Ego-centred measures offer the chance to collect network data in contexts where a complete network measurement is not feasible. To meet the challenge of reversed causality and endogeneity as a consequence of the non-random, often homophilous, formation of social ties, panel data including repeated, or prospective and retrospective, measures are promising. Several international large-scale surveys made significant progress in this domain.
By bringing together researchers from both camps, we seek to promote a discussion that allows for a better evaluation of the advantages and pitfalls of each approach. The session's focus shall be on longitudinal measurements and statistical modelling of social networks, especially on means to identify causal network effects. The second focus shall be on ways to assess the reliability and validity of ego-centred and complete network measures. For ego-centred network measures, such as name or resource generators, the reliability of these instruments will be of central interest. For complete network measures, the specification of network boundaries is a heavily debated issue. Contributions might also include studies on how to identify and deal with compositional changes or on inference errors that may follow from insufficiently specified boundaries.

1. A new tool to collect ego-centered network data in online surveys
Dr Tobias Stark (Utrecht University)
Professor Jon Krosnick (Stanford University)

2. How should we ask surveys questions about how many people do know you? Experimental evidence regarding the

role of response categories and follow-up questions.
Dr Matías Bargsted (Institute of Sociology, Catholic University of Chile)
Dr Luis Maldonado (Institute of Sociology, Catholic University of Chile)

3. Interviewer Differences In Social Network Surveys
Dr Sören Petermann (Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main)
Dr Andreas Herz (University Hildesheim)

4. Order effects in the position generator
Professor Bonnie Erickson (University of Toronto)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-103

Methodological issues of using administrative data to improve the quality of survey data 2

Convenor   Dr Emanuela Sala (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di MIlano Bicocca)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jonathan Burton (ISER, University of Essex)
Coordinator 2 Dr Gundi Knies (ISER, University of Essex)

Session Details

There is a body of research on eliciting respondents' consent to link their survey data to their administrative records. However, the process of linking survey and administrative data is complex and the issues that survey practitioners need to tackle go beyond the asking for respondents' consent. Furthermore, using that linked data also provides potential for further methodological research. The aim of this session is to foster discussion on i) methodological issues that concern the data linkage process, ii) the research potential of the linked data,
iii) use of administrative data to improve the quality of survey data

We welcome papers on the following topics:

1. Analysis of mis-reporting
2. Measurement 'bias' using linked data
3. Impact on research findings compared to using survey data only
4. Validation studies
5. Methodological lessons from linkage process
6. Implications of consent bias

Relevant papers on other aspects of data linkage will also be considered.

1. Using Register Data in Income Statistics in the Austrian EU-SILC: (Why) Do People Get Poorer?
Mr Richard Heuberger (Statistics Austria)
Ms Nadja Lamei (Statistics Austria)
Mr Stefan Angel (WU Wien)

2. Determining recall errors in retrospective life course data – an approach using linked survey and administrative data
Ms Stefanie Unger (Institute for Employment Research)
Dr Britta Matthes (Institute for Employment Research)

3. Integration of Administrative Data in the Survey of Income and Program Participation
Dr Jason Fields (US Census Bureau)
Dr Martha Stinson (US Census Bureau)
Dr Gary Benedetto (US Census Bureau)

4. Use of Medicare linkage data to study nonresponse bias in the distribution of physical measure and biomarker data: Examination of the Health and Retirement Study
Dr Jessica Faul (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)
Dr Mary Beth Ofstedal (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)

5. Consent to Data Linkage in Business Surveys: Correlates and linked dataset representativeness.
Dr Jamie Moore (Administrative Data Research Centre for England and Department of Social Statistics and Demography)
Dr Gabriele Durrant (Administrative Data Research Centre for England and Department of Social Statistics and Demography)
Professor Peter Smith (Administrative Data Research Centre for England and Department of Social Statistics and Demography)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: L-102

Mixed methods designs combining survey data and qualitative data 2

Convenor   Professor Mark Trappmann (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Coordinator 1 Dr Andreas Hirseland (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))

Session Details

In social science research there is a long tradition of research combining survey data with qualitative data. There can be various reasons why this integration of approaches provides advantages compared to a single method approach and how it is implemented in a research design. Greene et al. (1989) propose a typology consisting of five types of mixed-method designs. Triangulation involves investigating the same aspect of the same phenomenon. If research methods bias results, there is a chance of detecting this bias by using different methods independently. In contrast, complementarity involves investigating different aspects of the same phenomenon by different methods. Results from one method are used to elaborate, enhance, or illustrate results from the other. Development designs sequentially use one method to develop or support the other method. Examples include using qualitative interviews in questionnaire design or residual diagnostics or to use quantitative survey data for theoretical sampling in qualitative research. Initiation designs aim at uncovering paradox or contradictions to initiate new insights. Finally, expansion designs extend the scope of a study by mixing methods. One typical example of this last approach is the combination of quantitative evaluation of programme outcomes with qualitative studies of programme implementation. We encourage submissions dealing with designs of mixed-methods studies combining survey research and qualitative research. Presentations should focus on methodological issues of research designs or analysis of such data.

1. Mixing methods for quality assessment and harmonisation of survey questions
Dr Vlasta Zucha (Statistics Austria)

2. Methodological lessons from using alternative methods to measure social processes through surveys
Professor Wim Hardyns (Ghent University, Free University of Brussels, Antwerp University)
Professor Lieven Pauwels (Ghent University)

3. Use of Norwegian Municipal Public Health Profiles and Data Bank: a mixed methods study
Ms Heidi Lyshol (Norwegian Institute of Public Health)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-105

Mixing modes and mode effects

Convenor   Mrs Caroline Bayart (University Lyon 1)
Coordinator 1 Mr Patrick Bonnel (University Lyon 2 - ENTPE)

Session Details

Survey response rates are decreasing over the world. Even if weighting procedures allow to reduce the incidence of non-response, it is always necessary to postulate that people with some socio-demographic characteristics who do not respond to a survey have the same behaviour than people with the same socio-demographic characteristics who respond. But evidence seems to indicate that it is not always the case and survey non-response might produce bias. Efforts are made to increase response rate for traditional survey by improving the questionnaire, reducing respondent burden, increasing reminders… Even if results are generally positive, it is in most cases not sufficient.
A way to balance the impact of non-response and produce more reliable results, is to propose different media and let people chose the apppropriate mode and moment to answer. The potential of new and interactive media seems to be high to collect data. But these solutions generates some bias. First, in terms of design and administration of the questionnaire, which could vary according to the mode. Then, the generalization of the results to the whole population sometimes is an issue. Lastly, the question of data comparability remains. When mixed survey modes are used, individuals choose to belong to one group or another or only respond if the proposed medium suits them. The responses are therefore not completely comparable, because the sample is no longer random and the presence of respondents is determined by external factors, which may also affect the variable of interest in the studied model. The danger when databases are merged is that a sample selection bias will be created and compromise the accuracy of explanatory models.
The aim of the session is to to characterize bias generated by mixed modes surveys and give some perspectives for reduce them.

1. How to combine survey media (web, telephone, face-to-face): application to the Lyon household travel survey
Mrs Caroline Bayart (University Lyon 1)
Mr Patrick Bonnel (University Lyon 2 - ENTPE)

2. Why do Internet users choose the offline mode? – Evidence from the recruitment of a mixed mode panel

Dr Tanja Dannwolf (GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Klaus Pforr (GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. Consequences of mid-stream mode switching in a panel survey
Professor Nick Allum (University of Essex)
Professor Fred Conrad (University of Michigan)

4. Selection Bias and Cross-Group Differences depending on the Level of Effort in Mixed-Mode-Surveys
Mr Hagen Von Hermanni (TU Dresden)
Dr Robert Neumann (TU Dresden)

5. Mode effects when collecting data on sensitive behaviours: an experiment using a repeated measures design on the British National Survey of Sexual Attitudes & Lifestyles
Mr Bob Erens (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine)
Ms Sarah Burkill (Karolinska Institutet)
Dr Andrew Copas (University College London)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: L-101

Multilevel survey research, agent based modeling and social mechanisms: towards new frontiers in theory-based empirical research

Convenor	Dr Dominik Becker (Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf)
Coordinator 1	Dr Tilo Beckers (Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf)
Coordinator 2	Professor Ulf Tranow (Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf)

Session Details

This three-part session will lay the spotlight on the link between empirically-oriented theories and empirical research by focusing on the explanatory concept of social mechanisms. When explaining macro-level phenomena such as network structures or social diffusion outcomes, establishing the underlying social mechanisms is a strategy to overcome incomplete explanations which remain restricted on the macro level. Instead, the theoretical and empirical objective is to unveil the meso- or micro-level social mechanisms causing the macro-level explananda. Whether following Coleman's explanatory macro-micro-macro model, (`wide´) rational action theory or DBO theory (desires, beliefs and opportunities), social scientists address the need for more fine-grained explanatory approaches.

Since about two decades, social mechanism research evolves to be an important paradigm in the social sciences. Yet, though survey data allow for and are often used to study social mechanisms, their methodological potential to do so is only rarely addressed systematically.

In part 1, we invite colleagues establishing social mechanisms as part of their theoretical explanation and actually researching these mechanisms applying different survey research designs. In part 2, we would like to bring together researchers using survey (and/or network) data and linking them to agent-based modeling, an approach which will gain importance to extend and enrich the use of survey data. In part 3, we invite presenters discussing either specific micro- or macro-based mechanisms, i.e. both survey-based and experimental approaches (including mediation and moderation analyses) as well as process tracing. We particularly welcome papers applying multilevel mechanism research, e.g. explicating cross-level interaction effects, or controlling for group-induced selection biases and linking analytical theoretical arguments with their data.

Abstracts should include theoretical references, a specification of the mechanism(s) under study and the method and type of data and analyses.

1. A closer look at the relation between religiosity and formal volunteering. A cross-regional analysis using Swiss data
Ms Elena Damian (University of Cologne)
Professor Elmar Schlüter (Justus-Liebig-University of Giessen)

2. Middle-range theories, moderator models and marginal effects: What does sour grapes make taste sweeter?
Dr Dominik Becker (Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf)
Professor Klaus Birkelbach (University of Duisburg-Essen)

3. Resilience as a Mechanism for Educational Success Despite Disadvantaged Circumstances
Ms Jennifer Tork (Bielefeld University, CRC 882)

4. Unraveling the paradox of job search via personal contacts and wages: Evidence combining agent based modelling and empirical research
Dr Gerhard Krug (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)

5. Case study data for validating agent-based models
Professor Sharon Purchase (The University of Western Australia)

Dr Luis Izquierdo (The University of Burgos)
Dr Segismundo Izquierdo (The University of Valladolid)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: HT-102

Response rates and nonresponse bias in comparative surveys 2

Convenor	Dr Koen Beullens (KU Leuven)
Coordinator 1	Dr Ineke Stoop (SCP)

Session Details

Comparing response rates and possibly associated nonresponse bias can be hard in the context of cross-national surveys. First, response rates objectives may be set differently. In this respect, the European Social Survey sets a 70% response rate objective, without really penalizing countries that do not achieve this objective. PIAAC, on the other hand, also sets a target response rate of of 70%, but accepts response rates in between 50% to 70%, whereas when response rates below 50% occur a nonresponse analysis has to be provided. Second, response rates have to be calculated in a comparable ways. Response rates from EU-SILC and the LFS, for instance, are sometimes hard to compare because the numerator and/or denominator may be calculated in different ways. Third, and even more complicated, are the national differences regarding survey design features (e.g. sampling design) that have diverse implication for the response and the nonresponse bias.

Not only is it hard to determine nonresponse bias for a single survey, the cross-national context even adds more complexity, probably strongly jeopardizing the comparability between countries or surveys. The survey climate in different countries, the related nonresponse mechanisms, strategies to minimize nonresponse (bias) or adjustment methods are not likely to be considered as uniform over different countries or surveys.

Therefore, this session welcomes papers on (1) enhancing response, (2) fieldwork strategies minimising nonresponse bias and (3) nonresponse adjustment methods, all providing better comparability for cross-national surveys.

1. Is it Really Worth the Effort? – A Meta-Regression Approach on the (Cost-) Effectiveness of Incentives in Self-Administered Surveys
Mr Andreas Schneck (Goethe University Frankfurt Main)
Professor Katrin Auspurg (Goethe University Frankfurt Main)

2. A responsive fieldwork design to increase retention rates in the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)
Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging (MEA))

3. Money Makes the World Go 'Round: A Survey Experiment on Income Non-Response in Multi-National Surveys
Dr Jill Carle (Pew Research Center)
Dr James Bell (Pew Research Center)
Ms Fatima Ghani (Pew Research Center)

Thursday 16th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: L-103

Survey Research in Developing Countries 4

Convenor   Dr Irene Pavesi (Small Arms Survey)

Session Details

This session explores the challenges involved in conducting survey research in developing countries and discuss best practices in sampling, questionnaire design and fieldwork organisation.

Even more often than in developed countries up-to-date data on population size and composition is absent. Mobile populations, scarcely populated areas and areas connected only by low quality roads and security issues complicate the creation of a sampling frame. What strategies have researchers used to deal with these challenges?

Response rates tend to be high in developing countries. This is in part because in rural areas trust tends to be high or a survey is seen as an interesting break from everyday life. However in some cases the consent of village heads or other local leaders is an order to people to participate. How does this fit with the idea of informed consent?

High poverty in some areas raises ethical questions on whether and how respondents should be compensated for their time; if

respondents receive cash or in kind compensation this can lead to competition among households for inclusion in the survey. What are appropriate ways to compensate respondents?

Large household with complex structures can make collection of household data a time consuming and error prone process. How can data be collected in an efficient way?

High ethnic and linguistic diversity poses challenges to both questionnaire translation and selection of interviewers. How can these challenges be dealt with?

If the people who design the questionnaire are not from the country of data collection, what procedures can be used to ensure that concepts in the survey resonate with those of the target population?

We welcome papers on these and related topics, such as reaching female respondents, use of ICT in data collection, surveying in (post-)conflict areas, and surveys among populations with high illiteracy rates

1. A varied methodological approach to measuring labor in agriculture
Dr Amparo Palacios Lopez (World Bank)
Dr Gbemisola "mimi" Oseni (World Bank)

2. Can student populations in developing countries be reached by online surveys? The case of the National Service Scheme Survey (N3S) in Ghana
Dr Arnim Langer (KU Leuven)
Mr Maarten Schroyens (KU Leuven)
Dr Bart Meuleman (KU Leuven)

3. Examining survey based obstacles in research on South African social movements
Mr Thorsten Euler (University of Bremen / Germany)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-101

Comparability in International Comparative Research

Convenor Dr Katarzyna M. Staszynska (Kozminski University)

Session Details

The session would be devoted to the problems of comparability of data gathered in international comparative research. The limitations of comparability might be of various origin:

Linguistic. The rules of conducting international comparative research require detail translation of the research questionnaires into native languages of participant countries. The problem of lacking the translation that takes into account cultural differences between countries/ethnic groups (various understandings of terms, for instance: "democracy" is differently understood in Western societies where it has a positive meaning while in some Eastern societies might easily be associated with social disorder; "happiness" in some societies might be understood as individual material well being, good family life and love while in others - relationship of an individual with God, successful meditation and self-acceptance);
Related to social structure and stratification. The rules of social behaviors are strongly attached to social position of an individual. On some social positions particular behaviors might be considered inappropriate. During an interview people on some social positions might easily hide their own attitudes and opinions because in a particular culture they are not expected to present their own, individual points of view but rather a point of view of a strata they belong to.
Gender related. In some societies/ethnic groups women cannot be interviewed by male interviewers and men should rather not be interviewed by female interviewers. Since the interviewer effect is well recognized, the fact that male and female interviewers interview respondents of the same gender might be a reason of biased data.

Not all of the barriers for comparability of data gathered in international comparative research have been listed in here. We are open to hear the experiences of researchers running survey research in various societies and cultures.

1. Cross-cultural transferability of concepts: issues, problems, strategies
Dr Michael Ochsner (FORS)
Dr Michèle Ernst Staehli (FORS)
Ms Karin Nisple (FORS)

2. Is the Concept of Attitudes Towards the Welfare State Fitted for Measurement in both Europe and Non-European Countries? Evidences from the Development of International Surveys in Venezuela
Mr Roberto Briceno-rosas (GESIS)

3. Consistency factors in the approach to the sample design in international face to face surveys
Dr Hayk Gyuzalyan (TNS Opinion)

4. Interviewer Gender in Face-to-Face Surveys: A Cross-Cultural Analysis
Dr Steve Schwarzer (Pew Research Center)
Dr James Bell (Pew Research Center)
Dr Jill Carle (Pew Research Center)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-202

Effects of respondent incentives in Health Interview Surveys. Differences according to survey modes, incentive strategies and incentive values 2

Convenor	Dr Elena Von Der Lippe (Robert Koch Institute)
Coordinator 1	Mr Patrick Schmich (Robert Koch Insitute)
Coordinator 2	Mr Matthias Wetzstein (Robert Koch Institute)

Session Details

Respondent incentives as one possible mean of raising response rates is broadly used in social science. It is often reported that the respondent incentives have different impact on various sub-population groups under study. Also, incentive effects vary according to the survey modes and strategies applied. Research shows that the value of the respondent incentives has to be well considered, as not always higher values lead to higher response rates.
The aim of this session is to gather and exchange experiences in applying incentive strategies in health interview surveys and also other population based surveys. One of the sample biases that are often faced in health interview surveys is the higher participation of respondents with high education level. Applying any incentive strategy would aim at reaching the population that otherwise is not willing to participate in health interview surveys.
We would like to welcome presentations dealing with the application of any kind of incentive strategies in health interview surveys, regardless of the survey mode used. In particular, we are interested in reporting: what kind of incentive strategies (e.g. monetary or non-monetary) show significant effects on the response rates; did the incentives have the same effects for different sub-population groups (e.g. urban/rural, young/old population); did the usage of incentives lead also to a better sample composition and reduction in the sample bias; what incentive strategies and values are balancing best between costs and effects?

1. The impact of unconditional incentives on cooperation rates among non-responders in a mixed mode panel study
Dr Katherine A. Mcgonagle (University of Michigan)
Dr Vicki A. Freedman (University of Michigan)

2. Survey incentives in the context of a developing country. The impact of amount and conditionality on response rate and data quality
Professor Bart Meuleman (University of Leuven)
Professor Arnim Langer (University of Leuven)

3. Experiments on the Effectiveness of Non-Monetary Incentives in Longitudinal and Cross-Sectional Physician Surveys
Dr Paul Beatty (U.S. Census Bureau)
Dr Eric Jamoom (U.S. National Center for Health Statistics)
Mr Ian Lundberg (Harvard University)

4. Determining a Cost-Effective Incentive Amount for Surveying Physicians
Dr Timothy Beebe (Mayo Clinic)
Dr Jeanette Ziegenfuss (HealthPartners Institute for Education and Research)
Dr Jon Tilburt (Mayo Clinic)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-105

Estimating effects of modes and mixed modes designs 2

Convenor Mr Alexandru Cernat (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)

Session Details

Traditional approaches to data collection in the social sciences (i.e., face to face and telephone surveys) are becoming more expensive. At the same time cheaper approaches, such as web surveys, lack traditional sampling frames. This has led to a

surge in data collection designs that aim to combine the strength of each mode into a single survey. In this context, accumulating evidence that informs design decision in mixed modes surveys is essential.

This session will contribute to this debate by tackling some important topics such as:
- Is the effect of social desirability moderated by mode?
- How do self-administered strategies (e.g., paper and web) differ in data quality?
- Are traditional scales (like those measuring personality, depression, cognitive ability) equivalent across modes?
- How does selection/non-response bias differ across modes?
- Does the use of mixed mode data impact substantive results?
- How does research on mixed mode integrate in the Total Survey Error framework?
- How to prevent mode effects through design?

1. Mode Effects in Personality Measurement - An Experimental Investigation of the Interviewer's Influence
Ms Luisa Hilgert (German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP))
Professor Martin Kroh (German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP))
Dr David Richter (German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP))

2. Volunteering, Survey Mode, and Consent
Dr Nikki Graf (University of Mannheim)

3. Mode effects on measures of wellbeing: a comparison between uni- and multi-dimensional approaches
Miss Rosa Sanchez Tome (NCCR LIVES- University of Lausanne)
Ms Caroline Roberts (University of Lausanne)
Ms Michèle Ernst Stahli (FORS - University of Lausanne)

4. Understanding mode effects in reading assessment – the impact of item and person covariates
Mrs Sarah Buerger (German Institute of International Educational Research (DIPF))
Mr Ulf Kroehne (German Institute of International Educational Research (DIPF))
Mr Frank Goldhammer (German Institute of International Educational Research (DIPF), Centre for International Student Assessment (ZIB))

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N-132

Methodological Aspects of the Left-right Self-placement Scale

Convenor	Ms Cornelia Zuell (GESIS)
Coordinator 1	Dr Evi Scholz (GESIS)

Session Details

The left-right dimension is a core element of political science research, serving as an instrument that supports citizens' orientations in a complex political world by condensing political contents. Analyses of the left-right dimension are usually based on responses to a left-right self-placement scale, and sometimes to open-ended questions about the meaning of left and right. Left-right self-placement on a uni-dimensional scale is a standard type of survey question that measures respondents' ideological orientations in a minimalist way. Aspects that are taken into account are the context and the way the scale is traditionally calibrated or methodological aspects, e.g., offering a midpoint or a "can't choose" option, or cross-cultural differences in understanding the scale by the respondents.

The proposed session aims at bringing together national and comparative researchers interested in
- the design of the left-right scale (for example, scale range, scale labels, use of midpoint, use of permitted "don't know", mode effects);
- methodological aspects of response behavior to the left-right scale or to open-ended questions;
- the use of probe question, for example, about the meaning of left and right or about reasons for selecting the midpoint;
- response bias and social desirability;
- cross-national equivalence (left-right; liberal-conservative) and comparability;
- other methodological aspects related to the left-right self-placement.

1. 10-point vs. 11-point? Effects of Left-right Scale Design in a Cross-national Perspective
Mrs Cornelia Zuell (GESIS)
Dr Evi Scholz (GESIS)

2. Stability and meaning of the left-right scale in the Czech Republic
Dr Lukas Linek (Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences)

3. Stability without validity? The left-right scale in Iceland from 1983-2013.
Dr Hulda Thorisdottir (University of Iceland)

4. Is the left-right alignment of parties outdated? The German case
Professor Andranik Tangian (Institute of Economic and Social Research in the Hans-Boeckler-Foundation)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: L-102

Mixing Survey and Qualitative Data 1

Convenor   Professor Nina Baur (Technische Universität Berlin)
Coordinator 1 Dr Leila Akremi (Technische Universität Berlin)
Coordinator 2 Ms Melanie Wenzel (Technische Universität Berlin)

Session Details

The session invites papers that discuss how to mix survey data with qualitative data, e.g. qualitative interviews, ethnography, video analysis etc. Presenters are specifically asked to discuss what methodlogical problems they faced and how they handled them.

1. Mixed methods in prejudice research: Combining survey data and qualitative interviews to investigate current anti-Americanism in Germany
Mr Felix Knappertsbusch (Justus-Liebig-University Giessen, Germany)

2. Mixing Surveys and Ethnography in Social Experiments. The Case of Orientation in Space
Ms Cornelia Thierbach (Technische Universität Berlin)

3. Problems and solutions of a mixed methods study that analyzes recalls
Mr Tobais Gebel (Bielefeld University)
Mrs Andrea Hense (Bielefeld University)
Mrs Franziska Schork (Bielefeld University)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: L-101

Multilevel Models for the Analysis of Comparative (Longitudinal) Survey Data 1

Convenor   Dr Alexander Schmidt-catran (Institute of Sociology and Social Psychology, University of Cologne)
Coordinator 1 Professor Bart Meuleman (Centre for Sociological Research, University of Leuven)

Session Details

Multilevel models have become predominant in analyses of comparative survey datasets, where respondents are clustered in higher-level units like countries or regions. Such models have also long been fitted to longitudinal data, where repeated observations are clustered within units. Additionally, researchers are fitting multilevel models to data that are clustered both ways, such as multiple waves of surveys whose respondents are nested in countries or regions each observed multiple times. These comparative longitudinal survey datasets should be useful resources for studies of social change in the broadest sense, and for drawing inferences previously based on only cross-sectional analyses. This session welcomes papers using multilevel models for the analysis of cross-sectional data, longitudinal data and, in particular, data that is clustered both ways. Papers might address recent methodological advances; present illuminating or innovative applications in some field of the social sciences; and/or discuss limitations and challenges that remain.

1. Modelling the Dynamics of Social Trust in 15 European countries (2002-2012): Keeping it maximal and the small-N problem in cross-national research
Dr Jan Mewes (Örebro University)

2. Multilevel strategies for the complex nested structures of international repeated cross-sectional surveys
Dr Raül Tormos (University of Barcelona & Centre d'Estudis d'Opinió)

3. The Random Effects in Multilevel Models: Getting Them Wrong and Getting Them Right
Dr Malcolm Fairbrother (University of Bristol)
Dr Alexander Schmidt-catran (University of Cologne)

4. Historical analysis of survey results and survey data: The incredible possibilities afforded by longitudinal multilevel

analysis using time as the higher level
Professor Claire Durand (Université de Montréal)
Mrs Isabelle Valois (Université de Montréal)
Mr François Yale (ASSSMM)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-201

New sources of data for survey research: challenges and opportunities 1

Convenor   Mr Arnaud Wijnant (CentERdata – Tilburg University)

Session Details

We live in a rapidly changing world in which people using smartphones all the time, being on Facebook, tweet about what they like, a world of 'internet of things' in which more and more data are available. All these data could in potential be a new source of information for survey researchers. However, this implies another way in how we collect and analyse data, moreover how can these new sources of data help survey researchers?

Smartphones and tablets for example offer new opportunities for collecting 'passive' data which can provide insight into how individuals use smartphones, GPS information tells us more about the exact location of the respondent and can track their patterns of mobility. Pop-up questions which allow us to ask people at random intervals how they feel at that moment (Experience Sampling). Other options are to ask respondents to make photos or videos and to scan the barcodes of what they bought. Furthermore all these kinds of data can be combined (with traditional surveys) to give a full overview of the respondent's behaviour and well-being.

Social media offer new ways of collecting information on people without asking questions. How can twitter and other social media help to improve surveys or give a deeper understanding in people's opinions or behaviour?

In this session we want to examine best practices and new ways of collecting and analysing data that can complement survey research. We welcome contributions, but not limited to these, which report on the use of smartphones, social media and other new sources of data in their research design.

1. Mobile devices in web surveys: How much difference do they make?
Mrs Inna Becher (LINK Institute for Market and Social Research, Zurich)

2. Using Wikipedia Page View Statistics to Measure Issue Salience
Mr Simon Munzert (University of Konstanz)

3. How WOuld We Measure Public Opinion If We Didn't Have Public Opinion Polls? (And Would We Be Better or Worse Off?)
Dr Tom W. Smith (NORC)

4. The feasibility of collecting objective physical activity data from 14-year olds on the sixth sweep of the Millennium Cohort Study
Ms Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)
Ms Anne Conolly (Ipsos MORI)
Ms Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-106

Occupations and survey research: methodological and substantive applications exploiting occupations as social contexts 1

Convenor   Professor Christian Ebner (University of Cologne, Germany)
Coordinator 1 Dr Daniela Rohrbach-schmidt (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training, Bonn, Germany)

Session Details

The individual's occupation belongs to the most frequently surveyed and most used background variables in social surveys. Occupational codes are regularly used as nominal units within fixed-effects approaches (economics), or they are recoded into different status measures or class schemes (sociology). More recent approaches describe occupations as "microclass" categories, which shape individual behavior and attitudes (e.g. Weeden/Grusky 2005). This view is also interesting from a

methodological view, as it understands occupations as a contextual unit, in which individuals are nested and socialized.

Following this approach our session focuses on occupations as a higher-level unit of analysis in multi-level designs. The session is a good opportunity to reflect on:
- How the relevance of occupations as a social context can be justified / what are valuable concepts to understand and systemize the occupational level?
- How occupational characteristics (e.g. regulations, skill / job task requirements) help to explain social phenomena at the individual level?

Methodological papers might address issues related to multi-level techniques (hierarchical, non-hierarchical, cross-classified), levels of occupational aggregation and data linkage, (inter)national occupational classifications, and the comparability of results between regions or countries. Substantive papers might cover the usefulness of the occupational context for the understanding of e.g. attitudes and lifestyles, labor market outcomes or well-being. In particular, we are interested in the theoretical and empirical mechanisms (e.g. social closure (ibid.), technological change (Autor/Handel 2013)), which lead to the described outcomes at the individual level.

References:
Autor, David; Handel, Michael (2013). Putting Tasks to the Test: Human Capital, Job Tasks, and Wages. Journal of Labor Economics 31(2): S59-S96.
Weeden, Kim; Grusky, David (2005). The Case for a New Class Map. American Journal of Sociology 111(1): 141-212.

1. Occupation as social context: An approach to estimating net contribution
Dr Jon Miller (University of Michigan, USA)
Dr Pamela Davis-kean (University of Michigan, USA)
Dr Linda Kimmel (University of Michigan, USA)

2. Payoff or penalty: The impact on wages for Australian young people arising from occupational task change.
Mr Patrick Lim (National Centre for Vocational Education Research)
Dr Harald Pfeifer (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB))

3. Occupational closure and temporary employment in Germany
Mr Stefan Stuth (Berlin Social Science Center (WZB))

4. Understanding occupational change and occupations
Dr Michael Tiemann (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-104

Open-ended questions in web panels and web surveys

Convenor   Professor Matthias Schonlau (University of Waterloo)

Session Details

Open-ended questions do not constrain respondents' answer choices. Open-ended questions can clarify previous answers or the dreaded multiple choice category "other". Web panels routinely include open-ended questions in the form of a final questions ("Do you have any other comment?"). Open-ended questions are well suited to web surveys and web panels because respondents' type themselves; no transcription is required. We welcome all contributions related to open-ended questions in web surveys, web panels, and handheld survey devices.

1. Are final comments in web survey panels predictive of attrition?
Miss Cynthia Mclauchlan (University of Waterloo)
Dr Matthias Schonlau (University of Waterloo)

2. Item nonresponse in open-ended questions: Identification and reduction in web surveys
Dr Lars Kaczmirek (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Mrs Katharina Meitinger (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. Open-ended questions to increase respondent satisfaction in web surveys
Dr Marika Wenemark (Linköping University / Region Östergötland)

4. An Experiment in Open End Response Length in Relation to Text Box Length in a Web Survey
Dr Michael Traugott (University of Michigan)
Mr Christopher Antoun (University of Michigan)

5. Do open-ended questions provide useful additional information?
Dr Per Kropp (Institute for Employment Research)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: O-206

Potential and Challenges of Cognitive Interviewing and Online Probing in a Cross-National Context

Convenor   Mr Andrew Johnson (Ipsos MORI)
Coordinator 1   Ms Katarina Meitinger (GESIS)

Session Details

A key consideration of cross-national surveys is that their questions possess functional equivalence, allowing for comparative analysis across people of differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Cognitive interviewing plays an invaluable role in uncovering problems of non-equivalence and offers at the same time the possibility to identify the causes of non-equivalence. However, its application in a cross-national setting faces unique challenges, such as the need to have multiple interviewing teams, often speaking different languages and possessing varying levels of interviewing experience and training. Teams may also have more or less experience of analyzing cognitive interviewing findings, and may be better or worse at making the sometimes fine analytical distinctions between problems of functional equivalence, translation error or poor source question design.

Recently, the supplemental method of online probing has been developed that implements probing techniques in cross-national web surveys. It allows for a relatively inexpensive increase in sample size, probe standardization and a quantification of results (Behr et al. 2012) but faces its own challenges, such as mismatching answers or probe non-response.

For this session, we invite papers that address the topic of equivalence testing by making use of either cognitive interviewing or online probing. What can the different methods achieve and where do they face challenges? And most importantly: How can these challenges be resolved?

Papers are welcome on both substantive findings and on methodological challenges and considerations. This session also invites papers that can provide a helpful contribution to understanding how best to achieve a uniformity of approach in cross-country cognitive interviewing, with a focus on, but not restricted to:
• Interviewer training and briefing
• Interview protocols
• Collection, organization and analysis of cognitive interviewing data

Co-organizers: Tom Frere-Smith, Ipsos and Dorothée Behr, GESIS

1. The Effect of Providing Think-Aloud Examples and Practice on Cognitive Interviewing in Nepal
Ms Jennifer Kelley (University of Michigan)
Ms Kristen Cibelli (University of Michigan)
Dr Ting Yan (Westat)

2. Collecting, organising and analysing data from cross-national cognitive interviewing - a review of approaches used and suggestions for improvements
Miss Sally Widdop (Ipsos MORI)
Mr Tom Frere-smith (Ipsos MORI)
Ms Sara Grant-vest (Ipsos MORI)

3. Challenges of Cognitive Interviewing in a Cross-National Context
Dr Rossalina Latcheva (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights)

4. Cognitive probing in a cross-national survey: What can we learn about measurement context?
Dr Sunghee Lee (Michigan Program in Survey Methodology)
Ms Colleen Mcclain (Michigan Program in Survey Methodology)
Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

5. Insights from Online Probing: Can the General Pride Item Serve as a Measure for Nationalism or Patriotism in a Cross-national Context?
Ms Katharina Meitinger (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-101

Propensity score methods: methodological developments and innovative applications

Convenor   Dr Bruno Arpino (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Session Details

Methods, such as matching, weighting and stratification, based on the propensity score have been increasingly used in many fields for estimating causal effects in observational studies. Still a lot of methodological work needs to be done to identify optimal ways of specifying the propensity score model, analyzing covariates balance, treat missing data and measurement error, etc. The panel will focus on recent developments in propensity score methods that address one or more of these issues. Submissions regarding innovative use of propensity score methods in applied works are also welcome.

1. Effectiveness of Sequences of Classroom Training for Welfare Recipients: What works best in West Germany?
Mrs Katharina Dengler (Institute for Employment Research)

2. Does the Participation in a Panel Study Really Change Respondents' Behavior? Evidence of Panel Conditioning in a German Panel Study on Labor Market Outcomes
Mr Ruben Bach (PhD student at the University of Mannheim, Germany; Researcher at the Statistical Methods Department, Institute for Employment Research, Nuremberg, Germany)
Dr Stephanie Eckman (IAB)

3. How to avoid misspecifying the propensity score equation – Evidence from a Monte Carlo simulation
Dr Gerhard Krug (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)

4. Propensity score matching with social network data
Dr Bruno Arpino (Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Spain)
Dr Luca De Benedictis (University of Macerata, Italy)
Dr Alessandra Mattei (University of Florence, Italy.)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-102

Sample composition in online studies

Convenor Mr Ulrich Krieger (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim)

Session Details

This session focusses on sample composition in internet based research.

As not every member of the population has access to the web, online studies are prone to coverage error and thus resulting in a selective sample. This is problematic when researchers want to draw inference on the population as a whole, online and offline sample members.

Papers in this session explore the effect on sample composition when this mode is being used. Also measures to counter the effects of data collection via the web are being discussed.

1. What is the gain in a probability-based online panel to provide Internet access to sampling units that did not have access before?
Dr Melanie Revilla (RECSM - Universitat Pomepu Fabra)
Miss Anne Cornilleau (Centre de données sociopolitiques (Sciences Po / CNRS))
Dr Anne-sophie Cousteaux (Centre de données sociopolitiques (Sciences Po / CNRS))
Mr Stéphane Legleye (National Institute for Demographic Studies (INED); Inserm, U669; University Paris-Sud and University Paris Descartes)
Mr Pablo De Pedraza (Amsterdam Institute for Advanced labour Studies, University of Amsterdam, AIAS; Applied Economics Department, University of Salamanca)

2. Parallel Phone and Web-based Interviews: Comparability and Validity.
Mr Randall Thomas (GfK Custom Research)
Mr David Krane (Nielsen Company)
Dr Frances Barlas (GfK Custom Research)

3. Representative web-survey!
Mr Peter Linde (Statistics Denmark)

4. Measuring subjective well-being: do the use of web-surveys bias the results? Evidence from the 2013 GEM data from Luxembourg.
Mr Francesco Sarracino (Statistical Office of Luxembourg and Higher school of Economics)
Ms Malgorzata Mikucka (Universite Catholique de Louvain and Higher School of Economics)

Mr Cesare Riillo (Statistical Office of Luxembourg)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: L-103

Surveying children and young people 3

Convenor   Miss Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)
Coordinator 1 Ms Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)

Session Details

Many large-scale surveys successfully collect a variety of different types of data from children and young people. However, there is relatively little methodological evidence in this area. Much of the literature relating to children and young people's participation in research focuses on small-scale qualitative studies and tends to concentrate on ethical issues relating to the rights of children and young people in research. This session will cover experiences of including children and young people in surveys, and related survey design issues. The session aims to explore a variety of methodological issues around surveying children and young people. Submissions are particularly welcomed on:
- designing questionnaires for children and young people, including question testing methods
- collecting sensitive data from children and young people, including methods for ensuring privacy and encouraging accurate reporting
- collecting different types of data from children and young people, including physical measurements, cognitive assessments, biological samples and time use data
- using different methods of data collection, including the use of innovative technology such as the web and mobile phones
- inclusivity in data collection methods, including facilitating the participation of young people with lower literacy levels
- assessing the reliability and validity of young people's self-reports
- preventing non-response by engaging young people in research, including designing survey materials to appeal to young people and using new technology and digital media for participant engagement
- ethical issues in involving children and young people in surveys, including gaining informed consent and protecting children's rights and well-being

1. Measuring Young People's Prejudice: Challenges and Psychometric Properties of a Prejudice Scale in a Cross European Survey
Dr Haridhan Goswami (Senior Lecturer, Dept. of Sociology, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK)

2. Does adding items increase the reliability of the Family Affluence Scale?
Dr Katrina Lloyd (Queen's University Belfast)
Dr Paula Devine (Queen's University Belfast)

3. Children's and Young People's Well-being: Validity and Reliability of Self Reported Measures
Dr Haridhan Goswami (Senior Lecturer, Dept. of Sociology, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK)

4. Investigating education from the first year onwards: The early childhood cohort of the National Educational Panel Study
Ms Manja Attig (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Professor Hans-günther Roßbach (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Professor Sabine Weinert (University of Bamberg)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: HT-103

Technical Problems and Solutions for Record Linkage and Big Data 1

Convenor   Dr Manfred Antoni (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Coordinator 1   Mr Stefan Bender (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Coordinator 2   Professor Rainer Schnell (University of Duisburg-Essen)

Session Details

The scope of the session includes technical issues of linkage, handling large administrative databases or big data (for example, blocking strategies) and problems caused by incomplete identifiers. Furthermore, techniques and problems of privacy preserving record linkage and secure access to linked datasets will be discussed. Finally, new algorithms and software for record-linkage applications for large datasets will be covered.

We invite presentations on:
- Handling missing and messy identifiers
- Blocking techniques
- Privacy Preserving Record Linkage
- Access to linked datasets
- Algorithms and Software

1. Privacy-Preserving Distance Comparable Geospatial Encoding
Dr James Farrow (Farrow Norris)
Professor Rainer Schnell (University of Duisburg-Essen)

2. Recent advances in Privacy Preserving Record Linkage
Professor Rainer Schnell (University of Duisburg-Essen)
Mr Christian Borgs (University of Duisburg-Essen)

3. Linking the SED to administrative data: technical challenges
Dr Joshua Tokle (American Institutes for Research)
Ms Christina Jones (American Institutes for Research)
Dr Michelle Yin (American Institutes for Research)

Friday 17th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N-131

Using Surveys to Study the Environment

Convenor Dr Malcolm Fairbrother (University of Bristol)
Coordinator 1 Dr Kerry Ard (Ohio State University)

Session Details

Effective public policies and regulations have begun to mitigate many environmental problems globally, but many problems remain severe (e.g., urban air pollution) or are getting worse (greenhouse gas emissions, species extinctions). There is an urgent need for research on solutions to such problems, and in this regard surveys have much to offer. Existing research has used health surveys to show that exposure to environmental toxins is an important determinant of human health outcomes. Political researchers have shown how public opinion has often shaped key environmental policy outcomes. Building on previous studies of these kinds, this session welcomes papers related to survey research on environmental topics broadly defined. Papers may be either substantive or methodological. Substantively, papers should address topics including but not limited to: the measurement of environmentally consequential behaviours and lifestyles; public concern about environmental problems; political attitudes relevant to environmental protection; or the impacts of pollution on human health and well-being (including stress and mental health). What are the correlates of less environmentally damaging behaviours, greater environmental concern, more pro-environmental attitudes, or greater exposure to environmental toxins? Papers may use datasets that are comparative or single-nation, cross-sectional or longitudinal, but should all make an important contribution to some substantive field of research relevant to the natural environment. For example, how does exposure to environmental toxins vary across different demographic groups, and how is such exposure changing over time? Under what conditions do people support (or oppose) measures for environmental protection? (What kinds of people, and what kinds of protections?) Methodologically, we are interested in innovations such as survey experiments, new or improved measures, new analytical techniques appropriate for data types of particular relevance to the environment, and innovative survey modes and forms of data linkage.

1. Apathy is the Enemy. A study of UK environmental concern and its complicated relationship with pro-environmental behaviour.
Ms Rebecca Rhead (University of Manchester)

2. Wellbeing and environmental quality: does pollution affect life satisfaction?
Dr Kati Orru (Institute of Social Studies, University of Tartu)
Dr Hans Orru (University of Tartu)
Mr Reigo Hendrikson (University of Tartu)

3. The Swedish Cosmopolitan: Cosmopolitan Attitudes and Political Orientations in Sweden
Dr Joakim Kulin (Department of Sociology, Stockholm University)
Professor Jens Rydgren (Department of Sociology, Stockholm University)

4. Vulnerability to Urban Heat Stress in Two Climates: The Importance of Social Surveys in Discerning Perceptions of Risk and Resilience in Berlin, Germany and Phoenix, USA
Professor Sharon Harlan (Arizona State University)
Professor Tobia Lakes (Humboldt-Universitaet zu Berlin)
Ms Anita Hagy-ferguson (Arizona State University)
Ms Sarah Osenberg (Humboldt-Universitaet zu Berlin)

5. Pollution Prophylaxis? Social Capital and Environmental Inequality
Professor Kerry Ard (the Ohio State University)
Professor Malcolm Fairbrother (University of Bristol)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N-132

Comparative Welfare Research: Actors, Arenas, Attitudes 1

Convenor   Dr Joakim Kulin (Department of Sociology, Stockholm University)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jan Mewes (School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences, Örebro University)

Session Details

This session invites papers from different areas of comparative welfare research, with a particular interest in studies making use of cross-national survey data. Our interest goes beyond the by now established field of comparative welfare state research as it invites papers that focus on a multitude of actors and arenas related to public welfare and the production of collective goods. In this respect, we invite papers that address the configuration of, and public attitudes towards, state and market based welfare institutions. A broad range of paper submissions is encouraged, including a variety of methods and theoretical perspectives. In particular, we seek substantive applications in the broader field of welfare research that use rigorous and state-of-the-art methods. For instance, cross-national welfare research has for a long time been dominated by operationalizations that can be seriously questioned in terms of validity and equivalence (e.g., additive indices). Therefore, we welcome paper submissions that take seriously the issues of measurement quality and the cross-national comparability of measurements. Additionally, we also encourage submissions that exploit the full potential of survey data, such as for example vignette studies and survey experiments.

1. Don't ask what your nation can do for you... National identity and individual attitudes towards welfare issues
Professor Annette Schnabel (University of Wuppertal)

2. Migrants' Preferences for State-provided Welfare. Evidence from Germany
Dr Alexander Schmidt-catran (Institute of Sociology and Social Psychology - University of Cologne)
Dr Romana Careja (Department of Political Science and Public Management - University of Southern Denmark)

3. The effect of immigration on support for redistribution re-examined: survey experiments in three European countries
Dr Elias Naumann (University Mannheim)
Mr Lukas Stoetzer (University Mannheim)

4. Self-Interest, Insecurity or Empathy: What's behind Popular Support for the Welfare State in Times of Economic Crisis?
Dr Patrick Sachweh (Goethe University Frankfurt)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-202

Data Collection Management: Monitoring Bias in a Total Survey Error Context

Convenor   Mr Brad Edwards (Westat)

Session Details

In the total survey error paradigm, nonsampling errors and their relationship to cost have been very difficult to quantify, especially in real time. This is especially vexing in surveys conducted by interviewers, because of their large labor costs. Recent advances in paradata processing and analysis offer an opportunity to address this problem in survey operations. (Kreuter 2013) For example, CARI data selected with known probabilities from a pretest could be used to produce estimates of questionnaire (specification) error, to make improvements to address the design problems, and to monitor error levels after changes are implemented in the main data collection phase of face-to-face or telephone surveys. (Hicks, Edwards, Tourangeau, et al. 2010). The additional cost of CARI coding and analysis could reduce the resources available to complete more interviews, but result in a net reduction in bias.
Another example: GIS data could detect likely interview falsification on 100% of the cases completed on face-to-face surveys, at much lower cost than other techniques. GPS data from face-to-face surveys can detect falsification as it happens, thereby improving quality and saving costs that could be directed elsewhere. The quality improvement could be estimated by comparing the level of falsification detected with GPS compared to the level detected by more traditional methods (e.g., mail return forms, telephone and in-person re-interviews, CARI coding). Data collection savings from this innovation could be estimated by comparing the GPS costs with the costs of detecting and remediating falsifiers using traditional methods..
This session will include presentations on recent developments in CARI, GPS, mobile technology, and call record data and on

studies that detect bias associated with various data collection activities, informed by the TSE paradigm.

1. Quantifying Measurement Error
Mr Brad Edwards (Westat)
Dr Aaron Maitland (Westat)

2. Legal issues in recruitment and their likely impact on response: an example from the pilot for Life Study
Ms Darina Peycheva (UCL Institute of Child Health)

3. Operations Management from a TSE Perspective
Ms Patty Maher (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)
Ms Beth-ellen Pennell (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)

4. Field Interviewer Travel Routes: Cost Control and Nonresponse Bias
Mr Brad Edwards (Westat)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-101

Dealing with content validity in cross-cultural research. Methodological challenges and innovative approaches

Convenor   Dr Wolfgang Aschauer (University of Salzburg)
Coordinator 1   Professor Martin Weichbold (University of Salzburg)

Session Details

The main research aim of cross-national survey instruments (such as the European Social Survey, the ISSP or the World Value Survey) is to achieve comparable results and the key term to reach this goal is "equivalence", more exactly: "functional equivalence". Regarding certain aspects (e.g. sampling or translation) considerable progress has been made during the last years but in certain areas there is still a clear need for further research. One particular area is the task to achieve content validity of the major research themes in cross-national research. There is already awareness of certain biases with regards to latent constructs, indices and measurement concepts, but the challenges how to capture the various aspects of a specific construct in certain countries remain often unsolved. In many applied projects we can still observe the problematic strategy of an inconsiderate use of Western-based approaches which claim universality. On the other hand several researchers start to apply rather strict tests to achieve construct equivalence before defining and searching for the constituent parts of the constructs in specific countries. Excluding indicators which do not fit to the established models which claim to be culturally invariant can thus go hand in hand with a decreasing validity of the measurement in certain countries. Therefore construct equivalence and content validity are two different aspects and should be addressed separately in methodological research.

In the proposed session we especially look for contributions focusing on the validity of the measurement of certain (culturally sensitive) constructs. Survey researchers who are active in various research fields are highly welcome to present methodological groundwork on the proposed issues, to present their own strategies to deal with content validity in ongoing research projects or to discuss existing, alternative or innovative approaches of equivalence testing keeping certain validity constraints in mind.

1. Toward Emically Informed Cross-Cultural Research
Professor Klaus Boehnke (Jacobs University Bremen)

2. Cross-cultural diversity in the understanding of 'Medicines' by young adults
Dr Hilde Tobi (Wageningen University & Research centre)
Mrs Justina Agula (Ghana Health Services)
Dr Jennifer Barrett (University of South Wales)

3. The latent concept of teacher professional community over 36 countries
Dr Catalina Lomos (CEPS/INSTEAD Luxembourg)

4. Measuring Religiosity Cross-Nationally
Ms Insa Bechert (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-105

Estimating effects of modes and mixed modes designs 1

Convenor Mr Alexandru Cernat (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)

Session Details

Traditional approaches to data collection in the social sciences (i.e., face to face and telephone surveys) are becoming more expensive. At the same time cheaper approaches, such as web surveys, lack traditional sampling frames. This has led to a surge in data collection designs that aim to combine the strength of each mode into a single survey. In this context, accumulating evidence that informs design decision in mixed modes surveys is essential.

This session will contribute to this debate by tackling some important topics such as:
- Is the effect of social desirability moderated by mode?
- How do self-administered strategies (e.g., paper and web) differ in data quality?
- Are traditional scales (like those measuring personality, depression, cognitive ability) equivalent across modes?
- How does selection/non-response bias differ across modes?
- Does the use of mixed mode data impact substantive results?
- How does research on mixed mode integrate in the Total Survey Error framework?
- How to prevent mode effects through design?

1. Comparing estimates across survey designs – are mode effects the greatest cause for concern?
Dr Michèle Ernst Stähli (FORS - Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences)
Professor Caroline Roberts (University of Lausanne)
Ms Rosa Sanchez Tome (University of Lausanne)

2. Mixed mode designs and sensitive questions, an experimental design comparing CATI and CATI/Web
Professor Peter Kriwy (Sociology, University of Technology, Chemnitz, Germany)
Dr Gerhard Krug (Sociology, University Erlangen Nuremberg, Germany)
Mr Johann Carstensen (Sociology, University Erlangen Nuremberg, Germany)

3. Estimation of Mode Effects in the Health and Retirement Study using Measurement Models
Mr Alexandru Cernat (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)
Professor Mick Couper (Joint Program in Survey Methodology, University of Michigan)
Dr Mary Beth Ofstedal (Population Studies Center, University of Michigan)

4. A systematic review of mixed-mode research in the European Social Survey
Dr Ana Villar (City University London)
Mr Rory Fitzgerald (City University London)
Miss Yvette Prestage (City University London)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N-131

Measuring gender role attitudes

Convenor   Ms Jessica Walter (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Mr Christof Wolf (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Many studies analyze gender role attitudes, in particular how they change over time or how they differ across countries. These studies depend on the quality of measures provided in surveys. In most international or national omnibus surveys based on representative samples, indicators of gender role attitudes are part of a complex questionnaire. Consequently, surveys mainly use short measures of gender role attitudes which were usually developed in the1970s and 1980s.
For analyses over time or/and across countries the equivalence of measures of gender role attitudes is crucial. Measures of gender role attitudes should not change over time and should not depend on the cultural context. Social changes such as a differentiation of family patterns and changes in (female) labor force participation and education challenge the assumption that the measures are equivalent over time. Based on these changes we suggest that the measures of gender role attitudes need to be revisited and updated. By doing so, different cultural contexts, which may limit the equivalence of measures of gender role attitudes across countries, also come into focus.
The session aims at discussing how equivalence of measures of gender role attitudes over time and across countries can be ensured and how these measures can be adjusted to social changes. The focus of the discussion is on adjustments of measures of gender role attitudes which improve the equivalence of measures and on best practices for an implementation of improved measures in cross-cultural or longitudinal surveys.
We welcome all papers which deal with the advancement of measures of gender role attitudes or use new measures of gender

role attitudes with focus on analyses over time and/or across countries.

1. Improving measures of gender role attitudes – an approach using the German General Social Survey
Mrs Jessica Gabriele Walter (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. Assessing the measurement reliability of scale taping attitudes towards gender roles in cross-cultural surveys. What went wrong in EVS 2008?
Ms Vera Lomazzi (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan)
Dr Malina Voicu (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Ruud Luijkx (Tilburg University)

3. The Changing Construct of Gender Role Attitude – An Application of MCA
Ms Alice Barth (Research Assistant)

4. Measurement Equivalence of Gender Role Attitudes in East and West Germany?
Mr Torsten Lietzmann (Institute for Employment Research, Germany)
Dr Arne Bethmann (Mannheim University)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-102

Mixing Survey and Qualitative Data 2

Convenor Professor Nina Baur (Technische Universität Berlin)
Coordinator 1 Dr Leila Akremi (Technische Universität Berlin)
Coordinator 2 Ms Melanie Wenzel (Technische Universität Berlin)

Session Details

The session invites papers that discuss how to mix survey data with qualitative data, e.g. qualitative interviews, ethnography, video analysis etc. Presenters are specifically asked to discuss what methdlogical problems they faced and how they handled them.

1. Classical Categories of Political&Legal Philosophy in the Social Consciousness of Poles. Methodological Considerations on Combined Qualitative and Quantitative Research Approach
Dr Katarzyna M. Staszynska (Kozminski University)
Professor Zbigniew W. Rau (Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Lodz)

2. Exploring disciplinary cultures by combining online survey and group discussion. Evaluation of the university library (Technical University Berlin)
Dr Leila Akremi (Technische Universitaet Berlin)

3. Combining longitudinal survey data and multigenerational qualitative interviews: Status dynamics and educational inheritance
Professor Henning Lohmann (University of Hamburg)
Ms Theresa Büchler (University of Bremen)
Professor Olaf Groh-samberg (University of Bremen)

4. Assessing stability in domestic care arrangements for people with dementia considering the informal carer's perspective: A challenge for mixed-methods in health services research - Conclusions from the VerAH-Dem (trajectories in domestic care arrangements for people with dementia) study
Ms Milena Von Kutzleben (German Center for Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE) Site Witten)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-106

Occupations and survey research: methodological and substantive applications exploiting occupations as social contexts 2

Convenor Professor Christian Ebner (University of Cologne, Germany)
Coordinator 1 Dr Daniela Rohrbach-schmidt (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training, Bonn, Germany)

Session Details

The individual's occupation belongs to the most frequently surveyed and most used background variables in social surveys. Occupational codes are regularly used as nominal units within fixed-effects approaches (economics), or they are recoded into different status measures or class schemes (sociology). More recent approaches describe occupations as "microclass" categories, which shape individual behavior and attitudes (e.g. Weeden/Grusky 2005). This view is also interesting from a methodological view, as it understands occupations as a contextual unit, in which individuals are nested and socialized.

Following this approach our session focuses on occupations as a higher-level unit of analysis in multi-level designs. The session is a good opportunity to reflect on:
- How the relevance of occupations as a social context can be justified / what are valuable concepts to understand and systemize the occupational level?
- How occupational characteristics (e.g. regulations, skill / job task requirements) help to explain social phenomena at the individual level?

Methodological papers might address issues related to multi-level techniques (hierarchical, non-hierarchical, cross-classified), levels of occupational aggregation and data linkage, (inter)national occupational classifications, and the comparability of results between regions or countries. Substantive papers might cover the usefulness of the occupational context for the understanding of e.g. attitudes and lifestyles, labor market outcomes or well-being. In particular, we are interested in the theoretical and empirical mechanisms (e.g. social closure (ibid.), technological change (Autor/Handel 2013)), which lead to the described outcomes at the individual level.

References:
Autor, David; Handel, Michael (2013). Putting Tasks to the Test: Human Capital, Job Tasks, and Wages. Journal of Labor Economics 31(2): S59-S96.
Weeden, Kim; Grusky, David (2005). The Case for a New Class Map. American Journal of Sociology 111(1): 141-212.

1. The estimation of occupation specific wage growth when (a lot of) employees change their occupation
Dr Andreas Haupt (Karlsruher Institut für Technologie)

2. Labor market segmentation and monetary returns to further training in Germany
Mr Martin Ehlert (WZB Berlin Social Science Center)

3. Do general competencies predict wages in occupations with complex tasks in Germany?
Mrs Stefanie Velten (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training, Germany)
Professor Christian Ebner (University of Cologne, Germany)

4. Job tasks, job change and wages in Germany
Dr Daniela Rohrbach-schmidt (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB))

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-102

Representativeness of Surveys Using Internet-based Data Collection

Convenor   Professor Michael Bosnjak (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Mr Ulrich Krieger (University of Mannheim)
Coordinator 2 Dr Tobias Enderle (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Statistical theory is essentially based on random probability samples. However, Web surveys making use of convenience samples and volunteer access panels, where respondents self-select themselves into the sample, still dominate the landscape. Such recruitment strategies are attractive due to their low costs. Yet, recent years have seen increasing debates surrounding their quality in terms of representativeness. As a consequence, researchers across several countries are working towards Internet and mixed-mode panels based on probability samples.

The overall aim of this session is to provide a platform to present and to discuss recent research on the representativeness of surveys making use of Internet-based data collection modes (i.e., Web surveys, self-administered mobile surveys). The scope of this sessions encompasses both cross-sectional as well as panel-based surveys using Internet surveys as the sole data collection mode, or as one mode within a mixed mode context. Proposals may include, but are not limited to, the following topics:

* Representativeness concepts and corresponding indicators applicable to Internet-based and mixed-mode surveys
* Representativeness of Internet-based surveys and mixed-mode surveys of the general population compared to well-established modes
* Sample recruitment and refreshment strategies aimed at ensuring representativeness in (Internet-based and mixed-mode) access panels
* Effectiveness of various survey implementation measures and procedures aimed at ensuring representativeness (e.g., effectiveness of panel maintenance strategies, incentives, non-responder conversion, etc.)

1. Conditional vs. Unconditional incentives: Comparing the effect on sample composition in the recruitment of the German Internet Panel study.
Mr Ulrich Krieger (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim)

2. Evolution of representativeness in an online probability panel
Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)
Dr Thomas Klausch (Utrecht University)
Dr Barry Schouten (Statistics Netherlands and Utrecht University)

3. Moderators of Survey Representativeness: A Meta-Analysis
Ms Carina Cornesse (German Internet Panel, SFB 884,University of Mannheim, Germany)
Professor Michael Bosnjak (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. Setting-up a probability-based web panel. Lessons learned from the ELIPSS Pilot Study.
Ms Anne-sophie Cousteaux (Sciences Po - CDSP)
Ms Anne Cornilleau (Sciences Po - CDSP)
Mr Stéphane Legleye (INED)

5. The pretest of Wave 2 of the German Health Interview and Examination Survey for Children and Adolescents (KiGGS) as a mixed-mode survey: composition of participant groups
Mr Robert Hoffmann (Department of Epidemiology and Health Monitoring, Robert Koch Institute, Berlin, Germany)
Mr Panagiotis Kamtsiuris (Department of Epidemiology and Health Monitoring, Robert Koch Institute, Berlin, Germany)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-101

Robust Methods in Survey Design and Analysis with Applications

Convenor	Dr Marco Geraci (University of South Carolina)
Coordinator 1	Dr James Hardin (University of South Carolina)
Coordinator 2	Dr Andrew Ortaglia (University of South Carolina)

Session Details

The violation of the assumptions that underlie parametric statistical methods is potentially a serious issue when drawing inferences about a population. Resulting bias in the estimates may lead to incorrect conclusions. Typical problems include, but are not limited to, the presence of outliers, untenable normality assumptions, and model misspecification.

This session aims at showcasing recent developments in robust methods for survey design and survey data analysis with emphasis on applications. Submissions on topics such as semi- and non-parametric modelling, estimation of distribution functions and quantiles, variance estimation and methods for missing data are particularly welcome. The presentations will illustrate the application of robust methods to studies in the life, social and natural sciences. Examples on the usage of related statistical software are also encouraged.

1. Design and Estimation Considerations for Stratum Jumping in the National Survey of College Graduates
Professor Jay Breidt (Colorado State University)
Professor Jean Opsomer (Colorado State University)
Mr Michael White (US Censu Bureau)

2. On the influence of transforming skewed distributions on survey analysis using imputed data
Mr Tobias Enderle (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Professor Ralf Münnich (University of Trier)

3. Robust quantile regression of surveys with data missing at random
Miss Xinling Xu (University of South Carolina)
Dr Marco Geraci (University of South Carolina)
Dr Andrew Ortaglia (University of South Carolina)

4. A new statistical approach to quantile regression of complex survey dietary data
Mr David Pell (University of Cambridge)
Dr Ivonne Solis-trapala (Medical Research Council)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: L-103

Surveying children and young people 4

Convenor Miss Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)
Coordinator 1 Ms Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)

Session Details

Many large-scale surveys successfully collect a variety of different types of data from children and young people. However, there is relatively little methodological evidence in this area. Much of the literature relating to children and young people's participation in research focuses on small-scale qualitative studies and tends to concentrate on ethical issues relating to the rights of children and young people in research. This session will cover experiences of including children and young people in surveys, and related survey design issues. The session aims to explore a variety of methodological issues around surveying children and young people. Submissions are particularly welcomed on:
- designing questionnaires for children and young people, including question testing methods
- collecting sensitive data from children and young people, including methods for ensuring privacy and encouraging accurate reporting
- collecting different types of data from children and young people, including physical measurements, cognitive assessments, biological samples and time use data
- using different methods of data collection, including the use of innovative technology such as the web and mobile phones
- inclusivity in data collection methods, including facilitating the participation of young people with lower literacy levels
- assessing the reliability and validity of young people's self-reports
- preventing non-response by engaging young people in research, including designing survey materials to appeal to young people and using new technology and digital media for participant engagement
- ethical issues in involving children and young people in surveys, including gaining informed consent and protecting children's rights and well-being

1. Survey Design and Results for the 2014 Child Development Supplement to the U.S. Panel Study of Income Dynamics
Professor Narayan Sastry (University of Michigan)
Dr Paula Fomby (University of Michigan)

2. Tweets, Branding and Swag: Engaging Teenagers in Research
Ms Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)
Ms Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)
Ms Meghan Rainsberry (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

3. Using open-ended questions as a tool to inform the design of a survey of young people. The example of the YLT survey
Dr Dirk Schubotz (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)
Dr Martina Mcknight (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-103

Technical Problems and Solutions for Record Linkage and Big Data 2

Convenor Dr Manfred Antoni (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Coordinator 1 Mr Stefan Bender (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Coordinator 2 Professor Rainer Schnell (University of Duisburg-Essen)

Session Details

The scope of the session includes technical issues of linkage, handling large administrative databases or big data (for example, blocking strategies) and problems caused by incomplete identifiers. Furthermore, techniques and problems of privacy preserving record linkage and secure access to linked datasets will be discussed. Finally, new algorithms and software for record-linkage applications for large datasets will be covered.

We invite presentations on:
• Handling missing and messy identifiers
• Blocking techniques
• Privacy Preserving Record Linkage
• Access to linked datasets
• Algorithms and Software

1. The Generations and Gender Programme: The legal challenges in combining Survey data, Administrative Data and

Registry data and how we are overcoming them
Mr Thomas Emery (NIDI)

2. Quality, analytic potential and accessibility of linked administrative, survey and publicly available data
Dr Manfred Antoni (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Ms Alexandra Schmucker (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: HT-104

The Nimble Survey Methodology in Addressing Humanitarian Emergencies 1

Convenor   Dr Asaph Young Chun (US Census Bureau and ASA Statistics Without Borders)
Coordinator 1 Dr Fritz Scheuren (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Coordinator 2 Professor James Cochran (University of Alabama)

Session Details

Could survey methodology be agile enough to help resolve humanitarian crises that have fast and lasting impacts on many people's lives? This session is devoted to discussing survey methodology that has played a vital role in efforts to resolve acute humanitarian crises affecting the disadvantaged people disproportionately.

The papers relevant to this session include, but are not limited to the following: health surveys of the disadvantaged people, such as children, women and disabled population in hard-to-access countries; survey studies leveraging SNS tools for the humanitarian disaster response; and agile surveys supplemented by administrative records and/or big data addressing humanitarian interventions. We are open to accepting case studies that leveraged interdisciplinary survey methodology to address human right issues in developing countries. Research papers in this session use survey methodology and interdisciplinary thinking to assist Non-Governmental Organizations and/or UN agencies in addressing current humanitarian crises or human rights.

Papers encouraged to submit include innovative studies demonstrating how survey research has led to nimble policy decisions that help save many people's lives and/or improve quality of life of the disadvantaged people in developing countries. Submissions of interests are agile survey research that promoted synergy of academics, NGOs and UN agencies as well as governmental agencies to help develop humanitarian interventions. This session should be of interest to most ESRA participants and to those who are involved or wish to be involved with survey methodology applied to humanitarian efforts or human rights across the globe.

1. Surveying in difficult terrain, a case study: Bhutan
Ms Nicole Naurath (Regional Director, Asia)

2. Data Visualization to Aid Humanitarian Intervention Strategies
Mr Giang Nguyen (University of Iowa)
Mr Star Ying (US Census Bureau)
Mr Elliott Chun (International Strategy and Reconciliation Foundation)
Mrs Hannah Cho (International Strategy and Reconciliation Foundation)
Mrs Esther Lim (New York University)
Mrs Catherine Myong (Harvard University)
Mr Christian Tae (nternational Strategy and Reconciliation Foundation)
Mrs Cindy Won (International Strategy and Reconciliation Foundation)
Mr Nathan Yoon (Carnegie Melon University)
Mrs Elena Zafarana (Pyongyang Summer Institute in Survey Science)

3. Surveys in Societies in Turmoil
Ms Jennifer Kelley (University of Michigan)
Dr Zeina Mneimneh (University of Michigan)
Ms Beth-ellen Pennell (University of Michigan)

Friday 17th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: O-206

What does it mean to produce equivalent questionnaire translations 1?

Convenor   Dr Dorothée Behr (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Dr Alisú Schoua-glusberg (Research Support Services Inc.)
Coordinator 2 Ms Brita Dorer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Equivalent data in cross-cultural and cross-national surveys is the precondition for any meaningful comparison across countries or cultures. Equivalence is a complex concept, though. Johnson (1998) lists over 50 different equivalence definitions from the social sciences, psychology and related fields that may broadly be classified into interpretive and procedural equivalence. The field of translation studies equally struggles with a multitude of approaches and definitions (Kenny, 1998), which specify, for instance, the rank of equivalence (e.g., word or textual level) or the type of equivalence (denotative, pragmatic, etc.) that can be obtained.

In this session, we will look into what it means to produce equivalent questionnaire translations. Key questions in this regard are: What needs to be kept equivalent and what needs to change in order to produce questionnaire translations that work as intended? What guidance can be given to translators of questionnaires in cross-national studies?

Presenters are invited to cover any of the following topics: (1) equivalence of form vs. equivalence of effect; (2) face-value-equivalence vs. perceived meaning; (3) the role of culture-specific discourse conventions (e.g., directness, politeness; theme-rheme); (4) questionnaire design principles (usually developed on the basis of the English language) and their challenges for translation; (5) challenges for particular language combinations; (6) methods to address equivalence: interplay between statistical assessment and expert judgment, split-ballot, mixed-method, rating tasks (for response scales, for instance), corpus linguistics. Presentations are encouraged to further our knowledge on "changes" in the translation that may be necessary in order to produce translations that pave the way for comparable data.

1. On the quest for equivalence in translating response scales. The ESS 6 example in Poland
Ms Danuta Przepiórkowska (University of Warsaw)
Ms Teresa Zmijewska-jedrzejczyk (Polish Academy of Sciences)

2. The potential of corpus linguistics and lexical databases to assist questionnaire design: Results of two case studies
Ms Ana Slavec (University of Ljubljana)
Mr Vasja Vehovar (University of Ljubljana)

3. The Translation Management Tool (TMT) – one platform for carrying out and steering the workflow of questionnaire translations in cross-national surveys
Ms Brita Dorer (GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Mr Maurice Martens (CentERdata)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: N-132

Comparative Welfare Research: Actors, Arenas, Attitudes 2

Convenor   Dr Joakim Kulin (Department of Sociology, Stockholm University)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jan Mewes (School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences, Örebro University)

Session Details

This session invites papers from different areas of comparative welfare research, with a particular interest in studies making use of cross-national survey data. Our interest goes beyond the by now established field of comparative welfare state research as it invites papers that focus on a multitude of actors and arenas related to public welfare and the production of collective goods. In this respect, we invite papers that address the configuration of, and public attitudes towards, state and market based welfare institutions. A broad range of paper submissions is encouraged, including a variety of methods and theoretical perspectives. In particular, we seek substantive applications in the broader field of welfare research that use rigorous and state-of-the-art methods. For instance, cross-national welfare research has for a long time been dominated by operationalizations that can be seriously questioned in terms of validity and equivalence (e.g., additive indices). Therefore, we welcome paper submissions that take seriously the issues of measurement quality and the cross-national comparability of measurements. Additionally, we also encourage submissions that exploit the full potential of survey data, such as for example vignette studies and survey experiments.

1. Policy-Culture Gaps and the Role of Gender Norms
Professor Daniela Grunow (Goethe University Frankfurt)
Dr Katia Begall (Goethe University Frankfurt)
Dr Sandra Buchler (Goethe University Frankfurt)

2. Subjective Poverty using Anchoring Vignettes-Testing the effect of latent heterogeneity
Mr Tewodros Aragie Kebede (Researcher)

3. Protection, Activation and Regulation: Attitudes towards Labor Market Policies in the European Economic Crisis
Mr Christopher Buss (Mannheim University)

4. Can Subjective Questions on Economic Welfare be Trusted?
Dr Kathleen Beegle (World Bank)
Ms Kristen Himelein (World Bank)
Professor Martin Ravallion (Georgetown University)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: HT-102

Health inequalities between health survey participants and non-participants

Convenor Dr Hanna Tolonen (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland)

Session Details

Health surveys, especially health examination surveys where physical measurements are conducted and biological samples are collected, are important data sources about health of the population. This information can be used for evidence-based policy making, planning and evaluation of prevention programmes as well as for research.

The participation rates of health surveys have declined in past decades similarly to other surveys. There is also evidence that health and risk factor profiles of survey participants and non-participants differ. Previous studies have shown that mortality of non-participants is twice as high as that of participants, and for example smoking related mortality is three times higher among non-participants. These observed health inequalities between health survey participants and non-participants imply that survey non-participants have more diseases and worse health behaviors, such as smoking, than participants. Better understanding of these differences is needed, to ensure that our interpretation of survey results for evidence-based policy making and research are accurate.

The aim of this session is to present research findings about the differences in health and risk factor profiles of survey participants and non-participants, with special focus on health surveys.

1. Non-respondents' health vs. repondents' health in Slovenian health surveys
Mrs Darja Lavtar (National Institute of Public Health (NIJZ), Slovenia)
Mrs Tina Zupani? (National Institute of Public Health (NIJZ), Slovenia)

2. Health survey non-participants have more hospitalizations during the survey period than participants
Dr Hanna Tolonen (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland)
Mr Kennet Harald (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland)
Dr Satu Männistö (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland)

3. Strategies to analyze representativeness of net sample in health examination surveys. Analyses from the "German Health Interview and Examination Survey for Adults" DEGS1
Dr Antje Goesswald (Robert Koch Institute)
Mr Robert Hoffmann (Robert Koch Institute)
Mr Panagiotis Kamtsiuris (Robert Koch Institute)

4. Determinants of second-stage recruitment in the Belgian Health Interview Survey
Mr Stefaan Demarest (Scientific Institute of Public Health)
Dr Jean Tafforeau (Scientific Institute of Public Health)
Dr Johan Van Der Heyden (Scientific Institute of Public Health)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: O-202

Marrying survey methodology with survey management: Minimizing the Total Survey Error (TSE) with limited resources during fieldwork

Convenor   Dr Frederic Malter (Max-Planck-Society)

Session Details

The key goal of any survey is to deliver statistics with minimal errors that facilitate correct conclusions about the target population. It is easy to understand how applying the TSE can be a useful concept for minimizing the risk of flawed survey statistics at the "early life" of a survey, i.e. the design stage (e.g. designing survey items or scales with good psychometric properties) or the "late life" stage, i.e. the post-production phase such as applying post-stratification weighting to account for unit non-response. It is much less clear, however, how to allocate the limited resources at a survey's "mid-life" stage, i.e. the

fieldwork phase, to the various components of the total survey error. For example, how do surveys allocate resources to minimize measurement errors arising from non-standardized interviewing? A practical example is interviewers' shortcutting question texts or introduction texts that will create non-standardized interviewing. Another example may be issues arising from sampling errors: how do surveys minimize the risk of unit nonresponse with their limited resources?

The goal of this session is to bring survey managers and survey methodologists together to discuss solutions to the problem of allocating limited resources (training, survey managers' time, incentives for interviewers etc.) to the various components of the TSE while fieldwork is still ongoing. Ideally, the session will yield ideas on important "set screws" and how to get the biggest bang along the two major lines of intervening: training/managing interviewers and providing monetary or non-monetary incentives.

Any contribution applying the TSE ex-ante to fieldwork management or contributions of survey studies retro-fitting principles of TSE to their current fieldwork management are welcome. Ideally, submission will briefly lay out how the input side (e.g. incentives) is mapped onto the output.

1. How to effectively reduce the total survey error when resources are limited? A survey agency's perspective on responsive design for two case studies from Germany
Dr Thorsten Heien (TNS Infratest Sozialforschung)
Mr Jochen Heckmann (TNS Infratest Sozialforschung)

2. Quality in Telephone Surveys: Market Research Companies Perspective
Dr Wojciech Jablonski (University of Lodz)

3. Improving the quality of paradata collection on interviewer-mediated surveys
Mrs Lucy Haselden (Centre)
Mr Andrew Cleary (Ipsos Mori)
Mr Stephan Tietz (Ipsos Mori)

4. Total Survey Error across a program of three national surveys: using a risk management approach to prioritise survey error mitigation strategies
Ms Sonia Whiteley (Australian Centre for Applied Social Research Methods)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: L-101

Multilevel Models for the Analysis of Comparative (Longitudinal) Survey Data 3

Convenor   Dr Alexander Schmidt-catran (Institute of Sociology and Social Psychology, University of Cologne)
Coordinator 1 Professor Bart Meuleman (Centre for Sociological Research, University of Leuven)

Session Details

Multilevel models have become predominant in analyses of comparative survey datasets, where respondents are clustered in higher-level units like countries or regions. Such models have also long been fitted to longitudinal data, where repeated observations are clustered within units. Additionally, researchers are fitting multilevel models to data that are clustered both ways, such as multiple waves of surveys whose respondents are nested in countries or regions each observed multiple times. These comparative longitudinal survey datasets should be useful resources for studies of social change in the broadest sense, and for drawing inferences previously based on only cross-sectional analyses. This session welcomes papers using multilevel models for the analysis of cross-sectional data, longitudinal data and, in particular, data that is clustered both ways. Papers might address recent methodological advances; present illuminating or innovative applications in some field of the social sciences; and/or discuss limitations and challenges that remain.

1. Multilevel modeling when clusters are heterogeneous. A Monte Carlo comparison of mixed random intercept and slope models, cluster-robust OLS, and two-step approaches
Professor Johannes Giesecke (Humboldt-University Berlin)
Mr Jan Paul Heisig (WZB Berlin Social Science Center)
Dr Merlin Schaeffer (WZB Berlin Social Science Center)

2. Schools vs. classrooms? Sampling design in the OECD's PISA study
Professor David Reimer (Aarhus University, Department of Education)
Mr Bent Sortkær (Aarhus University, Department of Education)

3. How large are school and teacher effects on science achievement? A multilevel modeling perspective
Dr Liang-ting Tsai (Graduate Institute of Educational Information & Measurement, National Taichung University of Education)
Professor Chih-chien Yang (Graduate Institute of Educational Information & Measurement, National Taichung University of Education)

4. Remitting civic participation. A MMMM approach
Dr Bogdan Voicu (Romanian Academy)
Dr Bogdan Voicu (Romanian Academy)

5. Analyzing Redistributional Preferences: An Integrative Multilevel Approach for Cultural and Structural Explanations
Mr Sebastian Hülle (University of Bielefeld, Faculty of Sociology)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: O-106

Occupations and survey research: methodological and substantive applications exploiting occupations as social contexts 3

Convenor Professor Christian Ebner (University of Cologne, Germany)
Coordinator 1 Dr Daniela Rohrbach-schmidt (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training, Bonn, Germany)

Session Details

The individual's occupation belongs to the most frequently surveyed and most used background variables in social surveys. Occupational codes are regularly used as nominal units within fixed-effects approaches (economics), or they are recoded into different status measures or class schemes (sociology). More recent approaches describe occupations as "microclass" categories, which shape individual behavior and attitudes (e.g. Weeden/Grusky 2005). This view is also interesting from a methodological view, as it understands occupations as a contextual unit, in which individuals are nested and socialized.

Following this approach our session focuses on occupations as a higher-level unit of analysis in multi-level designs. The session is a good opportunity to reflect on:
- How the relevance of occupations as a social context can be justified / what are valuable concepts to understand and systemize the occupational level?
- How occupational characteristics (e.g. regulations, skill / job task requirements) help to explain social phenomena at the individual level?

Methodological papers might address issues related to multi-level techniques (hierarchical, non-hierarchical, cross-classified), levels of occupational aggregation and data linkage, (inter)national occupational classifications, and the comparability of results between regions or countries. Substantive papers might cover the usefulness of the occupational context for the understanding of e.g. attitudes and lifestyles, labor market outcomes or well-being. In particular, we are interested in the theoretical and empirical mechanisms (e.g. social closure (ibid.), technological change (Autor/Handel 2013)), which lead to the described outcomes at the individual level.

References:
Autor, David; Handel, Michael (2013). Putting Tasks to the Test: Human Capital, Job Tasks, and Wages. Journal of Labor Economics 31(2): S59-S96.
Weeden, Kim; Grusky, David (2005). The Case for a New Class Map. American Journal of Sociology 111(1): 141-212.

1. Occupational differences in firms search behaviour
Dr Martina Rebien (Institute for Employment Research)
Ms Judith Czepek (Institute for Employment Research)

2. Degree of Standardised Certification – An Indicator for Measuring Institutional Characteristics of Occupations
Mrs Basha Vicari (Institute for Employment Research)

3. Occupational Tasks in the German Labour Market. An alternative measurement on the basis of an expert database
Mrs Katharina Dengler (Institute for Employment Research)
Dr Britta Matthes (Institute for Employment Research)
Mrs Wiebke Paulus (Department of Statistics of the German Federal Employment Agency)

4. Occupational specific search costs and matching efficiency
Mr Michael Stops (IAB)
Mrs Basha Vicari (IAB)
Mrs Katharina Dengler (IAB)

5. Measuring Skill Transferability Across Occupations
Ms Basha Vicari (Institute for Employment Research, Nuremberg, Germany)
Dr Britta Matthes (Institute for Employment Research, Nuremberg, Germany)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: HT-105

Practical solutions for mixed mode survey users and producers

Convenor   Mrs Michèle Ernst Stähli (FORS, FORS, Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Mrs Caroline Roberts (Institut des sciences sociales, University of Lausanne)

Session Details

Mixed mode surveys have been gaining popularity over the course of the past decade. Many academically led and government-funded studies have been exploring such survey designs whereas survey organisations in some countries now routinely offer clients mixed mode survey designs as a way to improve population coverage and reduce survey costs. In response to these developments, the methodological literature exploring the advantages and disadvantages of mixed mode surveys has burgeoned, with a growing number of studies tackling the thorny issue of how to disentangle so-called 'mode effects' (differential measurement errors between modes) from selection effects. This research has highlighted the considerable analytic burden mixed mode data place on methodologists interested in measuring and potentially correcting for confounded survey errors, as well as on substantive researchers who analyze mixed mode data. Yet, there is still a relative lack of guidance available for designers and users of mixed mode data about whether mode effects matter enough to preclude the use of such data collection designs, or to warrant the use of potentially cumbersome analytic methods to control the potential impact of measurement differences on substantive research conclusions.
How should data providers and data users handle mixed mode data? What procedures need to be undertaken when analysts start to use the data? What thresholds should we set to decide whether measurement differences between modes are important enough to warrant special measures at the analysis stage? What preventative measures have to be taken in order to avoid a misuse of mixed mode data?
For this session, we are particularly interested in contributions that consider, in a pragmatic way, the challenges of using mixed mode data, and offer practical solutions, either for survey designers deciding whether to mix modes, or for data users approaching their analyses.

1. Current challenges and open questions in the field of mixed mode survey methodology
Professor Caroline Roberts (University of Lausanne)
Dr Michèle Ernst Stähli (FORS - Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences)

2. The impact of using the web in a mixed mode follow-up of a longitudinal birth cohort study: Evidence from the National Child Development Study
Mr Matt Brown (Centre for Longitudinal Studies - UCL Institute of Education)
Mr Joel Williams (TNS-BMRB)
Professor Alissa Goodman (Centre for Longitudinal Studies - UCL Institute of Education)

3. Using the measurement model to correct for mode effects: the equivalence testing approach
Mr Alexandru Cernat (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)

4. Estimating survey errors of mixed-mode designs using survey-based benchmarks
Dr Thomas Klausch (Utrecht University / Statistics Netherlands)
Dr Barry Schouten (Utrecht University / Statistics Netherlands)
Professor Joop Hox (Utrecht University)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: HT-103

The Challenges of Survey and Administrative Data Linkage

Convenor   Dr Tarek Mostafa (UCL Institute of Education)

Session Details

Surveys face significant challenges due to the rise in survey costs, attrition over time, and non-coverage of the target population. All these challenges have the potential of damaging the quality of the collected data. One method of reducing the costs of data collection and improving quality is to link selected individual administrative information to the survey record. Administrative data linkage leads to shorter interviews, less respondent burden and an overall reduction in costs, in addition to the gain of valuable information on respondents. However, access to administrative records will suffer from non-consent whenever respondents refuse permission to link their records, and non-linkage when it is impossible to link the records even though consent was given.

This session provides a series of original investigations on consent and linkage of survey and administrative data. The first two papers deal with consent in the context of longitudinal and panel surveys. The third paper explores consent to administrative data linkage in the context of a sequential mixed-mode survey. The fourth examines the success in linking housing data from survey, administrative, and commercial sources, and finally the fifth presents evidence from a feasibility study on linking health data from three different sources.

1. Enhancing research on health. A feasibility study on linking data from cancer Registries, survey and administrative

data in Italy
Mr Roberto Lillini (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di Milano Bicocca)
Dr Emanuela Sala (Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Università di Milano Bicocca)
Professor Francesco La Rosa (Università di Perugia)

2. Record Linkage of Survey, Administrative, and Commercial Housing Data: Challenges and Potential Solutions
Dr Quentin Brummet (US Census Burea)

3. Collecting data linkage consents in a sequential mixed-mode survey: challenges and solutions
Miss Marie Thornby (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)
Miss Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)
Mr Mehul Kotecha (NatCen Social Research)

4. Timing and Consequences of Record Linkage in Panel Studies
Mr Philipp Simon Eisnecker (Socio-Economic Panel, DIW Berlin)
Professor Martin Kroh (Socio-Economic Panel, DIW Berlin)

5. How Consistent is Consent Behaviour to Administrative Data Linkage Over Time?
Dr Tarek Mostafa (UCL Institute of Education)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: O-101

The interplay of conceptual and measurement validity in cross-nation analysis

Convenor   Professor Jaak Billiet (CeSO - KU Leuven)

Session Details

There is a long-standing tradition of cross-nation research, especially in comparative analysis in which political systems are analysed as cases or used as context. Social researchers believe that the context affects individual characteristics, attitudes, choices and behaviour. The nature of the research questions that ask for comparative quantitative analysis has been drastically changed due to the increasing availability of comparable micro data collected in many countries, and the development in methodology. Notwithstanding the advancements made, cross-nation research still confronts considerable scientific challenges, both in terms of methodology and the underlying theoretical assumptions. In recent years, a attention is paid to the challenges of measurement validity in broad sense (non-response bias and measurement equivalence) and to statistical analysis of hierarchical models. Less attention has been paid to the assumptions behind conceptualization and design aspects of relation in hierarchical models.
In this section we hope to discuss papers in which attention is paid to the assumptions made when lower and higher level variables are combined into explanatory multi-level models. We welcome papers in which attention is paid to the so called micro-macro link, the designs used, and the validity of operationalization and inferences. Reflections based at empirical examples of research are especially welcomed.

Background paper: Billiet, J., Meuleman, B. & Davidov, E. (2015). Some methodological challenges of cross-national social Research: conceptual and measurement validity. In Pawel B. Sztabinski, Henryk Domanski, and Franek Sztabinski (eds.) Hopes and Anxieties. Six Waves of the European Social Survey. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang (in press: expected April 2015)

1. Measuring well-being and fertility in cross-national perspective
Dr Hideko Matsuo (University of Leuven)

2. How to record events on country level for cross-national comparisons? The case of the ESS Round 6 in Poland.
Mrs Teresa Zmijewska-jedrzejczyk (Polish Academy of Sciences)

3. Left and Right Political Orientation in Eastern and Western Europe: Does it Have the same Meaning?
Mr Adrian Wojcik (University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland & Laboratory for Comparative Social Research, Moscow, Russia)
Dr Aleksandra Cislak (University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw, Poland)
Professor Peter Schmidt (University of Giessen, Germany)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: HT-104

The Nimble Survey Methodology in Addressing Humanitarian Emergencies 2

Convenor   Dr Asaph Young Chun (US Census Bureau and ASA Statistics Without Borders)

Coordinator 1 Dr Fritz Scheuren (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Coordinator 2 Professor James Cochran (University of Alabama)

Session Details

Could survey methodology be agile enough to help resolve humanitarian crises that have fast and lasting impacts on many people's lives? This session is devoted to discussing survey methodology that has played a vital role in efforts to resolve acute humanitarian crises affecting the disadvantaged people disproportionately.

The papers relevant to this session include, but are not limited to the following: health surveys of the disadvantaged people, such as children, women and disabled population in hard-to-access countries; survey studies leveraging SNS tools for the humanitarian disaster response; and agile surveys supplemented by administrative records and/or big data addressing humanitarian interventions. We are open to accepting case studies that leveraged interdisciplinary survey methodology to address human right issues in developing countries. Research papers in this session use survey methodology and interdisciplinary thinking to assist Non-Governmental Organizations and/or UN agencies in addressing current humanitarian crises or human rights.

Papers encouraged to submit include innovative studies demonstrating how survey research has led to nimble policy decisions that help save many people's lives and/or improve quality of life of the disadvantaged people in developing countries. Submissions of interests are agile survey research that promoted synergy of academics, NGOs and UN agencies as well as governmental agencies to help develop humanitarian interventions. This session should be of interest to most ESRA participants and to those who are involved or wish to be involved with survey methodology applied to humanitarian efforts or human rights across the globe.

1. survey of attitudes and expectation about post-conflict in Colombia.
Mr Daniel Guzman (University of Michigan)

2. Statistics Without Borders and Case Studies: Can Survey Methods Be Agile Enough to Help Resolve Humanitarian Emergencies?
Dr Asaph Young Chun (US Census Bureau; Statistics Without Borders of American Statistical Association)
Mr Justin Fisher (US Government Accountability Office)
Mrs Nilupa Gunaratna (Harvard University School of Public Health)
Mr Gary Shapiro (Statistics Without Borders of American Statistical Association)

3. A Glimpse of Self-Esteem of People in North Korea: Challenges and Lessons Learned from the First Self-administered Survey in Country
Mrs Cindy Won (International Strategy and Reconciliation Foundation)
Mrs Elena Zafarana (Pyongyang Summer Institute in Survey Science)
Mr Elliott Chun (International Strategy and Reconciliation Foundation)
Mrs Clara Kyung (International Strategy and Reconciliation Foundation)
Mrs Catherine Myong (Harvard University)
Mrs Jacquelyn Pennings (Elite Research)
Mr Rene Paulson (Elite Research)
Dr Asaph Young Chun (Statistics Without Borders of American Statistical Association)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: O-206

What does it mean to produce equivalent questionnaire translations 2?

Convenor Dr Dorothée Behr (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Dr Alisú Schoua-glusberg (Research Support Services Inc.)
Coordinator 2 Ms Brita Dorer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Equivalent data in cross-cultural and cross-national surveys is the precondition for any meaningful comparison across countries or cultures. Equivalence is a complex concept, though. Johnson (1998) lists over 50 different equivalence definitions from the social sciences, psychology and related fields that may broadly be classified into interpretive and procedural equivalence. The field of translation studies equally struggles with a multitude of approaches and definitions (Kenny, 1998), which specify, for instance, the rank of equivalence (e.g., word or textual level) or the type of equivalence (denotative, pragmatic, etc.) that can be obtained.

In this session, we will look into what it means to produce equivalent questionnaire translations. Key questions in this regard are: What needs to be kept equivalent and what needs to change in order to produce questionnaire translations that work as intended? What guidance can be given to translators of questionnaires in cross-national studies?

Presenters are invited to cover any of the following topics: (1) equivalence of form vs. equivalence of effect; (2) face-value-equivalence vs. perceived meaning; (3) the role of culture-specific discourse conventions (e.g., directness, politeness; theme-rheme); (4) questionnaire design principles (usually developed on the basis of the English language) and their challenges for translation; (5) challenges for particular language combinations; (6) methods to address equivalence: interplay between statistical assessment and expert judgment, split-ballot, mixed-method, rating tasks (for response scales, for instance), corpus linguistics. Presentations are encouraged to further our knowledge on "changes" in the translation that may be necessary in order to produce translations that pave the way for comparable data.

1. Translatability and translation in practice: experiences from the 6th European Working Conditions Survey
Dr Gijs Van Houten (Eurofound)
Dr Milos Kankaras (Eurofound)

2. Relating translation quality and measurement quality: exploring translation assessment methods
Mrs Diana Zavala Rojas (UPF)
Mrs Brita Dorer (GESIS)

3. Translation Pre-Testing and Instrument Usability at the United States Census Bureau
Ms Kathleen Kephart (US Census Bureau)
Dr Patricia Goerman (US Census Bureau)
Ms Mikelyn Meyers (US Census Bureau)

4. SPOKEN LANGUAGE VERSUS WRITTEN LANGUAGE: A CHALLENGE FOR THE LINGUISTIC VALIDATION OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL SURVEYS
Mr Andrea Ferrari (CAPSTAN)
Mr Steve Dept (CAPSTAN)

Friday 17th July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: O-201

When do social media data align with survey responses and administrative data?

Convenor	Professor Michael Schober (New School for Social Research)
Coordinator 1	Professor Frederick Conrad (University of Michigan)

Session Details

Demonstrations that analyses of social media content can align with measurement from sample surveys or from administrative data (like unemployment insurance claims) have raised the question of whether survey research can be supplemented or even replaced with less costly and burdensome data mining of already-existing or "found" social media content. But just how trustworthy such measurement can be—say, to replace official statistics—is unknown. New conversations between survey methodologists and data scientists are needed to understand the potential points of alignment and non-alignment, given different starting assumptions and analytic traditions on, for example, the extent to which adequate social measurement requires representative samples drawn from frames that fully cover the population.

What is needed are principles and hypotheses for understanding when and why alignment between social media analyses and survey responses or administrative data should and should not be found. Empirically, demonstrations that social media data can predict survey responses do not always replicate. Much more needs to be understood about the effects of the many potentially relevant factors: the range of survey topics and domains, different methods for mining the social media content, different algorithms for converting social media content?into quantifiable data, and different techniques for measuring alignment.

This panel will present empirical work that advances the conversation about (a) when analyses of social media content might provide estimates accurate enough to be used as reliable social measures or published as official statistics—and when they might not, (b) how self-report in surveys and analyses of social media content might complement and supplement each other, and (c) what should inform decisions about which methods to use for which purposes.

1. A "collective-vs-self" hypothesis for when Twitter and survey data tell the same story
Dr Michael Schober (New School for Social Research)
Dr Frederick Conrad (University of Michigan)
Dr Josh Pasek (University of Michigan)

2. Using Twitter Data to Calibrate Retrospective Assessments in Surveys
Dr Josh Pasek (University of Michigan)
Ms Elizabeth Hou (University of Michigan)
Dr Michael Schober (New School for Social Research)

3. Using Social Media to Measure Labor Market Flows
Professor Margaret Levenstein (University of Michigan)
Professor Matthew Shapiro (University of Michigan)

Professor Michael Cafarella (University of Michigan)

4. When #THC meets #TSE on @twitter: A Discussion of Surveys and Twitter for Examining Attitudes toward Marijuana Legalization
Dr Yuli Patrick Hsieh (RTI International)
Mr Joe Murphy (RTI International)