

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 102

How surveys and big data can work together 1

Chair Dr Mario Callegaro (Google)

Coordinator 1 Dr Yongwei Yang (Google)

Session Details

With more and more data available for answering research questions, the role of surveys in the broader context of social research needs to be redefined.

In this call for papers we are looking for works that bridge the use of big data and survey data, showing how the different signals can work together.

While varying definitions of “big data” exist, for the purpose of this session, we encourage authors to consider a helpful definition by Groves (2011) about organic data, described in contrast to designed data. In this context, there are five common sources of big data (but note the types of data available from these sources may overlap):

-Internet data. These data may take the form of online texts or multimedia data. They may come as social media data or as the by products of online activities - website metadata, logs, cookies, and website analytics.

-The Internet of Things (IoT). These are data produced by those devices that can communicate with another using the internet with some common transmission protocol. A subset of such data, called behavioral data, is particularly useful for research purposes. These data come from connected devices (smartphones, wearables, etc.) and capture information about locations, physical activities, health status, etc. that are passively or actively recorded by the users.

-Transaction data. These are digitally captured or stored records of interactions or transactions between individuals and a business, government or not-for-profit entity or among those entities.

-Administrative data. These are information collected and aggregated by public offices such as national health, tax, school, benefits, etc.

-Commercially available databases. These are curated data made available by data broker companies who combine data from the above sources.

For this session, we are looking for practical applications of that combine surveys in combination with any type of Big Data that would leverage the strengths and mitigate the weakness of each. Examples include:

-Using high quality surveys to validate the quality of Big Data sources.

-Using Big Data to ask better questions in surveys.

-Combining both data types to enhance construct coverage or measurement precision

-The relation between Total Survey Error and Big Data Total Error

Papers aiming at theoretical issues (errors, validity, utility, causal inferences, model building/testing, etc.) are also welcomed, but preferably to be supported by good empirical evidence or sound simulations.

1. Unifying Survey Data and Big Data: A Total Quality Perspective

Dr Paul Biemer (RTI International)

Ms Ashley Amaya (RTI International)

2. What Can Survey Research and Big Data Do for Each Other: Combining Data to Decrease Total Error?

Dr Daniela Hochfellner (New York University & University of Michigan)

Dr Antje Kirchner (RTI International)

3. Does Big Data mean Big Problems, or Bigger Opportunities?

Mr Pedro Cunha (INE)

Mrs Sonia Quaresma Gonçalves (INE)

Mr Jorge Magalhães (INE)

4. Media Exposure and Opinion Formation In an Age of Information Overload

Dr Simon Munzert (University of Mannheim, Mannheim Centre for European Social Research)

Professor Pablo Barberá (University of Southern California)

Dr Andrew Guess (New York University)

Mr JungHwan Yang (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 103

Power of Survey Research in Evidence-Based Policymaking 1

Chair Dr Young Chun (PSI Institute for Data Science and Interdisciplinary Research)
Coordinator 1 Ms Giang Nguyen (ISR Foundation Center for Interdisciplinary Research)
Coordinator 2 Ms Clara Kyung (McGill University)

Session Details

Co-Organizers: Cindy Won, Brown University; Hanyuying Wong, Cambridge University; Leying Guan, Stanford University

Evidence-Based Policymaking (EBP), a term coined from the idea of “evidence-based medicine” and spread to all spheres of public policy, involves the use of evidence collected by scientifically rigorous methods, such as randomized controlled trials. The EBP has garnered support from academia and governmental sectors across the Atlantic. For instance, Adrian Smith (1996) introduced the term in his presidential address to the Royal Statistical Society, questioning the current process of ideology-based policymaking and urging for an “evidence-based approach” in public policy. On the other side of the Atlantic, Davies (2004) echoed EBP as the integration of experience, judgement and expertise with “the best available external evidence from systematic research.” Listening to the call from the scientific research community and gleaning from the steps taken by the UK government, the Obama administration kicked off the Evidence-Based Policy Commission in summer of 2016 to institutionalize evidence-based policy development across all federal agencies.

Survey research-based data and survey data linked to other sources of data, such as administrative records and big data, are at the heart of evidence-based policy making. This session invites papers that demonstrate how survey research and administrative records are instrumental to evidence-based policymaking. We encourage submission of interdisciplinary papers that address the following topics:

- 1) Contributions of survey research applications to evidence-based policy making in public health, economy and education, just to name a few. For example, how survey research has informed the policymaking process, which intends to bring about social, economic, and fiscal benefits?
- 2) Papers demonstrating the use of administrative records linked to survey data in developing public policy, for example, in healthcare intervention, special education for the disabled, and economic welfare programs.
- 3) Papers involving experimental design, such as randomized controlled trials, in a broad context of survey research, to advance evidence-based policymaking with case studies (e.g., small business support, education initiatives for low-income children, healthcare programs to prevent or control epidemic disease like TB and Hepatitis).
- 4) Papers utilizing data visualization, a tool of showing agile comprehension of massive data, to communicate the public messages about policy issues particularly in developing countries. EBP is less implemented in developing countries due to lack of resources and limited civil liberty; the potential for evidence-based policy impact is greater.

1. Advancing Evidence-based Policymaking through Survey Integration Efforts

Dr Steven Cohen (RTI International)

2. Improving TB Diagnosis in India: The Potential of the Private Sector and New Technologies

Miss Clara (Yehyun) Kyung (McGill University)

Mr Akira Camargo (Brown University)

Mr Elliott Chun (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)

Miss Hanyuying Wang (University of Cambridge)

Dr Asaph Young Chun (U.S. Census Bureau)

Miss Helene Cho (International Strategy and Reconciliation Foundation)

Ms Jiwon Sophia Lee (International Strategy and Reconciliation Foundation)

3. Monitoring health and well-being with survey research in Finland – reporting results for national and regional level decision making

Ms Oona Pentala (National Institute for Health and Welfare Finland)

Mr Jukka Murto (National Institute for Health and Welfare Finland)

Mr Timo Koskela (National Institute for Health and Welfare Finland)

Dr Satu Helakorpi (National Institute for Health and Welfare Finland)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 104

Get in touch - Stay in touch: Methodological and procedural efforts and advancements regarding field access and panel maintenance 1

Chair Dr Roman Auriga (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 1 André Müller-Kuller (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 2 Dr Götz Lechner (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

This session focuses on central methodological and procedural efforts and advancements in dealing with panel access and maintenance. With regard to target population characteristics, study designs, and environmental/systemic conditions, elaborated and customized communication- and operationalization strategies do matter, as access to panel samples is administered in manifold ways. In addition, dealing with and operationalizing complex designs requires specific panel strategies that have to be implemented to cope with the inherent complexity of studies.

Besides special requirements of the target population and the study design, major challenges for the administration of panel studies mainly arise due to the sovereignty and responsibility of gatekeepers and therefore the need for authorization (e.g., institutional surveys). During the negotiation and administration processes within a multidimensional system with multiple players (stakeholders, normative-institutional social actors, targets, etc.), various – sometimes competing and changing – interests need to be brought in line to gain and maintain access. Considering the renewal of the EU-data protection regulation (EU) 2016/679, fieldwork management has to be revisited.

Response errors (i.e., unit and item nonresponse), panel attrition and withdrawals are painful mistakes culminating in biases or panel error. Experiences and strategies in multi-informant, multi-cohort and mixed-mode panels (e.g. NEPS, BCS, SOEP, SHARE) should help to increase our understanding of the causes and consequences of nonresponse, refusal and withdrawal behavior is the fundamental basis for staying in touch.

As administrating panel studies is an important part of conducting panels successfully, we are going to concentrate on the art of panel-maintaining strategies in the fields of:

- a) Increased understanding of nonresponse, refusal and withdrawal behavior. Which are the most appropriate ways for first and each successive contact and communication with target persons with regard to panel stability?
- b) Multi-level negotiation strategies and tools dealing with systemic obstacles and the renewal of data protection regulations.
- c) The reduction of response error and panel attrition considering particular framings of sense and meaning in target populations. Which characteristic communication strategies shall be addressed to target person's lifeworld (Lebenswelt). How can trustful relations with target persons be fostered through customized communication offerings?
- d) Advanced tracking and maintaining strategies comprising common and less common panel populations.

1. Get in touch: The role of the language style in invitation letters

Dr Roman Auriga (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

2. Communicating with respondents: Adding more ways to collect data while maintaining respondent cooperation

Ms Esther Ullman (University of Michigan)

Ms Heidi Guyer (University of Michigan)

3. Challenges in Implementing a New Panel Study for the Research in Higher Education – The Case of the “Student Life Cycle”

Mr Johann Carstensen (German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))

Mr Sebastian Lang (German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))

Professor Monika Jungbauer-Gans (German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))

4. Making Contact in Context of Cultural Diversity: Approaches, Challenges and Problems of Transmitting ‘Meaning’ Within Differing Cultural Spheres

Ms Kathrin Erbacher (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 105

Social Capital & Trust

Chair Dr Jan Mewes (Department of Sociology, Umeå University)

Session Details

Social capital & trust

1. Matching Beliefs against Facts: Prospective and Retrospective Access to Social Capital in the Transition to Vocational Training

Ms Kerstin Hoenig (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

2. Good relations: using time-series survey data in Northern Ireland

Dr Paula Devine (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)

Dr Dirk Schubotz (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)

3. Welfare States and Generalized Trust in Europe: Testing the Impact of Means-tested vs. Universal Social

Expenditure on Trust in Strangers, 2002-2014

Dr Jan Mewes (Department of Sociology, Umeå University)

4. Disentangling Trust and Perceived Trustworthiness? Towards a More Differentiated Analysis of Trust

Dr Anna Almakaeva (Higher School of Economics)

Dr Nicolas Griesshaber (European Central Bank)

5. Developing a question about volunteering for the 2021 England and Wales Census

Mrs Joanne Finnie (Office for National Statistics)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 107

Surveying Children and Young People 1

Chair Ms Kate Smith (Centre for Longitudinal Studies)

Coordinator 1 Dr Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies)

Session Details

Many large-scale surveys successfully collect a variety of different types of data from children and young people (up to the age of 25). 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 young people in research. This session will cover challenges and experiences of including children and young people in surveys, as they move from childhood to adults and related survey design issues. A major challenge when interviewing teenagers is that while children's participation in surveys is often mediated by and involves their parents, teenagers and young people make autonomous decisions, bringing challenges particularly in terms of engagement. The session aims to explore a variety of methodological issues around surveying young people. Submissions are particularly welcomed on:

- designing questionnaires for children and young people, including question testing methods
- collecting data on sensitive topics from young people, including methods for ensuring privacy and encouraging accurate reporting
- collecting different types of data from children and young people including physical measurements and cognitive assessments
- 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 children and young people with lower literacy levels
- assessing the reliability and validity of children and 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
- the challenges of retaining young people's contact and interest in surveys over time
- ethical issues in involving children and young people in surveys, including gaining informed consent and protecting young people's rights and well-being

1. Please stay! How to keep young adults in a study their parents signed up for.

Ms Joanne Corey (Australian Bureau of Statistics)

2. Tracking and engaging respondents using social media: the experiences of the Millennium Cohort Study and Next Steps

Ms Jenny Jackman (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL IOE)

Dr Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL IOE)

Dr Darina Peycheva (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL IOE)

Ms Meghan Rainsberry (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL IOE)

Ms Jennie Blows (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL IOE)

3. Millennials and emojis in Spain and Mexico.

Mr Oriol Bosch Jover (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Dr Melanie Revilla (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

4. Data Collection on Sensitive Topics with Adolescents Using Interactive Voice Response Technology

Professor Paula Fomby (University of Michigan)

Professor Narayan Sastry (University of Michigan)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 108

Mixed Methods and the Limits of Social Research 1

Chair Dr Andrea Hense (Sociological Research Institute Göttingen (SOFI), Germany)
Coordinator 1 Professor Udo Kelle (Helmut Schmidt University Hamburg, Germany)
Coordinator 2 Dr Felix Knappertsbusch (Giessen University, Germany)

Session Details

The term "mixed methods" usually indicates a mixture of qualitative and quantitative sampling procedures, data collections, or data analyses within a single study or longitudinal program of inquiry. One of the most important prospects of mixed and multi-method research (MMMR) is its ability to overcome the limitations of traditional mono-method approaches. Method combinations may be used to corroborate or generalize findings, or they may serve to present a more nuanced and multi-faceted view of a given phenomenon. Moreover, MMMR approaches may even raise awareness for possible shortcomings which would otherwise go unrecognized by proponents of mono-method traditions.

Yet at the same time MMMR itself is often confronted with certain limitations ranging from incomplete methodical knowledge, conflicts between methodological camps and rigid disciplinary boundaries to limited material resources and time constraints. One of the most important problems of mixed methods research is how to combine qualitative and quantitative data analysis in generating "meta-inferences". In practical research applications specific difficulties arise which are not covered by existing methods literature: How do we deal with convergent, complementary, and divergent findings? What implications do combined analyses have for fieldwork processes, data organization, and data documentation? How can we use joined displays during the research process to facilitate comparison between results of qualitative and quantitative analyses and how can we use them to communicate the joined results?

This session invites papers discussing the possibilities of MMMR for overcoming the limits of mono-method research as well as current problems and limitations within the diverse and evolving field of method integration. It will provide a forum for discussing problems of joined data analyses which were faced during specific research projects and the solutions found for them. Especially, it will focus on strategies that intend to relate qualitative and quantitative results explicitly instead of reporting two different studies that are only loosely linked to each other. Papers should either present a specific methodical issue with regard to concrete empirical MMMR projects, or discuss a methodological problem specifically pertaining to the prospects and limits of method integration.

1. Capturing Cultural Conceptions of the Family: Combining Survey Data with Semi-Structured Interviews, Based on Family Drawings

Mr Detlev Lueck (Federal Institute for Population Research, Wiesbaden, Germany)

2. Low education, high sanction rates. Exploring welfare benefit sanctions in Germany by diverse quantitative and qualitative data sets

Dr Franziska Schreyer (Institute for Employment Research)
Dr Andreas Moczall (Institute for Employment Research)
Professor Mark Trappmann (Institute for Employment Research)

3. Using Mixed Methods Designs to Identify Validity Problems related to Survey Question Wording – The Measurement of Religiosity in Large Scale Comparative Surveys

Professor Udo Kelle (Helmut-Schmidt-University Hamburg)
Dr Bettina Langfeldt (Helmut-Schmidt-University Hamburg)
Dr Brigitte Metje (Helmut-Schmidt-University Hamburg)

4. Assessment of the contents related to gamete donation on IVF clinics websites: prospects and limits of a multi-method research

Dr Catarina Samorinha (Institute of Public Health University of Porto)
Dr Inês Baía (Institute of Public Health University of Porto)
Dr Sandra Pinto da Silva (Institute of Public Health University of Porto)
Professor Susana Silva (Institute of Public Health University of Porto)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N AUD5

It's the Interviewers! New developments in interviewer effects research 1

Chair Dr Salima Douhou (City University of London, CCSS)
Coordinator 1 Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 2 Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 3 Dr Kathrin Thomas (City University of London, CCSS)
Coordinator 4 Mr Joel Williams (TNS BMRB)

Session Details

To what extent do interviewers affect data collection and how can we better monitor and limit their impact?

Any deviation from the standardised protocol of the data collection process has the potential to induce bias to the data. Interviewer effects, defined as the distortions of survey responses in surveys with interviewer presence, may have a severe impact on data quality. These effects result from potential reactions to the social style and personality of interviewers, but also to their presentation of questions.

Analysis based on data that are biased by interviewer intervention and the conclusions drawn on the basis of this are likely to be incorrect. Hence, survey methodologists have improved the way in which interviewers are trained and briefed in order to limit the interviewers' influence. Yet, it remains open why even in surveys with exceptional efforts to train and monitor interviewers, interviewer effects occur.

Interviewers make (initial) contact with the prospective respondents and attempt to convince them to participate in the survey. The doorstep interaction between prospective respondents and interviewers is rarely documented, but an increasing number of studies indicates that some interviewers are more successful than others in convincing the prospective respondents to participate in a survey and to avoid non-response.

Once door-step interaction has been successful, interviewers may further affect the way in which respondents answer the survey questions on the questionnaire. Variation in survey responses may be due to the attitudes, interpersonal skills and personality of interviewers, but also relate to how the interviewers present particular questions and how strictly they follow the instructions. Any deviation from the standardised protocol provided by the core research team of the survey project decreases the comparability of the survey responses.

This session welcomes papers on new developments in the area of interviewer effects. Topics may include but are not restricted to:

- methodological developments in measuring and modelling interviewer effects,
- interviewer effects on measurement error,
- interviewer effects on nonresponse rates and nonresponse bias,
- interviewer influences on response latencies (timings),
- influence of personality traits, behaviour, attitudes, experience, and other characteristics of interviewers on survey estimates,
- implications for interviewer recruitment and training strategies,
- monitoring and evaluation of fieldwork efforts by interviewers,
- collection of GPS data or audio-visual material of door-step interactions.

Papers that discuss these issues from a comparative perspective are also welcome. We invite academic and non-academic researchers and survey practitioners to contribute to our session.

1. Interviewer Gender and Survey Responses: The Effects of Humanizing Cues Variations

Dr Wojciech Jablonski (Utrecht University & University of Lodz)

Dr Aneta Krzewinska (University of Lodz)

Dr Katarzyna Grzeszkiewicz-Radulska (University of Lodz)

2. Influencing households' cooperation: Do an interviewer's personality and attitude matter?

Miss Sabine Friedel (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging (MEA), Max-Planck-Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)

3. Do interviewer characteristics affect the levels of political knowledge? Evidence from Austria and Germany.

Dr Sabrina Jasmin Mayer (University of Duisburg-Essen)

Dr David Johann (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies & University of Vienna)

4. Interviewer effects on onliner and offliner participation in the German Internet Panel

Ms Jessica Herzing (University of Mannheim, Germany)

Professor Annelies Blom (University of Mannheim, Germany)

Professor Bart Meulemann (University of Leuven, Belgium)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N 101

Overview of open access European survey data 1

Chair Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (SHARE – Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)

Coordinator 1 Ms Sabine Friedel (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)

Session Details

In recent years, many large sets of survey data have been made available to the scientific community. Large national and European surveys, such as ESS, SHARE, SOEP, Understanding Society, etc., disseminate their data to registered users. For researchers it can be difficult to get a good overview of what is offered and to find the specific variables and samples of their interest.

This session aims to give researchers more insight into the variety of variables available in large survey datasets. For that purpose, we invite survey practitioners to present their data sets, longitudinal as well as cross-sectional, to potential users. Presentations should address the following survey characteristics: Research field, target population and sample, survey design, data access regulations, available survey variables and paradata, linked administrative data (if applicable), and some examples of data use. Moreover, we especially welcome overviews including information which can be used for methodological analysis, such as key stroke data, auxiliary information, interviewer characteristics and observations, response behavior, experimental designs, etc.

1. The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP)

Mrs Regina Jutz (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Evi Scholz (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. The European Social Survey: a data resource for all

Dr Rory Fitzgerald (ESS ERIC)
Mr Luca Salini (European Social Survey, City, University of London)
Mr Stefan Swift (European Social Survey, City, University of London)

3. The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)

Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (SHARE – Survey of HealChair for Economics of Aging, Technical University of Munich)
Dr Frederic Malter (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging (MEA))
Dr Julie Korbmacher (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging (MEA))

4. The Generations and Gender Programme

Dr Tom Emery (NIDI)

5. European Values Study 1981-2017

Dr Ruud Luijkx (Tilburg University)
Dr Loek Halman (Tilburg University)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Using paradata to assess and improve survey data quality 1

Chair Dr Caroline Vandenplas (KULeuven)
Coordinator 1 Professor Geert Loosveldt (KULeuven)
Coordinator 2 Dr Koen Beullens (KULeuven)

Session Details

Survey methodologists are currently facing challenges of declining response rates, increasing risk of nonresponse bias and measurement error, as well as escalating costs of survey data collection. An approach, with limited costs, to tackle these challenges is the use of paradata. Paradata, data about the survey process, have always been present but the range and detail level of them have considerably increased with the computerization of the data collection process. Such data can be used to detect and eventually reduce systematic survey errors and increase data quality, during the fieldwork (adaptive designs) or in post-survey adjustment. Paradata can also be used to reduce the cost of the survey process as it is done to determine caps on the number of phone call attempts in telephone surveys.

We are interested in papers that apply the use of paradata to detect and improve data quality or/and reduce survey costs. For instance, time and timing are both linked to the survey costs and the data quality, two essential elements of a survey. The timing of the visits, calls or sent-out of questionnaire/request and reminders has been shown to be determining for survey participation. At the same time, requesting that interviewers work in the evening or at the weekend or making sure that the reminders to a Web or mail surveys are sent timely may have cost implications. Nonresponse error is not the only type of survey error to be linked to time: the time taken to answer a question, also called response latency, is known to echo the cognitive effort of the respondent and, hence, data quality. On the other hand, the interviewer speed can also influence data quality. Moreover the interviewer speed has been shown to be dependent of the rank of the interview.

The aim of this session is to reflect on possible links between paradata reflecting 'easy' measured characteristic of different steps of the survey process and data quality. Such a link could then help data collection manager and researcher to detect potential systematic survey errors in a fieldwork monitoring or post-evaluation context and lead to opportunities to prevent or correct for these errors. We invite papers demonstrating a link between paradata and data quality as well as papers showing how this link can be used to increase data quality or reduce cost.

1. Fieldwork monitoring and managing with time-related paradata

Dr Caroline Vandenplas (KULeuven)

2. Monitoring interview duration data: from a Statistical Process Control perspective

Ms Jiayun Jin (KU Leuven)
Professor Geert Loosveldt (KU Leuven)

Dr Caroline Vandenplas (KU Leuven)

3. The use of auxiliary and event data in tracking an inhomogeneity of substantive results from surveys in cross-national studies. Example of ESS.

Ms Teresa Zmijewska-Jedrzejczyk (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)

4. Using timestamps to monitor fieldwork and evaluate data quality: Experiences from a household survey in Tanzania

Dr Johanna Choumert Nkolo (Economic Development Initiatives (E.D.I.), High Wycombe, United Kingdom / Bukoba, Tanzania)

Mr Henry Cust (Economic Development Initiatives (E.D.I.), High Wycombe, United Kingdom / Bukoba, Tanzania)

Mr Callum Taylor (Economic Development Initiatives (E.D.I.), High Wycombe, United Kingdom / Bukoba, Tanzania. Email: c.taylor@surveybe.com)

5. Paradata as an aide to questionnaire design: Improving quality and reducing burden

Mrs Emma Timm (Office for National Statistics, UK)

Mr Jordan Stewart (Office for National Statistics)

Mr Ian Sidney (Office for National Statistics)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Measuring and modeling response behavior and response quality in web surveys 1

Chair Ms Carina Cornesse (Mannheim University and GESIS)

Coordinator 1 Dr Jean Philippe Décieux (Université du Luxembourg)

Coordinator 2 Ms Jessica Herzing (Mannheim University)

Coordinator 3 Professor Jochen Mayerl (University of Kaiserslautern)

Coordinator 4 Ms Alexandra Mergener (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

Coordinator 5 Mr Philipp Sischka (Université du Luxembourg)

Session Details

Web surveys have become a popular method of data gathering for many reasons, including low costs and the ability to collect data rapidly. Due to the rapid infusion of web surveys and the technological progress, the number of respondents filling out web surveys on the run using mobile devices increases. When answering survey questions on mobile devices, respondents can take short-cuts to the optimal cognitive response processes that are partly caused by external disturbing factors such as time pressure, inattention or presence of other persons. Such a response behavior might introduce additional measurement error and thus influence response quality.

Yet, there are inconclusive results on how the “interview situation” of web surveys can influence response behavior and thus response quality. On one hand, many studies have shown that respondents in web surveys answer questions on personal or sensitive topics more honestly compared to respondents in personal or telephone interviews. This can be explained by the subjective impression of anonymity which is due to the absence of an interviewer. On the other hand, recent studies have shown that missing direct interaction to an interviewer can lead to careless responses and increased satisficing response behavior. Furthermore, web surveys are confronted with high unit and item nonresponse as well as increasing dropouts. In addition, response behavior and response quality of web surveys may correlate with the selectivity of the samples under study and recruitment methods of access panels.

Such ambivalent perspectives on response behavior and response quality of web surveys should be addressed and discussed in this session. When modeling response quality and response behavior, researchers can draw on different measures and correlates, such as paradata (e.g. time stamps, types of devices), respondent profile data (e.g. education, socio-economic background) or survey profile data (e.g. type of survey question, interview situation).

We invite submissions from researchers who analyze response behavior and response quality in web surveys. We especially encourage submissions of papers which include experiments covering the area of response quality in web surveys based on empirical data, and papers that use complex statistical models to identify different respondent types. Furthermore, we are interested in submissions on solutions for response quality issues, e.g. on how researchers can attract attention and motivation of respondents to proceed survey questions and to give valid answers as well as which factors improve or impair answer quality.

1. Predicting Breakoffs in Web Surveys

Mrs Felicitas Mittereder (University of Michigan, ISR)

Mr Brady West (University of Michigan, ISR)

2. Do distractions during web survey completion affect data quality? Findings from a laboratory experiment

Mr Alexander Wenz (University of Essex)

3. Nonresponses as context-sensitive response behaviour of participants in online-surveys and their relevance for data

quality

Mrs Daniela Wetzlehütter (University of Applied Sciences Upper Austria)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Assessing Non-Cognitive Skills in Large Scale Assessments

Chair Professor Beatrice Rammstedt (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Dr Daniel Danner (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 2 Dr Clemens Lechner (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Over the last decade, non-cognitive skills such as personality characteristics, motivational factors, or socio-emotional skills have attracted more and more attention and national as well as international large scale surveys such as the German Socio-economic Panel (GSOEP), the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS), or the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) have included measures of non-cognitive skills in their portfolio. This symposium addresses to what extent non-cognitive skills are relevant and how they can be assessed in large scale assessments.

The relevance of non-cognitive skills may either be addressed empirically by demonstrating the predictive value of non-cognitive skills for individual, economic, or societal outcomes or conceptually, e.g. by introducing a theoretical framework that relates non-cognitive skills with other constructs.

Particularly in large scale assessment with limited time and heterogeneous respondents, the assessment of non-cognitive skills bears many challenges. We welcome contributions that introduce new measurement instruments (e.g. new short scales), new measurement approaches (e.g., situational judgements tests), new scaling approaches (e.g., forced-choice methods), deal with measurement related issues (e.g., response styles), or cross-cultural measurement issues (e.g., measurement invariance). Submitted abstracts should include the research question as well as information about the sample, method, and central results.

1. 'I can/I will' – a biaspectual approach to measuring non-cognitive skills in survey research

Dr Marcin Kocór (Jagiellonian University)

Dr Szymon Czarnik (Jagiellonian University)

2. Predicting life outcomes: The incremental value of personality facets

Professor Beatrice Rammstedt (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Daniel Danner (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Clemens Lechner (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. Determinants of social skills of preschoolers – different results from different perspectives

Ms Anika Bela (LifBi)

4. Identifying sociocultural predictors of acquiescence among Mexican American, Puerto Rican, and Cuban American survey respondents

Dr Rachel Davis (University of South Carolina)

Dr Timothy Johnson (University of Illinois at Chicago)

Dr Frederick Conrad (University of Michigan)

Dr Sunghee Lee (University of Michigan)

Dr Jim Thrasher (University of South Carolina)

Dr Ken Resnicow (University of Michigan)

Dr Karen Peterson (University of Michigan)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q4 ANF1

Researching Sensitive Topics: Improving Theory and Survey Design 1

Chair Dr Ivar Krumpal (University of Leipzig)

Coordinator 1 Professor Ben Jann (University of Bern)

Coordinator 2 Professor Mark Trappmann (IAB Nürnberg)

Session Details

Social desirability bias is a problem in surveys collecting data on private issues, deviant behavior or unsocial opinions (e.g. sex,

health, income, illicit drug use, tax evasion or xenophobia) as soon as the respondents' true scores differ from social norms. Asking sensitive questions poses a dilemma to survey participants. On the one hand, politeness norms may oblige the respondent to be helpful and cooperative and self-report the sensitive personal information truthfully. On the other hand, the respondent may not trust in his or her data protection and may fear negative consequences from self-reporting norm-violating behavior or opinions. Cumulative empirical evidence shows that in the context of surveying sensitive issues respondents often engage in self-protective behavior, i.e. they either give socially desirable answers or they refuse to answer at all. Such systematic misreporting or nonresponse leads to biased estimates and poor data quality of the entire survey study. Specific data collection approaches were proposed to increase respondents' cooperation and improve validity of self-reports in sensitive surveys.

This session is about deepening our knowledge of the data generation process and advancing the theoretical basis of the ongoing debate about establishing best practices and designs for surveying sensitive topics. We invite submissions that deal with these problems and/or present potential solutions. In particular, we are interested in studies that (1) reason about the psychological processes and social interactions between the actors that are involved in the collection of the sensitive data; (2) present current empirical research focusing on 'question-and-answer' based (e.g. randomized response techniques, factorial surveys), non-reactive (e.g. record linkage approaches, field experiments or administrative data usage) or mixed methods of data collection (e.g. big data analyses in combination with classical survey approaches) focusing on the problem of social desirability; (3) deal with statistical procedures to analyze data generated with special data collection methods; (4) explore the possibilities and limits of integrating new and innovative data collection approaches for sensitive issues in well-established, large-scale population surveys taking into account problems of research ethics and data protection.

1. The effects of social desirability and social undesirability on response latencies in surveys

Mr Henrik Andersen (Technische Universität Kaiserslautern)

Dr Jochen Mayerl (Technische Universität Kaiserslautern)

2. Measurement and Mismeasurement of Abortion and Other Pregnancy Outcomes

Ms Rachel Scott (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine)

Dr Laura Lindberg (Guttacher Institute, New York)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Cognition in surveys

Chair Dr Bregje Holleman (Utrecht University)

Coordinator 1 Dr Naomi Kamoen (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 judgement, 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.

In this session, we welcome studies in which the cognitive processes underlying question answering are addressed. This can for example be done by using qualitative research methods, such as cognitive interviewing, or by applying unobtrusive research methods such as reaction times or eye-tracking. We like to stress that we welcome work on cognitive processes in a broad range of survey contexts: the cognitions related to factual or behavioral questions as well as cognitive processes underlying the answers to attitude questions. This can be addressed in a large variety of survey types and administration modes - including online political attitude surveys called Voting Advice Applications.

1. Explaining systematic measurement errors using cognitive-process models of response behavior and the attitude towards surveys

Mr Christoph Giehl (Technical University Kaiserslautern)

Professor Jochen Mayerl (Technical University Kaiserslautern)

2. Attitude strength as an explanation for wording effects in political opinion questions

Dr Bregje Holleman (assistant professor Utrecht University)

Dr Naomi Kamoen (assistant professor Tilburg University)

3. Comparing the Performance of Agree/Disagree and Item-Specific Questions over PCs and Smartphones

Mr Jan Karem Höhne (University of Göttingen)

Dr Melanie Revilla (RECSM-Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Dr Timo Lenzner (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. I don't get it. Response difficulties in answering political attitude statements in Voting Advice Applications.

Dr Naomi Kamoen (Tilburg University)

Dr Bregje Holleman (Utrecht University)

Tuesday 18th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Estimating Households' consumption for surveys of income and wealth

Chair Dr Junyi Zhu (Bundesbank)

Session Details

There is a big interest of policy makers and analysts alike in the joint distribution of income, wealth and consumption across households. The relationship between income and consumption is more often studied than the influence of wealth and wealth change on consumption. The wealth itself is beyond the discounted future flows of income and consumption. It reflects the potential in consumption and intergeneration transfer even when the correlation between wealth and income can be weak. However, to date no survey covering all three dimensions exists. Consumption surveys, especially those with a diary approach, typically only collect some information on income but do not cover wealth. Wealth surveys on the other hand cover individual households' wealth and income, but contain only limited information on consumption. In recent years economists have developed several techniques to estimate consumption and expenditure (e.g. Browning et al, 2003, which can be applied to wealth surveys. These techniques include asking for components of consumption and extrapolating those to total consumption measures, asking summary questions on total consumption, matching datasets at the individual level, to calculate consumption as the difference between savings and net income. All these procedures are not without problems, not least because of methodological features of the surveys used. To give an example, some wealth surveys oversample rich households, while some household budget surveys don't even include the very rich in their target population. For this session we welcome contributions that deal with the measurement or estimation of consumption for income and wealth. We welcome papers dealing with the design of questions on consumption for general purpose surveys, with the estimation of consumption for wealth and income surveys or with methodological challenges when matching income, wealth and consumption surveys.

1. A Farewell to ARMs? The Diverse Regimes and Market Segments of Adjustable Rate Mortgages

Professor Frank Stafford (University of Michigan)

Dr Bing Chen (Researcher)

2. Reconciling Income, Spending, Borrowing and Saving in a Single Household Survey

Professor Annette Jackle (University of Essex)

Professor Thomas Crossley (University of Essex)

Professor Joachim Winter (University of Munich)

3. Regression with imputed dependent variables

Professor Thomas F. Crossley (University of Essex; Institute for Fiscal Studies)

Mr Peter Levell (Institute for Fiscal Studies)

Mr Stavros Poupakis (University of Essex)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 102

How surveys and big data can work together 2

Chair Dr Mario Callegaro (Google)

Coordinator 1 Dr Yongwei Yang (Google)

Session Details

With more and more data available for answering research questions, the role of surveys in the broader context of social research needs to be redefined.

In this call for papers we are looking for works that bridge the use of big data and survey data, showing how the different signals

can work together.

While varying definitions of “big data” exist, for the purpose of this session, we encourage authors to consider a helpful definition by Groves (2011) about organic data, described in contrast to designed data. In this context, there are five common sources of big data (but note the types of data available from these sources may overlap):

- Internet data. These data may take the form of online texts or multimedia data. They may come as social media data or as the by products of online activities - website metadata, logs, cookies, and website analytics.
- The Internet of Things (IoT). These are data produced by those devices that can communicate with another using the internet with some common transmission protocol. A subset of such data, called behavioral data, is particularly useful for research purposes. These data come from connected devices (smartphones, wearables, etc.) and capture information about locations, physical activities, health status, etc. that are passively or actively recorded by the users.
- Transaction data. These are digitally captured or stored records of interactions or transactions between individuals and a business, government or not-for-profit entity or among those entities.
- Administrative data. These are information collected and aggregated by public offices such as national health, tax, school, benefits, etc.
- Commercially available databases. These are curated data made available by data broker companies who combine data from the above sources.

For this session, we are looking for practical applications of that combine surveys in combination with any type of Big Data that would leverage the strengths and mitigate the weakness of each. Examples include:

- Using high quality surveys to validate the quality of Big Data sources.
- Using Big Data to ask better questions in surveys.
- Combining both data types to enhance construct coverage or measurement precision
- The relation between Total Survey Error and Big Data Total Error

Papers aiming at theoretical issues (errors, validity, utility, causal inferences, model building/testing, etc.) are also welcomed, but preferably to be supported by good empirical evidence or sound simulations.

1. Amplifying survey results with Google Trends data

Mr Jeffrey Oldham (Google, Inc.)

Mr Hal Varian (Google, Inc.)

2. Correcting for misclassification under edit restrictions in combined survey-register data using Multiple Imputation Latent Class modelling (MILC)

Mrs Laura Boeschoten (Tilburg University and Statistics Netherlands)

Dr Daniel Oberski (Utrecht University)

Professor Ton de Waal (Statistics Netherlands and Tilburg University)

Dr Marcel Croon (Tilburg University)

3. Can we learn from user-created online surveys?

Miss Sarah Cho (SurveyMonkey)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 103

Power of Survey Research in Evidence-Based Policymaking 2

Chair Dr Young Chun (PSI Institute for Data Science and Interdisciplinary Research)

Coordinator 1 Ms Giang Nguyen (ISR Foundation Center for Interdisciplinary Research)

Coordinator 2 Ms Clara Kyung (McGill University)

Session Details

Co-Organizers: Cindy Won, Brown University; Hanyuying Wong, Cambridge University; Leying Guan, Stanford University

Evidence-Based Policymaking (EBP), a term coined from the idea of “evidence-based medicine” and spread to all spheres of public policy, involves the use of evidence collected by scientifically rigorous methods, such as randomized controlled trials. The EBP has garnered support from academia and governmental sectors across the Atlantic. For instance, Adrian Smith (1996) introduced the term in his presidential address to the Royal Statistical Society, questioning the current process of ideology-based policymaking and urging for an “evidence-based approach” in public policy. On the other side of the Atlantic, Davies (2004) echoed EBP as the integration of experience, judgement and expertise with “the best available external evidence from systematic research.” Listening to the call from the scientific research community and gleaning from the steps taken by the UK government, the Obama administration kicked off the Evidence-Based Policy Commission in summer of 2016 to institutionalize evidence-based policy development across all federal agencies.

Survey research-based data and survey data linked to other sources of data, such as administrative records and big data, are at the heart of evidence-based policy making. This session invites papers that demonstrate how survey research and administrative records are instrumental to evidence-based policymaking. We encourage submission of interdisciplinary papers

that address the following topics:

- 1) Contributions of survey research applications to evidence-based policy making in public health, economy and education, just to name a few. For example, how survey research has informed the policymaking process, which intends to bring about social, economic, and fiscal benefits?
- 2) Papers demonstrating the use of administrative records linked to survey data in developing public policy, for example, in healthcare intervention, special education for the disabled, and economic welfare programs.
- 3) Papers involving experimental design, such as randomized controlled trials, in a broad context of survey research, to advance evidence-based policymaking with case studies (e.g., small business support, education initiatives for low-income children, healthcare programs to prevent or control epidemic disease like TB and Hepatitis).
- 4) Papers utilizing data visualization, a tool of showing agile comprehension of massive data, to communicate the public messages about policy issues particularly in developing countries. EBP is less implemented in developing countries due to lack of resources and limited civil liberty; the potential for evidence-based policy impact is greater.

1. Using survey research for evaluating new models of integrated health and social care services in England

Mr Bob Erens (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine)
Professor Nicholas Mays (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine)
Dr Mary Alison Durand (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine)
Dr Ties Hoomans (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine)

2. Renewable Energy in North Korea: Challenges of Limited Resources and Smart Solutions

Ms Giang Nguyen (ISR Foundation Center for Interdisciplinary Research)
Mr Jun Bin Lee (ISR Foundation Center for Interdisciplinary Research)
Ms Tiffany Lee (ISR Foundation Center for Interdisciplinary Research)
Ms Helene Cho (ISR Foundation Center for Interdisciplinary Research)
Mr Asaph Young Chun (U.S. Census Bureau)

3. Using long-term labour market projections for policy consulting

Mrs Caroline Neuber-Pohl (German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)
Mr Tobias Maier (German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 104

Get in touch - Stay in touch: Methodological and procedural efforts and advancements regarding field access and panel maintenance 2

Chair Dr Roman Auriga (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 1 André Müller-Kuller (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 2 Dr Götz Lechner (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

This session focuses on central methodological and procedural efforts and advancements in dealing with panel access and maintenance. With regard to target population characteristics, study designs, and environmental/systemic conditions, elaborated and customized communication- and operationalization strategies do matter, as access to panel samples is administered in manifold ways. In addition, dealing with and operationalizing complex designs requires specific panel strategies that have to be implemented to cope with the inherent complexity of studies.

Besides special requirements of the target population and the study design, major challenges for the administration of panel studies mainly arise due to the sovereignty and responsibility of gatekeepers and therefore the need for authorization (e.g., institutional surveys). During the negotiation and administration processes within a multidimensional system with multiple players (stakeholders, normative-institutional social actors, targets, etc.), various – sometimes competing and changing – interests need to be brought in line to gain and maintain access. Considering the renewal of the EU-data protection regulation (EU) 2016/679, fieldwork management has to be revisited.

Response errors (i.e., unit and item nonresponse), panel attrition and withdrawals are painful mistakes culminating in biases or panel error. Experiences and strategies in multi-informant, multi-cohort and mixed-mode panels (e.g. NEPS, BCS, SOEP, SHARE) should help to increase our understanding of the causes and consequences of nonresponse, refusal and withdrawal behavior is the fundamental basis for staying in touch.

As administrating panel studies is an important part of conducting panels successfully, we are going to concentrate on the art of panel-maintaining strategies in the fields of:

a) Increased understanding of nonresponse, refusal and withdrawal behavior. Which are the most appropriate ways for first and

- each successive contact and communication with target persons with regard to panel stability?
- b) Multi-level negotiation strategies and tools dealing with systemic obstacles and the renewal of data protection regulations.
 - c) The reduction of response error and panel attrition considering particular framings of sense and meaning in target populations. Which characteristic communication strategies shall be addressed to target person's lifeworld (Lebenswelt). How can trustful relations with target persons be fostered through customized communication offerings?
 - d) Advanced tracking and maintaining strategies comprising common and less common panel populations.

1. ELIPSS : how to improve and create the panel management activities

Mr Alexandre Chevallier (SciencesPo)

Mrs Elodie Petorin (SciencesPo)

2. Which factors affect participation in an additional online survey after participating in a one-hour-interview?

Miss Anne Kersting (infas Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft GmbH (Institute for Applied Social Sciences), Bonn, Germany)

Mr Michael Ruland (infas Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft GmbH (Institute for Applied Social Sciences), Bonn, Germany)

Dr Reiner Gilberg (infas Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft GmbH (Institute for Applied Social Sciences), Bonn, Germany)

3. "Don't Ever Call Me Again" – Methodological Efforts of Longitudinal Studies

Mr André Müller-Kuller (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Dr Nicole Luplow (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Mr Florian Bains (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

4. Non-response Bias reduction through weighting with Paradata

Mr Florian Bains (Leibniz-Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Mr André Müller-Kuller (Leibniz-Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 105

Societal well-being & happiness

Chair Professor Wolfgang Aschauer (University of Salzburg)

Coordinator 1 Professor Martin Weichbold (University of Salzburg)

Session Details

1. Life Satisfaction and Wellbeing in Transitional Societies of Eastern Europe and Central Asia

Miss Kseniya Kizilova (World Values Survey Association)

Professor Christian Haerper (World Values Survey Association)

2. Social Cohesion in Relation to Economic Outcomes and Sustainability in a Comparative Perspective

Ms Ekaterina Lytkina (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

Ms Natalya Voronina (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

3. Times they're changing: the role of income and social capital for Europeans' well-being over the 2008 economic crisis

Dr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC and HSE)

Dr Marcin Piekalkiewicz (University of Siena)

4. Cross-level Factors in Sustainability Value Patterns

Ms Anna Shirokanova (LCSR, Higher School of Economics, Russia)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 106

Questionnaire translation in theory and practice: achievements, challenges, and innovations 1

Chair Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Ms Brita Dorer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

The field of questionnaire translation in cross-national and cross-cultural research has slowly begun, but it has taken up speed and become prominent in survey projects and research since the 1990s at the latest. Best practice in terms of methods (committee approach, back translation, pretesting, translator profiles, etc.) has driven the field; this topic has made immense progress but it is a never-ending story nevertheless, especially if considered in a cross-disciplinary perspective (survey methodology, health, psychology, education, business). The importance of cultural factors, which impact both on language and item content, is nowadays pervasive. However, within survey methodology but also in other and across disciplines, many different meanings – and possibly false restrictions – are attached to the concepts of adoption, translation, adaptation or localization. There is more agreement on the provision of background information on concepts or terms, which was already called for in 1948 (!) (Barioux) and is now a key feature of comparative research. There is by now also agreement on early integration and involvement of translation and translation experts when designing a source questionnaire. The methods of advance translation or translatability assessment embody this strand. IT and translation tools are slowly gaining a foothold in the form of dedicated portals and translation tools, or of corpus linguistics. IT supports both the macro-processes (various stages of translating, assessing and testing) and the micro-processes (the translation as such). Against the backdrop of all these developments, it is a bit surprising that (systematic) empirical research on the effects of different translation versions is still missing – but also here, research has sprung up, the European SERISS project being a prime example.

Researchers and practitioners are invited to present on achievements in the field of questionnaire translation, on topics that are still inconclusive or challenging, and on innovations. Presentations can tackle any of the aforementioned themes, but they can also go beyond those. Presenters can look into the theory but also present their applications in cross-national and cross-cultural survey research and their lesson learned.

1. The impact of information and technology in translation processes for international large scale assessment studies: First results of a dissertation project

Mrs Britta Upsing (DIPF)

2. Asking Moses to help with translation verification

Dr Yuri Pettinicchi (Max-Planck-Institute for Social Law and Social Policy (MPISOC))

Mr Paulius Šukys (Technische Universität München (TUM))

3. The Translation Management Tool (TMT) used for a survey applying the TRAPD model: the example of the European Social Survey (ESS), Round 8

Ms Brita Dorer (GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Mr Maurice Martens (CentERdata (University of Tilburg))

Mr Sebastiaan Pennings (CentERdata (University of Tilburg))

4. Assessing the impact of different German-language translations of ESS Round 3 items on the resulting data

Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 107

Surveying Children and Young People 2

Chair Ms Kate Smith (Centre for Longitudinal Studies)

Coordinator 1 Dr Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies)

Session Details

Many large-scale surveys successfully collect a variety of different types of data from children and young people (up to the age of 25). 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 young people in research. This session will cover challenges and experiences of including children and young people in surveys, as they move from childhood to adults and related survey design issues. A major challenge when interviewing teenagers is that while children's participation in surveys is often mediated by and involves their parents, teenagers and young people make autonomous decisions, bringing challenges particularly in terms of engagement. The session aims to explore a variety of methodological issues around surveying young people. Submissions are particularly welcomed on:

- designing questionnaires for children and young people, including question testing methods
- collecting data on sensitive topics from young people, including methods for ensuring privacy and encouraging accurate reporting
- collecting different types of data from children and young people including physical measurements and cognitive assessments
- 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 children and young people with lower literacy

levels

- assessing the reliability and validity of children and 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
- the challenges of retaining young people's contact and interest in surveys over time
- ethical issues in involving children and young people in surveys, including gaining informed consent and protecting young people's rights and well-being

1. Developing patient reported experience measures for children and young people at Great Ormond Street Hospital in the UK

Ms Sarah Knibbs (Ipsos MORI)
Ms Sylvie Hobden (Ipsos MORI)
Dr Jo Wray (Great Ormond Street Hospital)
Ms Gerilyn Oldham (Great Ormond Street Hospital)

2. The use of vignettes in online surveys of children

Dr Katrina Lloyd (Queen's University Belfast)
Dr Paula Devine (Queen's University Belfast)

3. Successfully surveying young people online

Mr Peter Matthews (Kantar Public)
Mr Sinan Fahliogullari (Kantar Public)
Mrs Emily Bell (Kantar Public)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 108

Mixed Methods and the Limits of Social Research 2

Chair Dr Andrea Hense (Sociological Research Institute Göttingen (SOFI), Germany)
Coordinator 1 Professor Udo Kelle (Helmut Schmidt University Hamburg, Germany)
Coordinator 2 Dr Felix Knappertsbusch (Giessen University, Germany)

Session Details

The term "mixed methods" usually indicates a mixture of qualitative and quantitative sampling procedures, data collections, or data analyses within a single study or longitudinal program of inquiry. One of the most important prospects of mixed and multi-method research (MMMR) is its ability to overcome the limitations of traditional mono-method approaches. Method combinations may be used to corroborate or generalize findings, or they may serve to present a more nuanced and multi-faceted view of a given phenomenon. Moreover, MMMR approaches may even raise awareness for possible shortcomings which would otherwise go unrecognized by proponents of mono-method traditions.

Yet at the same time MMMR itself is often confronted with certain limitations ranging from incomplete methodical knowledge, conflicts between methodological camps and rigid disciplinary boundaries to limited material resources and time constraints. One of the most important problems of mixed methods research is how to combine qualitative and quantitative data analysis in generating "meta-inferences". In practical research applications specific difficulties arise which are not covered by existing methods literature: How do we deal with convergent, complementary, and divergent findings? What implications do combined analyses have for fieldwork processes, data organization, and data documentation? How can we use joined displays during the research process to facilitate comparison between results of qualitative and quantitative analyses and how can we use them to communicate the joined results?

This session invites papers discussing the possibilities of MMMR for overcoming the limits of mono-method research as well as current problems and limitations within the diverse and evolving field of method integration. It will provide a forum for discussing problems of joined data analyses which were faced during specific research projects and the solutions found for them. Especially, it will focus on strategies that intend to relate qualitative and quantitative results explicitly instead of reporting two different studies that are only loosely linked to each other. Papers should either present a specific methodical issue with regard to concrete empirical MMMR projects, or discuss a methodological problem specifically pertaining to the prospects and limits of method integration.

1. Like a bridge over troubled water? Combining unexpected results from quantitative research with qualitative interview material by using quote matrixes

Dr Christiane Gross (University of Hanover, Germany)
Mr Thomas Gurr (University of Hanover, Germany)
Professor Monika Jungbauer-Gans (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies, Hanover, Germany)
Mr Sebastian Lang (University of Hanover, Germany)

2. Mixed Methods Data Analysis: Qualitative Analysis and Data Transformation

Dr Susanne Vogl (University of Vienna)

3. Mixed Methods Research: a convergent or a complementary approach?

Dr Noemi Novello (Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca)

Professor Alessandra Decataldo (Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca)

4. Integrating Learning Analytics, Survey Self-Reports, and Qualitative Data: Insights from Two Pilot Studies

Dr Evgenia Samoilova (University of Mannheim)

Professor Florian Keusch (University of Mannheim)

Professor Tobias Wolbring (University of Mannheim)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 109

Comparative survey analysis using WVS data: social challenges and global value shifts

Chair Ms Kseniya Kizilova (World Values Survey Association)

Coordinator 1 Dr Tatiana Karabchuk (United Arab Emirates University)

Coordinator 2 Professor Eduard Ponarin (High School of Economics)

Session Details

The goal of the session is to contribute and facilitate the professional discussion and research experience exchange between survey methodologists, social researchers, survey analysts and social scholars using the world's largest survey data on values and attitudes – World Value Survey (WVS).

WVS covers more than 100 countries and allows cross-national and cross-cultural comparative studies based on the unified questionnaire and the unified way of the data collection, mainly through face to face interview. More than 300 questions on values, attitudes and social behavior are brought together with other demographic issues in the survey.

The session will open up the floor to the presentations focused on values, cultural shifts, and peoples' attitudes to the crucial social problem like social inequalities in cross-national perspective based on the WVS data. The proposed session will touch both methodological and comparative aspects of the survey analysis so that reflecting the main goals of the conference on survey research. It is highly relevant to discuss the ongoing value shifts in Europe alone with the social changes in the world regarding social inequalities, especially in the highlights of current migration crisis in Europe. Thus, we see the proposed session to be beneficial to the conference's debates by addressing the local European social problems as well as the global challenges in the world.

We expect that the session will attract a lot of participants and will stimulate the usage of open-access rich data of WVS for both research and training purposes. The session will bring the academics from different parts of the world due to the wide-range of the data coverage, so that contributing to the good geographical representation of the participants.

1. Political support in diverse democracies: A comparative survey analysis using WVS data

Dr Anaid Flesken (University of Bristol)

Mr Jakob Hartl (University of Bristol)

2. Unravelling the Trust-Globalization Relationship: How Social Inequality and Diversity Shape Trust Dynamics

Professor Martin Groß (Tübingen University)

Dr Scott Milligan (Tübingen University)

3. Comparing the World Value Survey and the European Social Survey. Case study: Happiness in European countries with transition since 1990

Professor Seppo Laaksonen (University of Helsinki)

4. The Significance of Work for Voluntary Associations: a Cross-National Comparison

Dr Anna Almakaeva (Higher School of Economics)

Dr Sarah Spencer (Higher School of Economics)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N AUD5

It's the Interviewers! New developments in interviewer effects research 2

Chair Dr Salima Douhou (City University of London, CCSS)

Coordinator 1 Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)

Coordinator 2 Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)

Coordinator 3 Dr Kathrin Thomas (City University of London, CCSS)

Coordinator 4 Mr Joel Williams (TNS BMRB)

Session Details

To what extent do interviewers affect data collection and how can we better monitor and limit their impact?

Any deviation from the standardised protocol of the data collection process has the potential to induce bias to the data. Interviewer effects, defined as the distortions of survey responses in surveys with interviewer presence, may have a severe impact on data quality. These effects result from potential reactions to the social style and personality of interviewers, but also to their presentation of questions.

Analysis based on data that are biased by interviewer intervention and the conclusions drawn on the basis of this are likely to be incorrect. Hence, survey methodologists have improved the way in which interviewers are trained and briefed in order to limit the interviewers' influence. Yet, it remains open why even in surveys with exceptional efforts to train and monitor interviewers, interviewer effects occur.

Interviewers make (initial) contact with the prospective respondents and attempt to convince them to participate in the survey. The doorstep interaction between prospective respondents and interviewers is rarely documented, but an increasing number of studies indicates that some interviewers are more successful than others in convincing the prospective respondents to participate in a survey and to avoid non-response.

Once door-step interaction has been successful, interviewers may further affect the way in which respondents answer the survey questions on the questionnaire. Variation in survey responses may be due to the attitudes, interpersonal skills and personality of interviewers, but also relate to how the interviewers present particular questions and how strictly they follow the instructions. Any deviation from the standardised protocol provided by the core research team of the survey project decreases the comparability of the survey responses.

This session welcomes papers on new developments in the area of interviewer effects. Topics may include but are not restricted to:

- methodological developments in measuring and modelling interviewer effects,
- interviewer effects on measurement error,
- interviewer effects on nonresponse rates and nonresponse bias,
- interviewer influences on response latencies (timings),
- influence of personality traits, behaviour, attitudes, experience, and other characteristics of interviewers on survey estimates,
- implications for interviewer recruitment and training strategies,
- monitoring and evaluation of fieldwork efforts by interviewers,
- collection of GPS data or audio-visual material of door-step interactions.

Papers that discuss these issues from a comparative perspective are also welcome. We invite academic and non-academic researchers and survey practitioners to contribute to our session.

1. Interpersonal Inferences and Interviewer Effects in Face-to-Face Surveys

Mr Simon Kühne (Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP))

2. Assessing Interviewer Effects on Immigration Attitudes

Ms Sonila Dardha (City, University of London)

3. Why Do Interviewer Gender and Religious Dress Interactively Affect Support for Gender Equality in the Middle East?

Dr Lindsay Benstead (Portland State University)

4. Toward a Better Understanding of the Effect of Interviewer's Attitudes on Reporting Sensitive Religious Information

Professor Zeina Mneimneh (University of Michigan)

Ms Julie de Jong (University of Michigan)

Professor Mansoor Moaddel (University of Maryland)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N 101

Overview of open access European survey data 2

Chair Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (SHARE – Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)

Coordinator 1 Ms Sabine Friedel (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)

Session Details

In recent years, many large sets of survey data have been made available to the scientific community. Large national and

European surveys, such as ESS, SHARE, SOEP, Understanding Society, etc., disseminate their data to registered users. For researchers it can be difficult to get a good overview of what is offered and to find the specific variables and samples of their interest.

This session aims to give researchers more insight into the variety of variables available in large survey datasets. For that purpose, we invite survey practitioners to present their data sets, longitudinal as well as cross-sectional, to potential users. Presentations should address the following survey characteristics: Research field, target population and sample, survey design, data access regulations, available survey variables and paradata, linked administrative data (if applicable), and some examples of data use. Moreover, we especially welcome overviews including information which can be used for methodological analysis, such as key stroke data, auxiliary information, interviewer characteristics and observations, response behavior, experimental designs, etc.

1. Free data! An overview of and how to access data from the true probability based LISS panel

Mr Joris Mulder (CentERdata, Tilburg University)

2. Using data from ELIPSS, the French probability based internet panel

Ms Anne Cornilleau (Sciences Po - CDSP)

Ms Anne-Sophie Cousteaux (Sciences Po - CDSP)

3. GESIS Panel - a probability-based mixed-mode access panel

Mr David Bretschgi (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Using paradata to assess and improve survey data quality 2

Chair Dr Caroline Vandeplass (KULeuven)

Coordinator 1 Professor Geert Loosveldt (KULeuven)

Coordinator 2 Dr Koen Beullens (KULeuven)

Session Details

Survey methodologists are currently facing challenges of declining response rates, increasing risk of nonresponse bias and measurement error, as well as escalating costs of survey data collection. An approach, with limited costs, to tackle these challenges is the use of paradata. Paradata, data about the survey process, have always been present but the range and detail level of them have considerably increased with the computerization of the data collection process. Such data can be used to detect and eventually reduce systematic survey errors and increase data quality, during the fieldwork (adaptive designs) or in post-survey adjustment. Paradata can also be used to reduce the cost of the survey process as it is done to determine caps on the number of phone call attempts in telephone surveys.

We are interested in papers that apply the use of paradata to detect and improve data quality or/and reduce survey costs. For instance, time and timing are both linked to the survey costs and the data quality, two essential elements of a survey. The timing of the visits, calls or sent-out of questionnaire/request and reminders has been shown to be determining for survey participation. At the same time, requesting that interviewers work in the evening or at the weekend or making sure that the reminders to a Web or mail surveys are sent timely may have cost implications. Nonresponse error is not the only type of survey error to be linked to time: the time taken to answer a question, also called response latency, is known to echo the cognitive effort of the respondent and, hence, data quality. On the other hand, the interviewer speed can also influence data quality. Moreover the interviewer speed has been shown to be dependent of the rank of the interview.

The aim of this session is to reflect on possible links between paradata reflecting 'easy' measured characteristic of different steps of the survey process and data quality. Such a link could then help data collection manager and researcher to detect potential systematic survey errors in a fieldwork monitoring or post-evaluation context and lead to opportunities to prevent or correct for these errors. We invite papers demonstrating a link between paradata and data quality as well as papers showing how this link can be used to increase data quality or reduce cost.

1. Interview speed, interviewer experience and the fieldwork process

Ms Celine Wuyts (Centre for Sociological Research, KU Leuven)

Dr Caroline Vandeplass (Centre for Sociological Research, KU Leuven)

Professor Geert Loosveldt (Centre for Sociological Research, KU Leuven)

2. What took you so long? The determinants of interview length

Dr Tobias Schmidt (Deutsche Bundesbank)

Dr Kristina Altmann (Deutsche Bundesbank)

3. Paradata and what they show us

Miss Marina Vyrskaya (Laboratory for Social Research Methodology (Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration))

4. Hesitations in socially desirable responses in a smartphone survey

Ms Stefanie Fail (New School for Social Research)
Professor Michael Schober (New School for Social Research)
Professor Frederick Conrad (University of Michigan)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Measuring and modeling response behavior and response quality in web surveys 2

Chair Ms Carina Cornesse (Mannheim University and GESIS)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jean Philippe Décieux (Université du Luxembourg)
Coordinator 2 Ms Jessica Herzing (Mannheim University)
Coordinator 3 Professor Jochen Mayerl (University of Kaiserslautern)
Coordinator 4 Ms Alexandra Mergener (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)
Coordinator 5 Mr Philipp Sischka (Université du Luxembourg)

Session Details

Web surveys have become a popular method of data gathering for many reasons, including low costs and the ability to collect data rapidly. Due to the rapid infusion of web surveys and the technological progress, the number of respondents filling out web surveys on the run using mobile devices increases. When answering survey questions on mobile devices, respondents can take short-cuts to the optimal cognitive response processes that are partly caused by external disturbing factors such as time pressure, inattention or presence of other persons. Such a response behavior might introduce additional measurement error and thus influence response quality.

Yet, there are inconclusive results on how the “interview situation” of web surveys can influence response behavior and thus response quality. On one hand, many studies have shown that respondents in web surveys answer questions on personal or sensitive topics more honestly compared to respondents in personal or telephone interviews. This can be explained by the subjective impression of anonymity which is due to the absence of an interviewer. On the other hand, recent studies have shown that missing direct interaction to an interviewer can lead to careless responses and increased satisficing response behavior. Furthermore, web surveys are confronted with high unit and item nonresponse as well as increasing dropouts. In addition, response behavior and response quality of web surveys may correlate with the selectivity of the samples under study and recruitment methods of access panels.

Such ambivalent perspectives on response behavior and response quality of web surveys should be addressed and discussed in this session. When modeling response quality and response behavior, researchers can draw on different measures and correlates, such as paradata (e.g. time stamps, types of devices), respondent profile data (e.g. education, socio-economic background) or survey profile data (e.g. type of survey question, interview situation).

We invite submissions from researchers who analyze response behavior and response quality in web surveys. We especially encourage submissions of papers which include experiments covering the area of response quality in web surveys based on empirical data, and papers that use complex statistical models to identify different respondent types. Furthermore, we are interested in submissions on solutions for response quality issues, e.g. on how researchers can attract attention and motivation of respondents to proceed survey questions and to give valid answers as well as which factors improve or impair answer quality.

1. Who fails and who passes instructed response item attention checks in web surveys?

Dr Tobias Gummer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Joss Roßmann (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Henning Silber (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. Comparing the same Questionnaire between five Online Panels: A Study of the Effect of Recruitment Strategy on Survey Results

Professor Rainer Schnell (University of Duisburg-Essen)
Mr Leo Panreck (University of Duisburg-Essen)

3. Where, When, How and with What Do Panel Interviews Take Place and Is the Quality of Answers Affected by the Interview Situation?

Dr Stefan Niebrügge (INNOFACT AG)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Satisficing in Surveys: Theoretical and Methodological Developments 1

Chair Dr Joss Rossmann (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Dr Henning Silber (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 2 Dr Tobias Gummer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Satisficing theory (Krosnick 1991, 1999) provides a framework for the analysis of respondents' response behaviors in surveys and, accordingly, the quality of their responses. The theory basically distinguishes between three response strategies: First, optimizing refers to the complete and effortful execution of all four cognitive steps of the response process. That is, respondents have to interpret the question, retrieve relevant information from their memory, form a judgment based on the available information, and translate the judgment into a meaningful answer. Second, if the task of answering a question is difficult and respondents lack the necessary abilities or motivation to provide an accurate answer, they might decide to perform the steps of information retrieval and judgment less thoroughly to reduce their response efforts. Thus, weak satisficing results in merely satisfactory answers (e.g., selecting the first response option that seems acceptable). Third, under certain conditions respondents might simplify the response task even further by superficially interpreting questions and completely skipping the steps of information retrieval and judgment. Strong satisficing is indicated, among others, by providing random, nonsubstantive, or non-differentiated responses.

Since its introduction in survey methodology, the concept of satisficing has become one of the leading theoretical approaches in the examination and explanation of measurement error in surveys. With regard to its increasing popularity, we particularly welcome submissions that present advancements to the theory, introduce new methods to measure satisficing, show how satisficing theory can be applied to better understand the occurrence of observable response patterns, or present practical applications in question or survey design that aim at reducing satisficing in surveys.

Contributions may cover but are not limited to the following research topics:

- Theoretical advancements of satisficing theory
- Innovative measurement approaches (e.g., instructional manipulation checks, use of response latencies or other paradata)
- Consequences of satisficing (e.g., rounding/heaping, nonsubstantive answers to open-ended questions)
- Effects of survey mode on satisficing (e.g., findings from mixed-mode studies)
- Effects of the sampling methodology and sample characteristics on satisficing (e.g., comparisons of opt-in and probability-based online panels)
- Experimental evidence on how the occurrence of satisficing can be reduced (e.g., innovations in survey, question, or response scale design).

1. Satisficing in surveys: A systematic review of the literature

Professor CAROLINE ROBERTS (University of Lausanne)
Dr Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education)
Professor Nick Allum (University of Essex)
Ms Léïla Eisner (University of Lausanne)

2. Satisficing in online panels

Ms Carina Cornesse (Mannheim University and GESIS)
Professor Annelies Blom (Mannheim University)

3. Do question order effects generalize across cultures?

Professor Tobias Stark (Utrecht University)
Dr Henning Silber (GESIS)
Professor Jon Krosnick (Stanford University)
Professor Annelies Blom (University of Mannheim)

4. Within-Respondent Variation in Satisficing across Waves of a Panel Survey

Dr Joss Roßmann (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF1

Researching Sensitive Topics: Improving Theory and Survey Design 2

Chair Dr Ivar Krumpal (University of Leipzig)
Coordinator 1 Professor Ben Jann (University of Bern)
Coordinator 2 Professor Mark Trappmann (IAB Nürnberg)

Session Details

Social desirability bias is a problem in surveys collecting data on private issues, deviant behavior or unsocial opinions (e.g. sex,

health, income, illicit drug use, tax evasion or xenophobia) as soon as the respondents' true scores differ from social norms. Asking sensitive questions poses a dilemma to survey participants. On the one hand, politeness norms may oblige the respondent to be helpful and cooperative and self-report the sensitive personal information truthfully. On the other hand, the respondent may not trust in his or her data protection and may fear negative consequences from self-reporting norm-violating behavior or opinions. Cumulative empirical evidence shows that in the context of surveying sensitive issues respondents often engage in self-protective behavior, i.e. they either give socially desirable answers or they refuse to answer at all. Such systematic misreporting or nonresponse leads to biased estimates and poor data quality of the entire survey study. Specific data collection approaches were proposed to increase respondents' cooperation and improve validity of self-reports in sensitive surveys.

This session is about deepening our knowledge of the data generation process and advancing the theoretical basis of the ongoing debate about establishing best practices and designs for surveying sensitive topics. We invite submissions that deal with these problems and/or present potential solutions. In particular, we are interested in studies that (1) reason about the psychological processes and social interactions between the actors that are involved in the collection of the sensitive data; (2) present current empirical research focusing on 'question-and-answer' based (e.g. randomized response techniques, factorial surveys), non-reactive (e.g. record linkage approaches, field experiments or administrative data usage) or mixed methods of data collection (e.g. big data analyses in combination with classical survey approaches) focusing on the problem of social desirability; (3) deal with statistical procedures to analyze data generated with special data collection methods; (4) explore the possibilities and limits of integrating new and innovative data collection approaches for sensitive issues in well-established, large-scale population surveys taking into account problems of research ethics and data protection.

1. Estimating anti-immigrant sentiment and social desirability bias: item-counts in a mixed-modes survey

Dr Sebastian Rinken (Institute for Advanced Social Studies (IESA), Spanish Research Council (CSIC))
Dr Sara Pasadas del Amo (Institute for Advanced Social Studies (IESA), Spanish Research Council (CSIC))
Mr Juan Antonio Domínguez (Institute for Advanced Social Studies (IESA), Spanish Research Council (CSIC))

2. COMPARING REPORTING OF ABORTIONS IN TWO NATIONALLY REPRESENTATIVE SURVEYS: METHODOLOGICAL INFLUENCES

Ms Rachel Scott (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine)

3. A Comparison of Self-reported Sexual Identity Using Direct and Indirect Questioning

Miss Alessandra Gaia (Institute for Social and Economic Research)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Question Pretesting and Evaluation: Challenges and Current Practices 1

Chair Dr Cornelia Neuert (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Dr Ellen Ebralidze (LIfBi – Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 2 Kerstin Hoenig (LIfBi – Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

Prior to data collection, survey questions are typically tested and evaluated in some form of pretesting. Researchers and survey methodologists have a broad and continuously growing set of methods at their disposal. However, there is relatively little empirical evidence of the comparative effectiveness of different pretesting methods. Just as manifold as the methods available for testing survey questions are the practices and (in-house) styles currently used by different institutes such as the GESIS Pretest Lab and large-scale surveys such as the German National Educational Panel (NEPS). A large set of procedures and approaches for planning, conducting and analyzing cognitive pretesting exists, in particular with regard to study design, recruitment, sample design, protocol development, data collection and management, number and experience of interviewers, analysis and reporting of findings. Each of these methods has particular advantages, disadvantages, and costs. In addition to these methodological concerns, pretest projects often face practical challenges such as constraints in time, resources and staff or target populations that are hard to reach.

The aim of this session is to discuss current practices and to share experiences on questionnaire testing and evaluation. We encourage researchers/practitioners in the field to present papers on how they undertake cognitive testing in their day-to-day work addressing the following topics:

Sampling and recruitment

- Sample population
- Sample size
- Recruiting methods (participant pool, panels, snowballing, advertisements, recruitment agencies)
- Incentives

Conduction of cognitive pretests

- Who is doing the testing? / Number and training of interviewers
- Development and (Non)Standardization of interview protocol
- Use of methods outside the lab (online probing, virtual methods)
- Deployment of observers, recording or transcripts of interviews

- Number of iterations

Analysis of cognitive interviews

- Analytical strategies, techniques used, use of formalized coding schemes
- Data management
- Documentation of results
- Analysis software

Evaluation of pretesting methods

- Advantages and disadvantages of competing modes, techniques and procedures
- Establishing standards for the evaluation of different methods
- Multi-method pretest approaches

1. Practices and Challenges of Cognitive Pretesting for the German National Educational Panel (NEPS)

Dr Ellen Ebralidze (LIfBi - Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Mrs Kerstin Hoenig (LIfBi - Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

2. Question Pretesting Practices in a German PhD Panel Study

Ms Susanne de Vogel (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))
Ms Gesche Brandt (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))
Mr Kolja Briedis (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))
Mr Steffen Jaksztat (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))

3. Cognitive interviewing to test survey instruments to reduce measurement error – real life examples

Ms Karen Kellard (Australian National University)

4. US Statistical System Standards and Guidelines for Cognitive Interviewing Studies

Dr Kristen Miller (National Center for Health Statistics)
Dr Paul Scanlon (National Center for Health Statistics)

Tuesday 18th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

New technologies to improve the measurement of household finances

Chair Mr Alexander Wenz (University of Essex)
Coordinator 1 Professor Annette Jäckle (University of Essex)
Coordinator 2 Professor Mick Couper (University of Michigan)

Session Details

The emergence of new mobile technologies (including smartphones and tablets, activity trackers, barcode scanners, smart meters, etc), as well as the availability of new data sources (for example from online financial management services such as Mint.com), offer new possibilities for survey research. New technologies can potentially improve the scope and quality of data collected in surveys, and have distinct advantages over existing questionnaire-based methods of data collection.

The measurement of household finances is one particular area that could benefit from data collection using new mobile technologies. Existing surveys measure the financial circumstances of households with detailed question lists on income, wealth, and debts, and use diary methods to collect information on household expenditure. These surveys are not only long and burdensome for respondents, but they also rely heavily on the respondent's ability to recall financial information, decisions, and behaviors, and are hence prone to recall error.

New mobile technologies make it easier for respondents to provide accurate data, by reducing the need to recall information: mobile devices can be used to capture objective measures, for example by asking respondents to scan payslips or till receipts, or to log purchases with an app at the point of sale. Alternatively, mobile devices can be used for 'in-the-moment' surveys that are triggered at regular intervals or in pre-specified GPS locations, again reducing the need to recall information. Some types of data can also be captured passively, without involving the respondent in the data collection process. For example, information about financial transactions could be obtained from financial aggregators that respondents use to manage their finances, or information about consumer behavior from store loyalty cards. Despite these opportunities, researchers must keep in mind that mobile technologies introduce new methodological challenges and sources of error to the data collection process.

In this session, we welcome contributions that discuss applications of new technologies for the measurement of household finances.

We encourage proposals from researchers, including academic research, national statistics and market research, investigating for example:

- Which mobile and other new technologies can be used to collect financial data in surveys?
- What are the sources of Total Survey Error in data collected with new technologies? How do errors affecting representation and/or measurement compare to questionnaire-based data?
- Which methods can be used to maximize participation in data collection using new technologies?

1. Real Time Measurement of Household Electronic Financial Transactions in a Population Representative Panel

Dr Arie Kapteyn (Center for Economic and Social Research, University of Southern California)
Dr Marco Angrisani (Center for Economic and Social Research, University of Southern California)
Dr Swaroop Samek (Center for Economic and Social Research, University of Southern California)

2. Participation in a Mobile App survey to collect expenditure data as part of a large-scale probability household panel: response rates and response biases

Professor Annette Jackle (University of Essex)
Ms Carli Lessof (University of Southampton)
Dr Jonathan Burton (University of Essex)
Professor Mick P. Couper (University of Michigan)

3. Data quality from a Mobile App survey to collect expenditure data as part of a large-scale probability household panel survey

Ms Carli Lessof (National Centre for Research Methods, University of Southampton)
Professor Annette Jackle (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)
Dr Jon Burton (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)
Professor Mick Couper (Institute for Social Research and Joint Program in Survey Methodology, University of Michigan)

4. Improving diary keeping of daily expenditures with online diaries

Mrs Laura Erhard (Bureau of Labor Statistics)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 102

Linking Big Data and Surveys in Practice: Solutions for Respondents Privacy Protection

Chair Professor Rainer Schnell (City University London)

Session Details

Linking survey data to big data and administrative data is an increasingly popular research strategy in official statistics as well as in social and medical sciences. In research settings using micro data, privacy of respondents is of utmost importance. Examples are geocoded services or respondent addresses, where the actual locations have to be protected by statistical measures or mathematical transformations (geomasking). Similar problems result by the availability of mobility tracks produced by cars, phones or laptops. The problems are even more severe with biomarkers or genetic data. Finally, linking different databases and/or surveys is possible in practice only if the privacy of the respondents can be protected. This requires in many cases the use of Privacy Preserving Record Linkage Techniques.

During the last 10 years, the privacy problems created by the increasing availability of big data and survey data has given rise to many different mathematical and statistical techniques to preserve the privacy of the respondents. The goal of the session is the presentation of these techniques to a broader audience. Tutorials as well as recent developments are welcome. We invite presentations on:

1. Analyzing individual geographical data without revealing locations
2. Protecting anonymity in the analysis of mobility profiles
3. Privacy Preserving Record Linkage
4. Privacy of biomarkers and genetic data.

Research on informed consent will not be covered in this session. Statistical disclosure control is also considered as a topic for other sessions.

1. Putting people on the map without revealing their location: Privacy preserving locational distance computations

Professor Rainer Schnell (Universität Duisburg-Essen)
Mr Jonas Klingwort (Universität Duisburg-Essen)

2. An Overview of State of the Art Bloom Filter-based Privacy-preserving Record Linkage for Very Large Databases

Professor Rainer Schnell (University of Duisburg-Essen)
Mr Christian Borgs (University of Duisburg-Essen)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 104

The agony of attrition - challenges in longitudinal studies 1

Chair Ms Joanne Corey (Australian Bureau of Statistics)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jutta von Maurice (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

All of us working on longitudinal studies face the challenge of minimising attrition: respondents who move and don't update their contact details, as well as respondents who refuse for a variety of reasons. Engagement with study participants is vital.

This session is interested in hearing from survey methodologists and practitioners who work in this area and would be interested in sharing their experiences, successful or not.

For example, we would love to hear about:

- different engagement strategies
- incentives
- targeted approaches and follow up
- forays into the world of social media – what platform was used? How did you measure the success? What are the pitfalls?

Other relevant topics include:

- panel attrition in transition periods
- research on panel consent
- data collection methodologies aimed at increasing engagement
- engaging and novel methods of relaying study results back to participants

1. Data-Driven Incentives: Developing a Model-Based Framework for Incentives in the 2014 SIPP

Dr Jason Fields (U.S. Census Bureau)

2. Addressing differential response through the use of targeted financial incentives: Results from a pilot on the Growing Up in Scotland study

Ms Line Knudsen (ScotCen Social Research (Growing Up in Scotland study))

Mr Paul Bradshaw (ScotCen Social Research)

3. Participation patterns in longitudinal surveys: what can we learn from interviewers' evaluations?

Dr Oliver Lipps (FORS)

Dr Marieke Voorpostel (FORS)

4. Short- and Medium-Term Effects of Incentive Alterations in the NEPS Adult Survey

Mr Michael Ruland (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences, Germany)

Mrs Angelika Steinwede (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences, Germany)

Mrs Annette Trahms (Institute for Employment Research (IAB), Germany)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 105

Subjective well-being and Sustainable Development

Chair Dr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC)
Coordinator 1 Dr Malgorzata Mikucka (University of Leuven-la-Neuve)
Coordinator 2 Dr Chiara Peroni (STATEC)
Coordinator 3 Dr Charles Henri DiMaria (STATEC)
Coordinator 4 Dr Cesare Riillo (STATEC)

Session Details

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).

Moreover, the research on the determinants of subjective well-being provided numerous insights about what matters for people. A multidisciplinary literature provided theoretical grounds and empirical evidence that, among many determinants, a clean natural environment, such as the accessibility to green and noise-free areas, the availability of clean water and air, as well as a rich social environment are important elements for people's well-being. This evidence also suggests that pursuing people's

well-being is conducive to new life styles and forms of economic and social organizations that may be conducive to sustainable development.

This session invites contributions that address the relationship between subjective well-being, economic outcomes and sustainability. We are particularly interested in research addressing the following questions:

- What is the role of well-being and/or job satisfaction for economic outcomes such as productivity, entrepreneurship, innovation, employment, inequality, economic growth?
- Is the pursuit of well-being harmful to sustainability? Or does the pursuit of well-being reinforce sustainability?
- Do people care for a sustainable development?
- Do people care for a sustainable well-being?
- How to measure sustainability? Can we do this using subjective well-being measures?
- How to disentangle the complex causal relationships between subjective well-being and sustainability?

We welcome any paper addressing these and similar questions, including works critically challenging this approach.

1. The role of well-being for productivity in Europe: sectoral level analysis using survey and official statistics

Dr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC and HSE)

Dr Chiara Peroni (STATEC)

2. “The warden attitude: an investigation of the value of interaction with everyday wildlife”

Dr Mike Brock (University of East Anglia)

Professor Robert Sugden (University of East Anglia)

Professor Grischa Perino (University of Hamburg)

3. No well-being without sustainability- at least for the young generation

Dr Kathrin Gärtner (Statistics Austria)

Mr Manfred Zentner (Danube University Krems)

4. When Does Economic Growth Improve Subjective Well-being? Multilevel Analysis of the Roles of Social Trust and Income Inequality in 44 Countries, 1981-2011

Ms Malgorzata Mikucka (Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium)

Mr Francesco Sarracino (Statec, Luxembourg)

Mr Joshua Kjerulf Dubrow (Polish Academy of Sciences)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 106

Questionnaire translation in theory and practice: achievements, challenges, and innovations 2

Chair Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Ms Brita Dorer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 2 Dr Alisú Schoua-Glusberg (Research Support Services Inc.)

Session Details

The field of questionnaire translation in cross-national and cross-cultural research has slowly begun, but it has taken up speed and become prominent in survey projects and research since the 1990s at the latest. Best practice in terms of methods (committee approach, back translation, pretesting, translator profiles, etc.) has driven the field; this topic has made immense progress but it is a never-ending story nevertheless, especially if considered in a cross-disciplinary perspective (survey methodology, health, psychology, education, business). The importance of cultural factors, which impact both on language and item content, is nowadays pervasive. However, within survey methodology but also in other and across disciplines, many different meanings – and possibly false restrictions – are attached to the concepts of adoption, translation, adaptation or localization. There is more agreement on the provision of background information on concepts or terms, which was already called for in 1948 (!) (Barioux) and is now a key feature of comparative research. There is by now also agreement on early integration and involvement of translation and translation experts when designing a source questionnaire. The methods of advance translation or translatability assessment embody this strand. IT and translation tools are slowly gaining a foothold in the form of dedicated portals and translation tools, or of corpus linguistics. IT supports both the macro-processes (various stages of translating, assessing and testing) and the micro-processes (the translation as such). Against the backdrop of all these developments, it is a bit surprising that (systematic) empirical research on the effects of different translation versions is still missing – but also here, research has sprung up, the European SERISS project being a prime example.

Researchers and practitioners are invited to present on achievements in the field of questionnaire translation, on topics that are still inconclusive or challenging, and on innovations. Presentations can tackle any of the aforementioned themes, but they can

also go beyond those. Presenters can look into the theory but also present their applications in cross-national and cross-cultural survey research and their lesson learned.

1. Translating Scales: From Scalespeak to Common Language

Dr Alisu Schoua-Glusberg (Research Support Services)

2. EXPERIMENT FOR TESTING QUESTIONNAIRE TRANSLATION METHODS IN THE EUROPEAN SOCIAL SURVEY (ESS): CLOSE VERSUS MORE ADAPTIVE APPROACHES

Ms Brita Dorer (GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Ana Villar (City, University of London)

3. The introduction of a Polish language survey to the Irish European Social Survey, Round 8

Dr Amy E Healy (Mary Immaculate College, UL)

Dr Siobhán Howard (Mary Immaculate College, UL)

Dr Brendan O'Keeffe (Mary Immaculate College, UL)

4. The Double Source Double Translation Design in the HPEI

Mr Steve Dept (cApStAn Linguistic Quality Control)

Mrs Danina Lupsa (cApStAn Linguistic Quality Control)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 107

Surveying Children and Young People 3

Chair Ms Kate Smith (Centre for Longitudinal Studies)

Coordinator 1 Dr Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies)

Session Details

Many large-scale surveys successfully collect a variety of different types of data from children and young people (up to the age of 25). 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 young people in research. This session will cover challenges and experiences of including children and young people in surveys, as they move from childhood to adults and related survey design issues. A major challenge when interviewing teenagers is that while children's participation in surveys is often mediated by and involves their parents, teenagers and young people make autonomous decisions, bringing challenges particularly in terms of engagement. The session aims to explore a variety of methodological issues around surveying young people. Submissions are particularly welcomed on:

- designing questionnaires for children and young people, including question testing methods
- collecting data on sensitive topics from young people, including methods for ensuring privacy and encouraging accurate reporting
- collecting different types of data from children and young people including physical measurements and cognitive assessments
- 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 children and young people with lower literacy levels
- assessing the reliability and validity of children and 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
- the challenges of retaining young people's contact and interest in surveys over time
- ethical issues in involving children and young people in surveys, including gaining informed consent and protecting young people's rights and well-being

1. Surveying pupil over their school career: Some methodological recommendations

Dr Sven Stadtmüller (Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences)

Mr Robert Lipp (Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences)

Professor Andreas Klocke (Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences)

Mrs Andrea Giersiefen (Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences)

2. Cross-cultural variations in the effect of student proxy reports on household socio-economic status

Dr Jill Wittrock (University of Northern Iowa)

Dr Linda Kimmel (University of Michigan)

Dr Anna Cotter (University of Michigan)

Dr Kien Trung Le (Qatar University)

3. Nonresponse In Educational Dyadic Multi-actor Studies

Dr Hans Walter Steinhauer (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Dr Christian Aßmann (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

4. Concordance of well-being reported by children and their parents are influenced by children's disease and rating scale types

Professor Jin-Shei Lai (Northwestern University)
Ms Jennifer Beaumont (Northwestern University)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 108

Mixed Methods - Epistemological and Methodological Issues 1

Chair Dr Leila Akremi (Technical University Berlin, Germany)

Coordinator 1 Dr Susanne Vogl (University of Vienna, Austria)

Session Details

Mixed Methods research has a long tradition in social science and currently under major resurgence. In this session we would like to stimulate an exchange over methodological and epistemological issues arising from Mixed Methods research: Do we move 'beyond paradigms' with Mixed Methods research? What are lessons learned from empirical Mixed Methods research from a methodological perspective? What has to be considered or which specific problems have to be solved during the different phases of the research process?

We welcome presentations on any kind of combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. Therefore the proposals can focus on different aspects and problems during the research process in Mixed Methods studies, e.g. different research questions, which require different approaches and types of data to be answered; combinations of different data collection methods; dealing with different types of data; data analysis and integration of the findings etc.

As we would like to reflect upon epistemological and methodological implications of Mixed Methods research in this session, proposals only dealing with mere presentations of the Mixed Methods design will not be considered. However, the proposals can be work in progress and do not have to offer fully developed theoretical frameworks, but they should inspire a discussion on methodological issues in Mixed Methods research.

1. Can Mixed Methods Research be a third paradigm?

Dr Noemi Novello (Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca)

Professor Alessandra Decataldo (Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca)

2. Paradigms lost!? – Some Critical Remarks on Supposed Epistemological Foundations of Mono- and Mixed-Methods-Research

Professor Udo Kelle (Helmut-Schmidt-University, Hamburg)

3. At first there was theory! - Why mixing methods is not a methodological problem.

Dr Frank Beier (Technical University Dresden)

4. Applying Andrew Abbott's "Fractal Heuristics" to Mixed Methods and Multimethod Research

Dr Felix Knappertsbusch (Justus-Liebig-University, Giessen, Germany)

5. Where do my methods come from? Unpacking the role of mixed-methods background in the process of becoming a reflexive researcher

Dr Aneta Piekut (Sheffield Methods Institute, University of Sheffield)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 109

Values in Development: New Findings and New Challenges from the World Values Survey

Chair Ms Kseniya Kizilova (World Values Survey Association)

Coordinator 1 Dr Tatiana Karabchuk (United Arab Emirates University)

Coordinator 2 Professor Christian Haerpfer (World Values Survey Association)

Coordinator 3 Professor Eduard Ponarin (High School of Economics)

Session Details

The World Values Survey (WVS) is an international research program devoted to study of social, political, cultural, religious and other values of people in different parts of the world. One of the project main goals is to analyse values, norms and beliefs in

comparative cross-national and over-time perspective and to assess how values stability or change influences social, economic and political development of societies. The survey shows what people want out of their lives, what is important for them and what is less, in what they believe, their ideas about the right and wrong things.

Over the years, the World Values Survey has proved the importance of population value study and has demonstrated that people's beliefs play a key role in economic development, emergence and flourishing of democratic institutions, rise of gender equality, and the extent to which societies have effective government.

Present session unites papers which make use of the WVS data and disclose its comparative, analytical and explanatory potential in studying values, well-being, participation, support for democracy, tolerance for foreigners and ethnic minorities, support for gender equality, the role of religion and changing levels of religiosity, the impact of globalization, attitudes toward the environment, work, family, politics, national identity, culture, diversity, security, electoral integrity, and etc. Additionally, we invite paper-givers discussing advantages and limitations of the WVS data and survey methodology for over-time and cross-national comparison.

1. Muslim Migrants on the Flight to Europe. Multilevel cross-classified analysis of migrant gender attitudes compared to sending and receiving societies

Mrs Veronica Kostenko (Laboratory for Comparative Social Research, Higher School of Economics)

2. Revisiting Schwartz human values of young people in Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia

Dr Wiebke Weber (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Dr Laur Lilleoja (Tallinn University)

Dr Elena Sanchez Montijano (CIDOB Barcelona Centre for International Affairs)

Mr Moussa Bourekba (CIDOB Barcelona Centre for International Affairs)

3. Secularisation and Sectarian Conflict

Dr Roberto Foa (University of Melbourne)

Professor Ronald Inglehart (University of Michigan)

4. A New Post-Soviet Value System or Old Values in New Clothes? 20 years of Cultural, Religious and Social Value Changes in Russia and the CIS 1994 - 2011

Miss Kseniya Kizilova (World Values Survey Association)

Professor Christian Haerpfer (World Values Survey Association)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N AUD4

Improving Response in Government Surveys 1

Chair Dr Kerry Levin (Westat)

Coordinator 1 Dr Jocelyn Newsome (Westat)

Coordinator 2 Ms Brenda Schafer (Internal Revenue Service)

Session Details

Government-sponsored household surveys continue to face historically low response rates (Groves, 2011; de Heer, 1999). Low response can correlate with response bias, since nonresponse is rarely uniform across groups or subgroups of interest. As a result, many government surveys focus heavily on maximizing response, often at a high cost (Tourangeau & Plewes, 2013; Stoop et al, 2010). For example, the cost of the U.S. census has more than doubled over the past several decades, from \$16 per household in 1970 to \$98 per household in 2010 (2010 Census GAO Report).

Survey methodologists have sought to address the problem of nonresponse by implementing a number of interventions to increase respondent engagement, minimize burden, and reduce response bias. Methodologists have suggested a variety of intervention strategies, including: offering surveys in multiple survey modes; limiting survey length; emphasizing official sponsorship; offering incentives; making multiple, distinct communication attempts; utilizing respondent-centric design; and targeting messaging to the intended audience (Dillman, 2014). However, the effectiveness of these strategies vary widely, and researchers continue to explore how to best implement these strategies in a cost-effective manner.

This session will explore innovative approaches for increasing response in government-sponsored household surveys.

Researchers are invited to submit papers discussing experiments or pilot studies on any of the following topics:

- Multimode survey design, including optimizing for mobile devices, to encourage response;
- Improving response through the use of incentives, targeted messaging, or multiple distinct forms of follow-up;
- Interviewer techniques that encourage response;
- Use of paradata to improve response;
- Impact of survey length on response; and
- Attempts to increase response from hard-to-reach populations of interest.

References

2010 Census: Preliminary Lessons Learned Highlight the Need for Fundamental Reforms. GAO- 11-496T. Washington, D.C.: April 6, 2011.

De Heer, W. (1999). International response trends: results of an international survey. *Journal of official statistics*, 15(2), 129.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: the tailored design

method. John Wiley & Sons.

Groves, R. M. (2011). Three eras of survey research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 75(5), 861-871.

Stoop, I., Billiet, J., Koch, A., & Fitzgerald, R. (2010). Improving survey response: Lessons learned from the European Social Survey. John Wiley & Sons.

Tourangeau, R. & Plewes, T. J. (Eds.). (2013). Nonresponse in social science surveys: a research agenda. National Research Council.

1. International Trends in Household Survey Nonresponse: The Labour Force Survey

Professor Edith de Leeuw (Utrecht University)

Professor Joop Hox (Utrecht University)

Dr Annemieke Luiten (Statistics Netherlands)

Dr Barry Schouten (Statistics Netherlands)

2. Experiments to improve response in a government survey

Dr Jocelyn Newsome (Westat)

Dr Kerry Levin (Westat)

Ms Hanyu Sun (Westat)

Ms Jennifer McNulty (Westat)

Ms Brenda Schafer (IRS)

Mr Pat Langetieg (IRS)

Dr Saurabh Datta (IRS)

3. Turning things around: Ways to improve response in pension-related surveys

Mr Jochen Heckmann (Kantar Public Germany)

Dr Thorsten Heien (Kantar Public Germany)

4. Improving Response in Multimode and Single Mode Probability Based Surveys Compared to a Non-probability Survey

Dr Virginia Lesser (Oregon State University)

Ms Kerri Nawrocki (Oregon State University)

Ms Lydia Newton (Oregon State University)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N AUD5

It's the Interviewers! New developments in interviewer effects research 3

- Chair** Dr Salima Douhou (City University of London, CCSS)
Coordinator 1 Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 2 Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 3 Dr Kathrin Thomas (City University of London, CCSS)
Coordinator 4 Mr Joel Williams (TNS BMRB)

Session Details

To what extent do interviewers affect data collection and how can we better monitor and limit their impact?

Any deviation from the standardised protocol of the data collection process has the potential to induce bias to the data. Interviewer effects, defined as the distortions of survey responses in surveys with interviewer presence, may have a severe impact on data quality. These effects result from potential reactions to the social style and personality of interviewers, but also to their presentation of questions.

Analysis based on data that are biased by interviewer intervention and the conclusions drawn on the basis of this are likely to be incorrect. Hence, survey methodologists have improved the way in which interviewers are trained and briefed in order to limit the interviewers' influence. Yet, it remains open why even in surveys with exceptional efforts to train and monitor interviewers, interviewer effects occur.

Interviewers make (initial) contact with the prospective respondents and attempt to convince them to participate in the survey. The doorstep interaction between prospective respondents and interviewers is rarely documented, but an increasing number of studies indicates that some interviewers are more successful than others in convincing the prospective respondents to participate in a survey and to avoid non-response.

Once door-step interaction has been successful, interviewers may further affect the way in which respondents answer the survey questions on the questionnaire. Variation in survey responses may be due to the attitudes, interpersonal skills and personality of interviewers, but also relate to how the interviewers present particular questions and how strictly they follow the instructions. Any deviation from the standardised protocol provided by the core research team of the survey project decreases the comparability of the survey responses.

This session welcomes papers on new developments in the area of interviewer effects. Topics may include but are not restricted to:

- methodological developments in measuring and modelling interviewer effects,
- interviewer effects on measurement error,
- interviewer effects on nonresponse rates and nonresponse bias,
- interviewer influences on response latencies (timings),
- influence of personality traits, behaviour, attitudes, experience, and other characteristics of interviewers on survey estimates,
- implications for interviewer recruitment and training strategies,
- monitoring and evaluation of fieldwork efforts by interviewers,
- collection of GPS data or audio-visual material of door-step interactions.

Papers that discuss these issues from a comparative perspective are also welcome. We invite academic and non-academic researchers and survey practitioners to contribute to our session.

1. Interviewer Effects in Large-Scale Assessments of Competence: Using posterior distributions to identify interviewers with effects on the assessment

Miss Theresa Rohm (Research Assistant)

Dr Timo Gnambs (Postdoctoral Researcher)

Miss Luise Fischer (Research Assistant)

Professor Claus H. Carstensen (Head of Psychology and methods of educational research)

2. Minimising interviewer effects on the Crime Survey for England and Wales

Mr Luke Taylor (Kantar Public)

Mr Adam Green (Kantar Public)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N 101

Overview of open access European survey data 3

Chair Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (SHARE – Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)

Coordinator 1 Ms Sabine Friedel (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)

Session Details

In recent years, many large sets of survey data have been made available to the scientific community. Large national and European surveys, such as ESS, SHARE, SOEP, Understanding Society, etc., disseminate their data to registered users. For researchers it can be difficult to get a good overview of what is offered and to find the specific variables and samples of their interest.

This session aims to give researchers more insight into the variety of variables available in large survey datasets. For that purpose, we invite survey practitioners to present their data sets, longitudinal as well as cross-sectional, to potential users. Presentations should address the following survey characteristics: Research field, target population and sample, survey design, data access regulations, available survey variables and paradata, linked administrative data (if applicable), and some examples of data use. Moreover, we especially welcome overviews including information which can be used for methodological analysis, such as key stroke data, auxiliary information, interviewer characteristics and observations, response behavior, experimental designs, etc.

1. Understanding Society: The UK Household Longitudinal Study

Dr Jonathan Burton (ISER, University of Essex)

2. The Swiss Household Panel

Dr Marieke Voorpostel (FORS)

Dr Oliver Lipps (FORS)

Dr Ursina Kuhn (FORS)

3. The German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP): Overview and new developments

Dr Jan Goebel (DIW Berlin / SOEP)

4. Second European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risks (ESENER-2)

Mr Xabier Irastorza (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Using paradata to assess and improve survey data quality 3

Chair Dr Caroline Vandenplas (KULeuven)
Coordinator 1 Professor Geert Loosveldt (KULeuven)
Coordinator 2 Dr Koen Beullens (KULeuven)

Session Details

Survey methodologists are currently facing challenges of declining response rates, increasing risk of nonresponse bias and measurement error, as well as escalating costs of survey data collection. An approach, with limited costs, to tackle these challenges is the use of paradata. Paradata, data about the survey process, have always been present but the range and detail level of them have considerably increased with the computerization of the data collection process. Such data can be used to detect and eventually reduce systematic survey errors and increase data quality, during the fieldwork (adaptive designs) or in post-survey adjustment. Paradata can also be used to reduce the cost of the survey process as it is done to determine caps on the number of phone call attempts in telephone surveys.

We are interested in papers that apply the use of paradata to detect and improve data quality or/and reduce survey costs. For instance, time and timing are both linked to the survey costs and the data quality, two essential elements of a survey. The timing of the visits, calls or sent-out of questionnaire/request and reminders has been shown to be determining for survey participation. At the same time, requesting that interviewers work in the evening or at the weekend or making sure that the reminders to a Web or mail surveys are sent timely may have cost implications. Nonresponse error is not the only type of survey error to be linked to time: the time taken to answer a question, also called response latency, is known to echo the cognitive effort of the respondent and, hence, data quality. On the other hand, the interviewer speed can also influence data quality. Moreover the interviewer speed has been shown to be dependent of the rank of the interview.

The aim of this session is to reflect on possible links between paradata reflecting 'easy' measured characteristic of different steps of the survey process and data quality. Such a link could then help data collection manager and researcher to detect potential systematic survey errors in a fieldwork monitoring or post-evaluation context and lead to opportunities to prevent or correct for these errors. We invite papers demonstrating a link between paradata and data quality as well as papers showing how this link can be used to increase data quality or reduce cost.

1. Assessing non-response bias in the 6th European Working Conditions Survey

Dr Gijs van Houten (Eurofound)
Mr Mathijn Wilkens (Eurofound)
Dr Aleksandra Wilczynska (Kantar Public Brussels)

2. Predicting panel attrition using panel meta-data: A machine learning approach

Dr Thomas Klausch (VU University Medical Center Amsterdam)

3. The Influence of HEI Practitioners on the Response Rate

Mr Lars Müller (INCHER-Kassel, Universität Kassel, Germany)
Mr René Kooij (ISTAT - Institut für angewandte Statistik, Kassel, Germany)

4. Using paradata-based key performance indicators to monitor implementation of a split-ballot experiment

Mrs Aneta Guenova (U.S. Department of State)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Push2web surveys: How to encourage people to go online when using a different contact mode? 1

Chair Ms Gerry Nicolaas (Ipsos MORI)
Coordinator 1 Dr Patten Smith (Ipsos MORI)

Session Details

The term 'push-to-web' was first used by Don Dillman and colleagues to describe surveys that use traditional modes of contact to encourage people to go online and complete a web questionnaire. This design may or may not offer alternative modes of data collection but, if so, only in subsequent contact attempts among those who failed to complete the web questionnaire. In recent years we have observed increasing use of push2web survey designs for random probability surveys of the general population, including surveys that produce official statistics. Furthermore, this design has recently been used for the 2015 Japanese Census and it is envisaged that a similar design will be used for the UK 2021 Census.

The main challenge for push2web surveys is obtaining an acceptable web response rate. Even among populations with high internet access, web response rates tend to be much lower than surveys using traditional data collection modes (Lozar Manfreda et al., 2008). It would seem that the extra effort to go online and to follow instructions for accessing and completing a web questionnaire acts as a strong disincentive to participation. Offering an alternative mode to web non-respondents is an

effective method for boosting the final response rate but some studies have shown that equivalent (Millar and Dillman, 2011) or even higher response rates (Messer and Dillman, 2011; Lynn, 2013) can be achieved when the alternative mode is offered on its own without the option of completing the questionnaire online. Furthermore, alternative modes are more expensive and their use will reduce potential cost savings significantly. This is particularly true when the web response rate is much lower than the final response rate.

The aim of this session is to explore a variety of methods for boosting web response rates when contact has to be made using traditional modes such as postal, telephone and face-to-face. The session welcomes papers on contact strategies, incentives, and mode sequencing. Papers exploring how smartphones can be utilised to increase web response rates in push2web designs are also welcome. We also invite papers on methods for encouraging participation in such a way that aims to enhance sample representativeness and reduce the risk of nonresponse bias.

1. The worldwide increase in use of web-push methods that start with a mail contact; what have we learned and where might we be going?

Dr Don Dillman (Washington State University)

2. Push2web or less is more? Experimental evidence from a mixed-mode population survey at the community level in Germany

Dr Robert Neumann (Technische Universität Dresden)
Professor Michael Häder (Technische Universität Dresden)
Mr Oliver Brust (Technische Universität Dresden)
Mrs Elisabeth Dittrich (Technische Universität Dresden)
Mr Hagen von Hermanni (Technische Universität Dresden)

3. Transformed respondent engagement strategy; an overview of the research at ONS to develop respondent materials

Miss Laura Wilson (Office for National Statistics)
Miss Sophie Nickson (Office for National Statistics)

4. Quantitative testing of the most effective advance communication strategies for a mixed mode (including online) UK Labour Force Survey

Mr Andrew Phelps (Office for National Statistics)

5. The 2016 Canadian Census: An Innovative Wave Collection Methodology to Maximize Self-Response and Internet Response

Mr Patrice Mathieu (Statistics Canada)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Satisficing in Surveys: Theoretical and Methodological Developments 2

Chair Dr Joss Rossmann (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Dr Henning Silber (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 2 Dr Tobias Gummer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Satisficing theory (Krosnick 1991, 1999) provides a framework for the analysis of respondents' response behaviors in surveys and, accordingly, the quality of their responses. The theory basically distinguishes between three response strategies: First, optimizing refers to the complete and effortful execution of all four cognitive steps of the response process. That is, respondents have to interpret the question, retrieve relevant information from their memory, form a judgment based on the available information, and translate the judgment into a meaningful answer. Second, if the task of answering a question is difficult and respondents lack the necessary abilities or motivation to provide an accurate answer, they might decide to perform the steps of information retrieval and judgment less thoroughly to reduce their response efforts. Thus, weak satisficing results in merely satisfactory answers (e.g., selecting the first response option that seems acceptable). Third, under certain conditions respondents might simplify the response task even further by superficially interpreting questions and completely skipping the steps of information retrieval and judgment. Strong satisficing is indicated, among others, by providing random, nonsubstantive, or non-differentiated responses.

Since its introduction in survey methodology, the concept of satisficing has become one of the leading theoretical approaches in the examination and explanation of measurement error in surveys. With regard to its increasing popularity, we particularly welcome submissions that present advancements to the theory, introduce new methods to measure satisficing, show how satisficing theory can be applied to better understand the occurrence of observable response patterns, or present practical applications in question or survey design that aim at reducing satisficing in surveys.

Contributions may cover but are not limited to the following research topics:

- Theoretical advancements of satisficing theory
- Innovative measurement approaches (e.g., instructional manipulation checks, use of response latencies or other paradata)
- Consequences of satisficing (e.g., rounding/heaping, nonsubstantive answers to open-ended questions)

- Effects of survey mode on satisficing (e.g., findings from mixed-mode studies)
- Effects of the sampling methodology and sample characteristics on satisficing (e.g., comparisons of opt-in and probability-based online panels)
- Experimental evidence on how the occurrence of satisficing can be reduced (e.g., innovations in survey, question, or response scale design).

1. Heaping in self-reported income data - a kind of weak satisficing

Ms Ariane Würbach (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LifBi))

2. Question Difficulty and Measurement Error

Dr Henning Silber (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Tobias Gummer (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Joss Roßmann (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. Satisficing and Errors in Reporting Pensions: How Do Difficulty, Ability, and Motivation Influence the Errors in Reporting Pensions Due to Old Age?

Mr Patrick Lazarevic (TU Dortmund University)

4. The Factorial Survey: The Dependency of the Response Behaviour on the Presentation Format and the Answer Format of Vignettes

Professor Hermann Dülmer (University of Cologne)

Dr Hawal Shamon (University of Cologne)

Mr Adam Giza (Institut der Deutschen Wirtschaft Köln)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q4 ANF1

Researching Sensitive Topics: Improving Theory and Survey Design 3

Chair Dr Ivar Krumpal (University of Leipzig)

Coordinator 1 Professor Ben Jann (University of Bern)

Coordinator 2 Professor Mark Trappmann (IAB Nürnberg)

Session Details

Social desirability bias is a problem in surveys collecting data on private issues, deviant behavior or unsocial opinions (e.g. sex, health, income, illicit drug use, tax evasion or xenophobia) as soon as the respondents' true scores differ from social norms. Asking sensitive questions poses a dilemma to survey participants. On the one hand, politeness norms may oblige the respondent to be helpful and cooperative and self-report the sensitive personal information truthfully. On the other hand, the respondent may not trust in his or her data protection and may fear negative consequences from self-reporting norm-violating behavior or opinions. Cumulative empirical evidence shows that in the context of surveying sensitive issues respondents often engage in self-protective behavior, i.e. they either give socially desirable answers or they refuse to answer at all. Such systematic misreporting or nonresponse leads to biased estimates and poor data quality of the entire survey study. Specific data collection approaches were proposed to increase respondents' cooperation and improve validity of self-reports in sensitive surveys.

This session is about deepening our knowledge of the data generation process and advancing the theoretical basis of the ongoing debate about establishing best practices and designs for surveying sensitive topics. We invite submissions that deal with these problems and/or present potential solutions. In particular, we are interested in studies that (1) reason about the psychological processes and social interactions between the actors that are involved in the collection of the sensitive data; (2) present current empirical research focusing on 'question-and-answer' based (e.g. randomized response techniques, factorial surveys), non-reactive (e.g. record linkage approaches, field experiments or administrative data usage) or mixed methods of data collection (e.g. big data analyses in combination with classical survey approaches) focusing on the problem of social desirability; (3) deal with statistical procedures to analyze data generated with special data collection methods; (4) explore the possibilities and limits of integrating new and innovative data collection approaches for sensitive issues in well-established, large-scale population surveys taking into account problems of research ethics and data protection.

1. Protection of Privacy in the Item Count Technique

Professor Tasos Christofides (University of Cyprus)

Miss Eleni Manoli (University of Cyprus)

2. A Recent Advancement of the List Experiment for Asking Sensitive Questions in Surveys: Empirical Evidence on the Performance of the Person-Count-Technique

Dr Felix Wolter (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Department of Sociology)

3. An Enhanced Item Sum Design for Measuring Quantitative Sensitive Behaviors

Dr Ivar Krumpal (University of Leipzig)

Professor Ben Jann (University of Bern)

Dr Martin Korndörfer (University of Leipzig)
Professor Stefan Schmukle (University of Leipzig)

4. Multiple sensitive estimation and optimal sample allocation in the item sum technique

Miss Beatriz Cobo Rodríguez (University of Granada)
Mr Pier Francesco Perri (University of Calabria)
Mrs María del Mar Rueda García (University of Granada)

Tuesday 18th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Question Pretesting and Evaluation: Challenges and Current Practices 2

Chair Dr Cornelia Neuert (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Dr Ellen Ebralidze (LIfBi – Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 2 Kerstin Hoenig (LIfBi – Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

Prior to data collection, survey questions are typically tested and evaluated in some form of pretesting. Researchers and survey methodologists have a broad and continuously growing set of methods at their disposal. However, there is relatively little empirical evidence of the comparative effectiveness of different pretesting methods. Just as manifold as the methods available for testing survey questions are the practices and (in-house) styles currently used by different institutes such as the GESIS Pretest Lab and large-scale surveys such as the German National Educational Panel (NEPS). A large set of procedures and approaches for planning, conducting and analyzing cognitive pretesting exists, in particular with regard to study design, recruitment, sample design, protocol development, data collection and management, number and experience of interviewers, analysis and reporting of findings. Each of these methods has particular advantages, disadvantages, and costs. In addition to these methodological concerns, pretest projects often face practical challenges such as constraints in time, resources and staff or target populations that are hard to reach.

The aim of this session is to discuss current practices and to share experiences on questionnaire testing and evaluation. We encourage researchers/practitioners in the field to present papers on how they undertake cognitive testing in their day-to-day work addressing the following topics:

Sampling and recruitment

- Sample population
- Sample size
- Recruiting methods (participant pool, panels, snowballing, advertisements, recruitment agencies)
- Incentives

Conduction of cognitive pretests

- Who is doing the testing? / Number and training of interviewers
- Development and (Non)Standardization of interview protocol
- Use of methods outside the lab (online probing, virtual methods)
- Deployment of observers, recording or transcripts of interviews
- Number of iterations

Analysis of cognitive interviews

- Analytical strategies, techniques used, use of formalized coding schemes
- Data management
- Documentation of results
- Analysis software

Evaluation of pretesting methods

- Advantages and disadvantages of competing modes, techniques and procedures
- Establishing standards for the evaluation of different methods
- Multi-method pretest approaches

1. Challenges of pre-testing business surveys online: Ensuring quality in accessible design

Mrs Emma Timm (Office for National Statistics, UK)
Mr Jordan Stewart (Office for National Statistics, UK)
Miss Bethan Phillips (Office for National Statistics, UK)

2. Usability testing as a method for evaluating self-completion survey instruments; what have we learned in practice and where do we go next?

Mr Tim Hanson (Kantar Public)
Ms Alice McGee (Kantar Public)

3. A joint implementation of cognitive interviewing and eye tracking to pretest survey questions

Dr Cornelia Neuert (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Timo Lenzner (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. Pretesting Retrospective Life History Questions for a Self-Administered Mail Survey in the Health and Retirement Study

Mr Brian Wells (University of Michigan)

Dr Mary Beth Ofstedal (University of Michigan)

Dr Jacqui Smith (University of Michigan)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 102

Administrative data linking: why not?

Chair Dr Paula Devine (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)

Coordinator 1 Professor Gillian Robinson (ARK, Ulster University)

Session Details

The linking of survey and administrative data is an exciting development within survey research. It provides opportunities to learn more about our population and society in ways that were previously unimaginable. Unsurprisingly, analysts have spent much time developing anonymisation, linking and statistical techniques to exploit these data.

However, the linking of administrative and survey data is not a problem-free process, since it takes place within specific political, social and cultural contexts. Thus, this session will explicitly focus on the ethical and governance issues related to data linkage and sharing.

Papers of interest in this session may explore:

- Ethical issues relating to the linking of survey and administrative data;
- Public knowledge and understanding of public and private data;
- Public understanding of, and support for, data linkage;
- Governance arrangements for data linking, and examples of good or bad practice;
- Case studies of research based on linked survey and administrative data, highlighting ethical and governance lessons for others embarking on this process.

Papers focusing solely on the methodological and statistical issues involved in administrative data research are directed to other sessions.

1. Exploring usage of administrative data in social science research

Dr Tom Emery (NIDI)

2. Administrative Data Linkage: The Data Archive Perspective

Dr Peter Granda (University of Michigan)

3. Public understanding of administrative data linking in Northern Ireland

Dr Paula Devine (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)

Professor Gillian Robinson (ARK, Ulster University)

4. Understanding young people's views about consenting to data linkage: findings from the PEARL qualitative study

Mr Andy Boyd (University of Bristol)

Dr Suzanne Audrey (University of Bristol)

Dr Lindsey Brown (Independent Researcher)

Professor Rona Campbell (University of Bristol)

Professor John Macleod (University of Bristol)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 104

The agony of attrition - challenges in longitudinal studies 2

Chair Ms Joanne Corey (Australian Bureau of Statistics)

Coordinator 1 Dr Jutta von Maurice (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

All of us working on longitudinal studies face the challenge of minimising attrition: respondents who move and don't update their contact details, as well as respondents who refuse for a variety of reasons. Engagement with study participants is vital.

This session is interested in hearing from survey methodologists and practitioners who work in this area and would be interested in sharing their experiences, successful or not.

For example, we would love to hear about:

- different engagement strategies
- incentives
- targeted approaches and follow up
- forays into the world of social media – what platform was used? How did you measure the success? What are the pitfalls?

Other relevant topics include:

- panel attrition in transition periods
- research on panel consent
- data collection methodologies aimed at increasing engagement
- engaging and novel methods of relaying study results back to participants

1. Lessons from New Zealand - Growing Up but not Giving Up

Dr Susan Morton (University of Auckland)

2. A longitudinal online study of mortgage shopping: Who drops out?

Dr Alycia Chin (CFPB)

Dr Mick Couper (University of Michigan)

Dr Dustin Beckett (CFPB)

3. Using web-CATI surveys in the context of a longitudinal cohort study: Experiences from the Growing Up in Scotland study

Ms Line Knudsen (ScotCen Social Research (Growing Up in Scotland study))

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 105

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

Chair Ms Malgorzata Mikucka (Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium)

Coordinator 1 Mr Francesco Sarracino (Statec, Luxembourg)

Coordinator 2 Ms Tatiana Karabchuk (United Arab Emirates University)

Session Details

The availability of repeated cross-sectional surveys and of panel data allows analyzing social change over time. This type 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. Life-Long Occupational Careers: A Dynamic Study Based on Data from the Polish Panel Survey, POLPAN 1988-2013

Professor Kazimierz Slomczynski (The Ohio State University, Polish Academy of Sciences and CONSIRT)

Dr Irina Tomescu-Dubrow (Polish Academy of Sciences and CONSIRT)

Dr Zbigniew Sawinski (Polish Academy of Sciences)

2. Europe united or still apart? East-West Differences in Gender Role Attitudes Over Time

Mrs Jessica Walter (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Malina Voicu (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. The effect of nonresponse on long-term trends of self-rated health

Ms Oona Pentala (National Institute for Health and Welfare Finland)

4. Gender inequality and the gender gap in depression

Mrs Malgorzata Mikucka (Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 106

Questionnaire translation in theory and practice: achievements, challenges, and innovations 3

Chair Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Ms Brita Dorer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 2 Dr Alisú Schoua-Glusberg (Research Support Services Inc.)

Session Details

The field of questionnaire translation in cross-national and cross-cultural research has slowly begun, but it has taken up speed and become prominent in survey projects and research since the 1990s at the latest. Best practice in terms of methods (committee approach, back translation, pretesting, translator profiles, etc.) has driven the field; this topic has made immense progress but it is a never-ending story nevertheless, especially if considered in a cross-disciplinary perspective (survey methodology, health, psychology, education, business). The importance of cultural factors, which impact both on language and item content, is nowadays pervasive. However, within survey methodology but also in other and across disciplines, many different meanings – and possibly false restrictions – are attached to the concepts of adoption, translation, adaptation or localization. There is more agreement on the provision of background information on concepts or terms, which was already called for in 1948 (!) (Barioux) and is now a key feature of comparative research. There is by now also agreement on early integration and involvement of translation and translation experts when designing a source questionnaire. The methods of advance translation or translatability assessment embody this strand. IT and translation tools are slowly gaining a foothold in the form of dedicated portals and translation tools, or of corpus linguistics. IT supports both the macro-processes (various stages of translating, assessing and testing) and the micro-processes (the translation as such). Against the backdrop of all these developments, it is a bit surprising that (systematic) empirical research on the effects of different translation versions is still missing – but also here, research has sprung up, the European SERISS project being a prime example.

Researchers and practitioners are invited to present on achievements in the field of questionnaire translation, on topics that are still inconclusive or challenging, and on innovations. Presentations can tackle any of the aforementioned themes, but they can also go beyond those. Presenters can look into the theory but also present their applications in cross-national and cross-cultural survey research and their lesson learned.

1. Second European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risks (ESENER-2) – Questionnaire translation process

Mr Xabier Irastorza (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work)

2. Questionnaire translation of the 4th European Quality of Life Survey

Ms Daphne Ahrendt (Eurofound)

Mr Steve Dept (Capstan)

Ms Eszter Sandor (Eurofound)

3. COMPARING METHODS OF ASSESSING TRANSLATION QUALITY AND DETECTING TRANSLATION ERRORS

Dr Anna Andreenkova (anna.andreenkova@cessi.ru)

4. Translation and cognitive testing of the harmonised well-being questions

Dr Ruxandra Comanaru (NatCen Social Research)

Ms Mari Toomse-Smith (NatCen Social Research)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 107

Doing Research on Children and Young People

Chair Professor Ingvill Constanze Mochmann (GESIS and CBS)
Coordinator 1 Mrs Julie Ane Odegaard Borge (University of Bergen)

Session Details

Many researchers are engaged in research projects where children and/or young people are involved. They can, for example, be respondents in surveys, participate in focus groups and qualitative interviews or participate actively as lay researchers. Depending on the topic, age and context doing research on and with children and young people confronts the researcher with several questions.

- When is it necessary to include this population group to obtain relevant information on a topic?
- Why may different research methods be required than when analyzing adults?
- How can the combination of methods contribute more to understanding the research problem together than separately in particular when conducting research on young people?

While early studies of children- and youth culture have been limited by a methodological monism based on a positivistic approach, recent research mainly favor qualitative methods to grasp the meaning making aspects of young people. This session therefore takes a broad approach and invites papers addressing experiences from research projects on children/young people focusing on the practical, methodological and ethical issues of the project and lessons learned.

1. Children's voices on their well-being: A mixed-methods study

Dr Silvia Exenberger (Medical University Innsbruck)
Professor Barbara Juen (Leopold-Franzens University Innsbruck)

2. Children's skills and implications for interviews

Dr Susanne Vogl (University of Vienna)

3. Measuring Social Hierarchies using Network Data

Miss Julia Leesch (University of Cologne)
Miss Andrea Meckel (Gesis Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)
Miss Julia Weymeirsch (University of Cologne)

4. Research on Young People: Cultural Aspects

Mrs Irina Gewinner (Leibniz University Hanover)

5. Constructing the story of political space among youth

Dr Julie Borge (University of Bergen)
Professor Ingvill Mochmann (CBS GESIS)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 108

Mixed Methods - Epistemological and Methodological Issues 2

Chair Dr Leila Akreimi (Technical University Berlin, Germany)
Coordinator 1 Dr Susanne Vogl (University of Vienna, Austria)

Session Details

Mixed Methods research has a long tradition in social science and currently under major resurgence. In this session we would like to stimulate an exchange over methodological and epistemological issues arising from Mixed Methods research: Do we move 'beyond paradigms' with Mixed Methods research? What are lessons learned from empirical Mixed Methods research from a methodological perspective? What has to be considered or which specific problems have to be solved during the different phases of the research process?

We welcome presentations on any kind of combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. Therefore the proposals can focus on different aspects and problems during the research process in Mixed Methods studies, e.g. different research questions, which require different approaches and types of data to be answered; combinations of different data collection methods; dealing with different types of data; data analysis and integration of the findings etc.

As we would like to reflect upon epistemological and methodological implications of Mixed Methods research in this session, proposals only dealing with mere presentations of the Mixed Methods design will not be considered. However, the proposals can be work in progress and do not have to offer fully developed theoretical frameworks, but they should inspire a discussion on methodological issues in Mixed Methods research.

1. Doing mixed-methods research with couples about parenting very preterm infants: what challenges do researchers face?

Mrs Mariana Amorim (ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, nº 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal; Global Public

Health Doctoral Programme; Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade do Porto, Alameda Prof. Hernâni Monteiro, 4200-319 Porto, Portugal)

Professor Elisabete Alves (ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, nº 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal; Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade do Porto, Alameda Prof. Hernâni Monteiro, 4200-319 Porto, Portugal)

Professor Susana Silva (ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, nº 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal; Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade do Porto, Alameda Prof. Hernâni Monteiro, 4200-319 Porto, Portugal)

2. Which negative ties are not mentioned in quantitative research? Comparison of qualitative and quantitative data.

Mr Philip Adebahr (University of Technology Chemnitz)

Dr Andreas Klärner (Thünen Institute of Rural Studies)

3. Qualitative methods doing the researcher's job – illustrated using the example of index construction

Dr Kathrin Gärtner (Statistics Austria)

Mr Manfred Zentner (Danube University Krems)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 109

Basic human values

Chair Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Cologne and University of Zurich)

Coordinator 1 Professor Jan Cieciuch (University of Zurich URPP 'Social Networks' and Cardinal Stefana Wyszyńskiego University)

Coordinator 2 Professor Peter Schmidt (University of Giessen)

Session Details

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 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) Values as consequence of various variables such as sociodemographic characteristics; (4) Value change and development; and related topics are welcome. Both substantive and methodological papers using cross-sectional, cross-cultural or longitudinal datasets are welcome.

1. Personality and human values in childhood, adolescence and adulthood

Professor Jan Cieciuch (University of Zurich)

Dr Włodzimierz Strus (Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw)

Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Cologne and University of Zurich)

2. Human Values and Attitudes towards Minorities: What is the Direction of Causality?

Mr Marcus Eisentraut (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Cologne and University of Zurich)

Professor Peter Schmidt (University of Giessen)

3. Use of Schwartz's Theory in Exploring the Directions of Convergence and Divergence of Human Values in Contemporary Society

Professor Kazufumi Manabe (Aoyama Gakuin University)

4. Relations Between Adjacent Higher-Order Basic Values Across The World

Dr Maksim Rudnev (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

Professor Vladimir Magun (Institute of Sociology Russian Academy of Sciences)

Professor Shalom Schwartz (Hebrew University in Jerusalem)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N AUD4

Improving Response in Government Surveys 2

Chair Dr Kerry Levin (Westat)
Coordinator 1 Dr Jocelyn Newsome (Westat)
Coordinator 2 Ms Brenda Schafer (Internal Revenue Service)

Session Details

Government-sponsored household surveys continue to face historically low response rates (Groves, 2011; de Heer, 1999). Low response can correlate with response bias, since nonresponse is rarely uniform across groups or subgroups of interest. As a result, many government surveys focus heavily on maximizing response, often at a high cost (Tourangeau & Plewes, 2013; Stoop et al, 2010). For example, the cost of the U.S. census has more than doubled over the past several decades, from \$16 per household in 1970 to \$98 per household in 2010 (2010 Census GAO Report).

Survey methodologists have sought to address the problem of nonresponse by implementing a number of interventions to increase respondent engagement, minimize burden, and reduce response bias. Methodologists have suggested a variety of intervention strategies, including: offering surveys in multiple survey modes; limiting survey length; emphasizing official sponsorship; offering incentives; making multiple, distinct communication attempts; utilizing respondent-centric design; and targeting messaging to the intended audience (Dillman, 2014). However, the effectiveness of these strategies vary widely, and researchers continue to explore how to best implement these strategies in a cost-effective manner.

This session will explore innovative approaches for increasing response in government-sponsored household surveys.

Researchers are invited to submit papers discussing experiments or pilot studies on any of the following topics:

- Multimode survey design, including optimizing for mobile devices, to encourage response;
- Improving response through the use of incentives, targeted messaging, or multiple distinct forms of follow-up;
- Interviewer techniques that encourage response;
- Use of paradata to improve response;
- Impact of survey length on response; and
- Attempts to increase response from hard-to-reach populations of interest.

References

- 2010 Census: Preliminary Lessons Learned Highlight the Need for Fundamental Reforms. GAO- 11-496T. Washington, D.C.: April 6, 2011.
- De Heer, W. (1999). International response trends: results of an international survey. *Journal of official statistics*, 15(2), 129.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: the tailored design method*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Groves, R. M. (2011). Three eras of survey research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 75(5), 861-871.
- Stoop, I., Billiet, J., Koch, A., & Fitzgerald, R. (2010). *Improving survey response: Lessons learned from the European Social Survey*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tourangeau, R. & Plewes, T. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Nonresponse in social science surveys: a research agenda*. National Research Council.

1. An examination of seasonal response rates during a year-long mail data collection using an ABS frame

Mr Eric Jodts (Westat)
Dr Sharon Lohr (Westat)

2. Improving response rates in the German Health Survey GEDA

Mrs Jennifer Allen (Robert Koch Institute)
Mr Matthias Wetzstein (Robert Koch Institute)
Mr Patrick Schmich (Robert Koch Institute)

3. Impact of a shortened follow-up survey on improving response to a government household survey

Mr Pat Langetieg (IRS)
Ms Brenda Schafer (IRS)
Dr Saurabh Datta (IRS)
Dr Jocelyn Newsome (Westat)
Ms Jennifer McNulty (Westat)
Ms Hanyu Sun (Westat)
Dr Kerry Levin (Westat)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N AUD5

It's the Interviewers! New developments in interviewer effects research 4

Chair Dr Salima Douhou (City University of London, CCSS)
Coordinator 1 Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 2 Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 3 Dr Kathrin Thomas (City University of London, CCSS)
Coordinator 4 Mr Joel Williams (TNS BMRB)

Session Details

To what extent do interviewers affect data collection and how can we better monitor and limit their impact?

Any deviation from the standardised protocol of the data collection process has the potential to induce bias to the data. Interviewer effects, defined as the distortions of survey responses in surveys with interviewer presence, may have a severe impact on data quality. These effects result from potential reactions to the social style and personality of interviewers, but also to their presentation of questions.

Analysis based on data that are biased by interviewer intervention and the conclusions drawn on the basis of this are likely to be incorrect. Hence, survey methodologists have improved the way in which interviewers are trained and briefed in order to limit the interviewers' influence. Yet, it remains open why even in surveys with exceptional efforts to train and monitor interviewers, interviewer effects occur.

Interviewers make (initial) contact with the prospective respondents and attempt to convince them to participate in the survey. The doorstep interaction between prospective respondents and interviewers is rarely documented, but an increasing number of studies indicates that some interviewers are more successful than others in convincing the prospective respondents to participate in a survey and to avoid non-response.

Once door-step interaction has been successful, interviewers may further affect the way in which respondents answer the survey questions on the questionnaire. Variation in survey responses may be due to the attitudes, interpersonal skills and personality of interviewers, but also relate to how the interviewers present particular questions and how strictly they follow the instructions. Any deviation from the standardised protocol provided by the core research team of the survey project decreases the comparability of the survey responses.

This session welcomes papers on new developments in the area of interviewer effects. Topics may include but are not restricted to:

- methodological developments in measuring and modelling interviewer effects,
- interviewer effects on measurement error,
- interviewer effects on nonresponse rates and nonresponse bias,
- interviewer influences on response latencies (timings),
- influence of personality traits, behaviour, attitudes, experience, and other characteristics of interviewers on survey estimates,
- implications for interviewer recruitment and training strategies,
- monitoring and evaluation of fieldwork efforts by interviewers,
- collection of GPS data or audio-visual material of door-step interactions.

Papers that discuss these issues from a comparative perspective are also welcome. We invite academic and non-academic researchers and survey practitioners to contribute to our session.

1. Explaining Interviewer Effects on Unit Nonresponse: A Cross-Survey Analysis

Professor Annelies Blom (School of Social Sciences, University of Mannheim)

Ms Daniela Ackermann-Piek (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim)

Dr Julie Korbmacher (Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe, Munich Center for the Economics of Aging)

Mr Ulrich Krieger (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim)

2. Are Interviewer Effects on Interview Pace Related to Interviewer Effects on Straight-Lining tendency in the European Social Survey? Interviewer related analysis of interview pace and straight-lining tendency

Dr Caroline Vandenplas (KULeuven)

Dr Koen Beullens (KULeuven)

Dr Katrijn Denies (KULeuven)

Professor Geert Loosveldt (KU Leuven)

3. Modelling of Interviewer Experience

Mr Felix Benjamin Grobe (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

4. Interviewer Effects in Factorial Survey Experiments

Ms Sandra Walzenbach (University of Konstanz)

Professor Katrin Auspurg (University of Munich)

Professor Thomas Hinz (University of Konstanz)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N 101

Overview of open access European survey data 4

Chair Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (SHARE – Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)

Coordinator 1 Ms Sabine Friedel (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)

Session Details

In recent years, many large sets of survey data have been made available to the scientific community. Large national and European surveys, such as ESS, SHARE, SOEP, Understanding Society, etc., disseminate their data to registered users. For researchers it can be difficult to get a good overview of what is offered and to find the specific variables and samples of their interest.

This session aims to give researchers more insight into the variety of variables available in large survey datasets. For that purpose, we invite survey practitioners to present their data sets, longitudinal as well as cross-sectional, to potential users. Presentations should address the following survey characteristics: Research field, target population and sample, survey design, data access regulations, available survey variables and paradata, linked administrative data (if applicable), and some examples of data use. Moreover, we especially welcome overviews including information which can be used for methodological analysis, such as key stroke data, auxiliary information, interviewer characteristics and observations, response behavior, experimental designs, etc.

1. Presentation of Adult Education Survey (AES) - German Data Sets 2007-2016

Miss Alexandra Strauss (Kantar Public, TNS Deutschland GmbH)

Mrs Frauke Bilger (Kantar Public, TNS Deutschland GmbH)

Dr Friederike Behringer (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB))

2. Transitions from Education to Employment (TREE): a Swiss multi-cohort panel survey

Ms Christina von Rotz (University of Bern)

Mr Maarten Koomen (University of Bern)

3. The National Educational Panel Study (NEPS): Design, Research Potential, and Data Supply

Dr Daniel Fuss (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LifBi, Bamberg, Germany))

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Using paradata to assess and improve survey data quality 4

Chair Dr Caroline Vandenplas (KULeuven)

Coordinator 1 Professor Geert Loosveldt (KULeuven)

Coordinator 2 Dr Koen Beullens (KULeuven)

Session Details

Survey methodologists are currently facing challenges of declining response rates, increasing risk of nonresponse bias and measurement error, as well as escalating costs of survey data collection. An approach, with limited costs, to tackle these challenges is the use of paradata. Paradata, data about the survey process, have always been present but the range and detail level of them have considerably increased with the computerization of the data collection process. Such data can be used to detect and eventually reduce systematic survey errors and increase data quality, during the fieldwork (adaptive designs) or in post-survey adjustment. Paradata can also be used to reduce the cost of the survey process as it is done to determine caps on the number of phone call attempts in telephone surveys.

We are interested in papers that apply the use of paradata to detect and improve data quality or/and reduce survey costs. For instance, time and timing are both linked to the survey costs and the data quality, two essential elements of a survey. The timing of the visits, calls or sent-out of questionnaire/request and reminders has been shown to be determining for survey participation. At the same time, requesting that interviewers work in the evening or at the weekend or making sure that the reminders to a Web or mail surveys are sent timely may have cost implications. Nonresponse error is not the only type of survey error to be linked to time: the time taken to answer a question, also called response latency, is known to echo the cognitive effort of the respondent and, hence, data quality. On the other hand, the interviewer speed can also influence data quality. Moreover the interviewer speed has been shown to be dependent of the rank of the interview.

The aim of this session is to reflect on possible links between paradata reflecting 'easy' measured characteristic of different steps of the survey process and data quality. Such a link could then help data collection manager and researcher to detect potential systematic survey errors in a fieldwork monitoring or post-evaluation context and lead to opportunities to prevent or correct for these errors. We invite papers demonstrating a link between paradata and data quality as well as papers showing how this link can be used to increase data quality or reduce cost.

1. Using GPS Data to Assess Errors in Paradata in Face-to-Face Surveys

Dr James Wagner (University of Michigan)

Dr Kristen Olson (University of Nebraska - Lincoln)

Ms Minako Edgar (University of Michigan)

2. The Accuracy of Using Paradata to Detect Interviewer Question-Reading Deviations and Assess Data Quality

Ms Jennifer Kelley (University of Essex)

3. Don't Know' Answers – An International Comparative Analysis Using Interviewer Data

Dr Kingsley Purdam (University of Manchester)

Dr Joe Sakshaug (University of Manchester)
Dr Mollie Bourne (University of Oxford)
Dr David Bayliss (University of Manchester)

4. Investigating the invariance between modes using indicators derived from process-related paradata

Dr Ulf Kroehne (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)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Push2web surveys: How to encourage people to go online when using a different contact mode? 2

Chair Ms Gerry Nicolaas (Ipsos MORI)

Coordinator 1 Dr Patten Smith (Ipsos MORI)

Session Details

The term 'push-to-web' was first used by Don Dillman and colleagues to describe surveys that use traditional modes of contact to encourage people to go online and complete a web questionnaire. This design may or may not offer alternative modes of data collection but, if so, only in subsequent contact attempts among those who failed to complete the web questionnaire. In recent years we have observed increasing use of push2web survey designs for random probability surveys of the general population, including surveys that produce official statistics. Furthermore, this design has recently been used for the 2015 Japanese Census and it is envisaged that a similar design will be used for the UK 2021 Census.

The main challenge for push2web surveys is obtaining an acceptable web response rate. Even among populations with high internet access, web response rates tend to be much lower than surveys using traditional data collection modes (Lozar Manfreda et al., 2008). It would seem that the extra effort to go online and to follow instructions for accessing and completing a web questionnaire acts as a strong disincentive to participation. Offering an alternative mode to web non-respondents is an effective method for boosting the final response rate but some studies have shown that equivalent (Millar and Dillman, 2011) or even higher response rates (Messer and Dillman, 2011; Lynn, 2013) can be achieved when the alternative mode is offered on its own without the option of completing the questionnaire online. Furthermore, alternative modes are more expensive and their use will reduce potential cost savings significantly. This is particularly true when the web response rate is much lower than the final response rate.

The aim of this session is to explore a variety of methods for boosting web response rates when contact has to be made using traditional modes such as postal, telephone and face-to-face. The session welcomes papers on contact strategies, incentives, and mode sequencing. Papers exploring how smartphones can be utilised to increase web response rates in push2web designs are also welcome. We also invite papers on methods for encouraging participation in such a way that aims to enhance sample representativeness and reduce the risk of nonresponse bias.

1. Pushing to web in the ISSP

Dr Gudbjorg Andrea Jonsdottir (University of Iceland)

Ms Andrea Gerdur Dofradottir (University of Iceland)

Mr Hafsteinn Birgir Einarsson (University of Iceland)

2. Notes from a Push2web(+mail) survey: the ISSP 2014 Citizenship survey in Spain

Dr Mónica Méndez (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas)

3. Address-based Online Surveying (ABOS): The impact of design features on response

Miss Alice Fitzpatrick (Kantar Public)

Mr Joel Williams (Kantar Public)

4. Pushing from telephone to web: a low-cost and effective way to conduct national election studies

Miss Evangelia Kartsounidou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)

Professor Ioannis Andreadis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)

5. How to encourage people to complete online surveys when using a different contact mode? A summary and discussion.

Ms Gerry Nicolaas (Ipsos MORI)

Dr Patten Smith (Ipsos MORI)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Satisficing in Surveys: Theoretical and Methodological Developments 3

Chair Dr Joss Rossmann (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Dr Henning Silber (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 2 Dr Tobias Gummer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Satisficing theory (Krosnick 1991, 1999) provides a framework for the analysis of respondents' response behaviors in surveys and, accordingly, the quality of their responses. The theory basically distinguishes between three response strategies: First, optimizing refers to the complete and effortful execution of all four cognitive steps of the response process. That is, respondents have to interpret the question, retrieve relevant information from their memory, form a judgment based on the available information, and translate the judgment into a meaningful answer. Second, if the task of answering a question is difficult and respondents lack the necessary abilities or motivation to provide an accurate answer, they might decide to perform the steps of information retrieval and judgment less thoroughly to reduce their response efforts. Thus, weak satisficing results in merely satisfactory answers (e.g., selecting the first response option that seems acceptable). Third, under certain conditions respondents might simplify the response task even further by superficially interpreting questions and completely skipping the steps of information retrieval and judgment. Strong satisficing is indicated, among others, by providing random, nonsubstantive, or non-differentiated responses.

Since its introduction in survey methodology, the concept of satisficing has become one of the leading theoretical approaches in the examination and explanation of measurement error in surveys. With regard to its increasing popularity, we particularly welcome submissions that present advancements to the theory, introduce new methods to measure satisficing, show how satisficing theory can be applied to better understand the occurrence of observable response patterns, or present practical applications in question or survey design that aim at reducing satisficing in surveys.

Contributions may cover but are not limited to the following research topics:

- Theoretical advancements of satisficing theory
- Innovative measurement approaches (e.g., instructional manipulation checks, use of response latencies or other paradata)
- Consequences of satisficing (e.g., rounding/heaping, nonsubstantive answers to open-ended questions)
- Effects of survey mode on satisficing (e.g., findings from mixed-mode studies)
- Effects of the sampling methodology and sample characteristics on satisficing (e.g., comparisons of opt-in and probability-based online panels)
- Experimental evidence on how the occurrence of satisficing can be reduced (e.g., innovations in survey, question, or response scale design).

1. The Effect of Respondent Commitment on Response Quality in Two Online Surveys

Ms Kristen Cibelli Hibben (University of Michigan)

2. Humanizing Cues in Internet Surveys: Investigating Respondent Cognitive Processes

Dr Wojciech Jablonski (Utrecht University & University of Lodz)

Dr Katarzyna Grzeszkiewicz-Radulska (University of Lodz)

Dr Aneta Krzewinska (University of Lodz)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q4 ANF1

Researching Sensitive Topics: Improving Theory and Survey Design 4

Chair Dr Ivar Krumpal (University of Leipzig)

Coordinator 1 Professor Ben Jann (University of Bern)

Coordinator 2 Professor Mark Trappmann (IAB Nürnberg)

Session Details

Social desirability bias is a problem in surveys collecting data on private issues, deviant behavior or unsocial opinions (e.g. sex, health, income, illicit drug use, tax evasion or xenophobia) as soon as the respondents' true scores differ from social norms. Asking sensitive questions poses a dilemma to survey participants. On the one hand, politeness norms may oblige the respondent to be helpful and cooperative and self-report the sensitive personal information truthfully. On the other hand, the respondent may not trust in his or her data protection and may fear negative consequences from self-reporting norm-violating behavior or opinions. Cumulative empirical evidence shows that in the context of surveying sensitive issues respondents often engage in self-protective behavior, i.e. they either give socially desirable answers or they refuse to answer at all. Such systematic misreporting or nonresponse leads to biased estimates and poor data quality of the entire survey study. Specific data collection approaches were proposed to increase respondents' cooperation and improve validity of self-reports in sensitive surveys.

This session is about deepening our knowledge of the data generation process and advancing the theoretical basis of the

ongoing debate about establishing best practices and designs for surveying sensitive topics. We invite submissions that deal with these problems and/or present potential solutions. In particular, we are interested in studies that (1) reason about the psychological processes and social interactions between the actors that are involved in the collection of the sensitive data; (2) present current empirical research focusing on 'question-and-answer' based (e.g. randomized response techniques, factorial surveys), non-reactive (e.g. record linkage approaches, field experiments or administrative data usage) or mixed methods of data collection (e.g. big data analyses in combination with classical survey approaches) focusing on the problem of social desirability; (3) deal with statistical procedures to analyze data generated with special data collection methods; (4) explore the possibilities and limits of integrating new and innovative data collection approaches for sensitive issues in well-established, large-scale population surveys taking into account problems of research ethics and data protection.

1. Using the Crosswise Model in the field of higher education and science research

Dr David Johann (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies)

Dr Kathrin Thomas (City University of London)

2. Evaluating the Crosswise Model RRT and the Item Count Technique for Surveying Sensitive Topics: An Approach that Detects False Positives

Dr Marc Hoeglinger (University of Bern)

Professor Andreas Diekmann (ETH Zurich)

3. A Unified Randomized Response Questioning Design for Quantitative Variables

Dr Andreas Quatember (Associate Professor)

4. Should we use indirect techniques for surveying sensitive topics? A meta-analysis of the Randomized Response Technique and the Item Count Technique

Dr Marc Höglinger (University of Bern)

Professor Ben Jann (University of Bern)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Innovations and Advanced Techniques for Question Testing and Evaluation

Chair Dr Ting Yan (Westat)

Coordinator 1 Dr Aaron Maitland (Westat)

Session Details

Researchers and policy-makers rely heavily on survey questionnaires to collect data. Question testing and evaluation is an important step to reduce potential measurement error and to improve the quality of the data collected. There is a large variety of question testing and evaluation tools available. Some methods produce qualitative assessment of the survey items whereas other methods generate quantitative estimates of validity, reliability, and other indicators of survey items' performance. Some are inexpensive and quick but others require data collection and are comparatively more costly. Furthermore, different evaluation methods could yield different conclusions on the performance of the same survey items. As new techniques are available, this session invites presentations that explore and showcase innovative uses of new or existing techniques and methods in question testing and evaluation. We particularly invite presentations employing (1) new techniques such as eye-tracking, (2) advanced statistical methods such as split-ballot Multitrait-Multimethod designs, (3) a combination of new and existing techniques (e.g., using QUAID, eye-tracking, and cognitive interviewing), and (4) innovations or advances in existing methods (such as new analyses to be done on cognitive interviewing data). We also invite presentations discussing question testing and evaluation in a cross-cultural context.

1. Choosing Question Testing Methods: A Framework for Decisions

Dr Roger Tourangeau (Westat)

2. A Comparison of Emerging Pretesting Methods for Evaluating "Modern" Surveys

Mrs Emily Geisen (RTI International)

Mr Joe Murphy (RTI International)

3. Comparative Analysis of the Quality Evaluation Algorithm of the Measuring Tool in English and Russian Languages Using Survey Quality Predictor

Miss Marina Vasilyeva (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

Miss Natalia Voronina (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

4. Measuring Subjective Health and Life Satisfaction with U.S. Hispanics

Professor Sunghee Lee (University of Michigan)

Professor Rachel Davis (University of South Carolina)

5. Oculomotor activities as potential indicators to the quality of survey instrument design

Dr Lin Wang (U.S. Census Bureau)

Tuesday 18th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Income and wealth inequality

Chair Professor Carlos Farinha Rodrigues (Lisbon School of Economics and Management, Universidade de Lisboa)

Session Details

The study of income inequality and poverty using cross sectional survey data, such as Eurostat's EU-SILC, is well established and has produced an important body of literature and an accepted methodology. However, no comparable research exists on the distribution of wealth, although it has been gaining importance due to the growing availability of cross sectional survey data that has shown how wealth is much more unequally distributed than income.

This session invites papers discussing the conceptual and methodological problems of analysing wealth distribution and inequality using cross sectional survey data such as the Household Finance and Consumption Survey (HFCS) conducted by the European Central Bank or the Survey of Consumer Finances (SCF) conducted by the Federal Reserve Board. In particular we welcome substantive research which investigates the distribution of different types of wealth and their relationship with income and savings, and intergenerational transfers (gifts and inheritances), presents novel methodological approaches, as well as postulates "good practices" in analysing such data.

The topics include, but are not restricted to:

- wealth measurement and definition, plus specific methodologic problems of dealing with a stock variable;
- wealth inequality by type of assets: real assets, in particular the household main residence, and financial assets; relationship between wealth and income inequality;
- intergenerational transfers, particularly inheritances and savings;
- theoretical models of wealth formation and lifetime.

1. The role of pension entitlements on wealth

Ms Laura Ravazzini (University of Neuchâtel)

Dr Ursina Kuhn (FORS)

2. Gender and social classe in Europe: how deep are the differences?

Professor Analia Torres (CIEG/ISCSP/University of Lisboa)

Professor Joao Ferreira de Almeida (CIES-IUL)

Professor Rui Brites (ISEG/University of Lisboa)

3. PORTUGUESE WEALTH DISTRIBUTION 2010/2013

Professor Carlos Farinha Rodrigues (CEMAPRE - Lisbon School of Economics and Management - Universidade de Lisboa)

Professor Isabel Andrade (CEMAPRE - Lisbon School of Economics and Management - Universidade de Lisboa)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 102

Administrative Records for Survey Methodology 1

Chair Dr Asaph Young Chun (US Census Bureau)

Coordinator 1 Professor Mike Larsen (George Washington University)

Coordinator 2 Dr Ingegerd Jansson (Statistics Sweden)

Coordinator 3 Dr Manfred Antoni (Institute for Employment Research)

Coordinator 4 Dr Daniel Fuss (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Coordinator 5 Dr Corinna Kleinert (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

Incorporation of administrative records have long been regarded as a way of improving the quality and interpretability of surveys and censuses and of controlling the rising cost of surveys (Chun and Scheuren, 2011). The increasing number of linked datasets, such as Health and Retirement Study in the U.S., National Educational Panel Study in Germany, and Understanding Society in UK, are accompanied by growing empirical evidence about the selectivity of linked observations. The extent and pace of using administrative data varies from continent to continent and from country to country. This is partly due to differential

concerns about privacy, confidentiality, and legal constraints, as well as variability in acceptance and implementation of advances in statistical techniques to control such concerns.

The primary goal is to control data quality and reduce total survey error. This session will feature papers that implement "total administrative records error" and "total linked data error" methods and provide case studies and best practices of using administrative data tied to the survey life cycle (Chun and Larsen, a forthcoming Wiley book). The session invites papers that discuss fundamental challenges and recent advancements involved in the collection and analysis of administrative records, integration with surveys, censuses, and auxiliary data. We also encourage submission of papers discussing institutional collaboration on linked data, sustainable data access, provision of auxiliary tools and user support. For example, papers in this session include, but are not limited to the following topics:

1. Innovative use of administrative data in household surveys and censuses to improve the survey frame, reduce nonresponse follow-up, and assess coverage error.
2. Quality evaluations of administrative data and quality metrics for linked data
3. Recent advancements in processing and linking administrative data with survey data (one-to-one) and with multiple sources of data (one-to-many).
4. Recent methods of disclosure limitation and confidentiality protection in linked data, including linkages with geographical information.
5. Bayesian approaches to using administrative data in surveys, censuses, small area estimation, and nonresponse control.
6. Implementation of new tools that facilitate the use of linked data by simplifying complex data structures or handling inconsistent information in life-course data
7. Strategies for developing and maintaining a user-friendly infrastructure for the analysis and dissemination of linked data and solutions for collaboration
8. Applications that transform administrative data into information that is useful and relevant to policymaking in public health, economics, science and education.

1. Evaluation of the Quality of Administrative Data Used in the Dutch Virtual Census

Mr Eric Schulte Nordholt (Project leader of the Census)

Dr Piet Daas (Senior methodologist)

Dr Martijn Tennekes (Methodologist)

Dr Saskia Ossen (Project leader at the division Data collection)

2. Evaluating the Accuracy of Administrative Data to Augment Survey Responses

Dr Marcus Berzofsky (RTI International)

Dr Stephanie Zimmer (RTI International)

Mr Timothy Smith (RTI International)

3. Assessing Administrative Data Quality: The Truth is Out There

Dr Asaph Young Chun (US Census Bureau)

Dr Sonya Porter (US Census Bureau)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 103

Handling missing data 1

Chair Professor George Ploubidis (University College London)

Coordinator 1 Mr Brian Dodgeon (University College London)

Session Details

Selection bias, in the form of incomplete or missing data is unavoidable in surveys. It results in smaller samples, incomplete histories, lower statistical power and bias in sample composition if missingness is related to the observed and unobserved characteristics of respondents. It is well known that unbiased estimates cannot be obtained without properly addressing the implications of incompleteness. In this session we focus on item missingness, survey non-response, and attrition over time in longitudinal surveys. We aim to identify best practices when dealing with missing data.

Under Rubin's framework, three types of missingness exist: Missing completely at random (MCAR) where the likelihood of response is unrelated to the respondents' characteristics. Missing at random (MAR) where the likelihood of response is explained by the observed characteristics of respondents, and missing not at random (MNAR) where the likelihood of response

is related to both observed and unobserved characteristics of respondents.

The objective of our session is to examine the principled techniques commonly used to deal with missing data. These include, inverse probability weights, multiple imputation, and full information maximum likelihood (FIML). All techniques rely on the MAR assumption, and therefore, their plausibility depends on the ability of the researcher to identify the predictors of response.

Contributors are welcomed to contrast these techniques with other procedures such as case-wise deletion, mean replacement, regression imputations, selection models (e.g. Heckman selection models), and others. Moreover, theoretical, empirical, and substantive applications of these techniques will be considered for presentation.

1. Contrasting three prominent MNAR methods for analyzing longitudinal survey data

Dr Sabine Zinn (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Dr Timo Gnambis (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

2. Maintaining representativeness by maximising the plausibility of the Missing At Random assumption: Evidence from the 1958 British birth cohort

Professor George Ploubidis (Centre for Longitudinal Studies - UCL)

Dr Benedetta Pongiglione (Centre for Longitudinal Studies - UCL)

Dr Tarek Mostafa (Centre for Longitudinal Studies - UCL)

Mr Brian Dodgeon (Centre for Longitudinal Studies - UCL)

3. Maximising the plausibility of the Missing At Random Assumption: Results from the 1958 British birth cohort

Dr Tarek Mostafa (University College London)

Professor George Ploubidis (University College London)

Mr Brian Dodgeon (University College London)

4. Maintaining representativeness in undertaking a practical research question, while increasing statistical power. Evidence from the 1958 British birth cohort

Mr Brian Dodgeon (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Dr Tarek Mostafa (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Professor George Ploubidis (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 104

Life course research 1

Chair Ms Katharina Burgdorf (University of Mannheim)

Session Details

1. Explaining Scientists' Plans for International Mobility from a Life Course Perspective

Mr Nicolai Netz (DZHW)

Mr Steffen Jaksztat (DZHW)

2. Optimal duration of participation in a job training program that promotes positive youth development

Dr Youngjo Im (University of Chicago)

Dr Ming-Long Lam (SAS Institute & University of Chicago)

3. Well-being over the Life Course: Analytical Strategies, Explaining Mechanisms and Evidence from Germany

Dr Fabian Kratz (LMU Munich)

Professor Josef Brüderl (LMU Munich)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 105

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

Chair Ms Malgorzata Mikucka (Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium)

Coordinator 1 Mr Francesco Sarracino (Statec, Luxembourg)

Coordinator 2 Ms Tatiana Karabchuk (United Arab Emirates University)

Session Details

The availability of repeated cross-sectional surveys and of panel data allows analyzing social change over time. This type 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. Embedding attitudes towards immigrants in solidarity contexts. A cross-European study

Professor Bogdan Voicu (Romanian Academy & Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu)

Professor Horațiu Rusu (Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu)

Professor Mircea Comănaș (Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj)

2. Cultural consumption as universal remedy? Unravelling the link between cultural intolerance and the fear of foreigners.

Ms Katharina Kunißen (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz)

Ms Mara Boehle (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz)

Ms Debora Eicher (Goethe University Frankfurt)

Mr Matthias Lehmann (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz)

3. Events and Changes in Values and Political Engagement: Findings from Panel Surveys in Egypt, Tunisia, and Turkey

Professor Mansoor Moaddel (University of Maryland-College Park)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 106

Methodological, Practical and Theoretical Challenges in Research on Refugees 1

Chair Dr Roman Auriga (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Coordinator 1 Dr Gisela Will (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Coordinator 2 Dr Christoph Homuth (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

The massive increase in the number of refugees since 2015 poses significant socio-political challenges to the receiving countries. For this reason, policy makers are looking for appropriate policies supporting effective and efficient social integration of refugees based on well-grounded empirical research. However, previous research on migration can only partly meet this need. There are first studies with the recent refugee groups (like IAB-SOEP-BAMF sample and the Re-GES study at LI fBi in Germany, or projects from Statistics Canada) but it is still little known about how to do appropriate research and how to conduct studies with these very specific target persons.

Therefore, the session focuses on methodological and practical challenges in research on refugees (cross-sectional and panel). We also aim at the exchange of experiences on interviewing refugees and bringing scholars together, which focus on both prior waves on refugees and recent migration of asylum seekers as well as migration researchers in general. We aim at addressing mainly the following questions:

Study design

Refugees are a very special group of migrants as their legal statuses, return aspirations or trajectories differ e. g. from working migrants. However, refugees resemble other migrants due to similar challenges in the receiving countries. Due to this duality the following questions arise: Are the migrant groups really that distinct? What is similar? Which experience of former migration

research can be used? What has to be adjusted or newly developed? How can research designs cope with the expected special challenges of refugee studies (e.g. traumatic experiences)? What innovative designs can be used to analyse existing data sets regarding these questions?

Sampling
What is the best way to identify refugees? How to deal with non-complete or non-existing registers? How can small groups of refugees be studied adequately? What strategies exist to reach undocumented migrants?

Tracking
Refugees are often a very mobile group. In panel studies, tracking of participants is especially challenging in case of illegal or non-registered persons. What special strategies exist/are needed to track refugees? How do they differ from tracking other migrants? Are special incentive schemes needed?

Languages
There exist good strategies for translation of questionnaires. However, experience and expertise of interviewing and translating into rare languages as well as about the comparability of findings are restricted. How can we deal with various and infrequent languages in one study and how comparable are the results?

1. ReGES - Refugees in the German Educational System: Introducing a new panel study on refugees in Germany

Dr Gisela Will (LIfBi - Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Dr Jutta von Maurice (LIfBi - Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Professor Hans-Günther Roßbach (LIfBi - Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Dr Christoph Homuth (LIfBi - Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

2. Refugees in Canada: benefits and challenges behind administrative data linkages

Mr Tristan Cayn (Statistics Canada)

3. The WELLCOME Study – A Panel Survey of Young Syrian Refugees

Mrs Angelika Steinwede (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences, Germany)
Mr Michael Ruland (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences, Germany)
Dr Hans Dietrich (Institute of Employment Research (IAB), Germany)

4. Translations into rare languages and foreign languages skills of refugees in Germany

Professor Jürgen Schupp (SOEP/DIW Berlin)
Mr Jannes Jacobsen (SOEP/DIW Berlin)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 107

Analyzing the lives of LGBTI people - survey approaches to LGBTI persons, couples and families 1

Chair Dr Stephanie Steinmetz (Sociology Department, University of Amsterdam)
Coordinator 1 Ms Mirjam Fischer (Sociology Department, University of Amsterdam)
Coordinator 2 Ms Nancy Bates (Research and Methodology Directorate, U.S. Census Bureau)

Session Details

In recent years, much progress has been made in the US, Europe and beyond with regard to legislation that is supportive and protective of LGBTs (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans persons). While these achievements are laudable, it is important to keep evaluating to what extent they truly improve the lives of LGBTs. There are still many sources of inequality and discrimination that remain deeply embedded in the social fabric of societies. Compared to research on other minority groups, sexual orientation has been studied quantitatively much less in the social sciences. Yet, quantitative scholars have continuously made efforts to overcome the methodological challenges associated with studying this population by using surveys. This is an important development which should be encouraged and continued.

This session welcomes contributions focusing on the wide range of issues that need to be addressed when studying LGBT populations with survey-based methods. For example, is the 2-step method (sex assigned at birth and sex identify with now) best for reducing undercounting of transgender populations? As younger people embrace non-binary or gender-nonconforming identities, how must our questions and categories for gender identity change? Can sexual orientation be collected by proxy in surveys that use a single household informant to provide all member's demographic information? How can concepts around sexual orientation and gender identity be translated for non-Western cultures and non-native languages? Are there interviewer effects when collecting SOGI in telephone and personal visit surveys? Does the addition of SOGI items harm unit response rates in surveys that do not typically collect such items (e.g. labor force or consumer expenditure surveys)? What are strategies for designing sampling frames intended at capturing LGBT populations? In addition, this session also invites submissions that focus on topical survey results around LGBT populations such as physical and mental health disparities, income inequality, hate crimes, and household and family structures. The session hopes to draw a cross-section of submissions from different countries

and different survey experiences.

1. Measuring Sexual Orientation in Household Panel Surveys

Professor Martin Kroh (SOEP at DIW Berlin and HU Berlin)

Dr David Richter (SOEP at DIW Berlin)

Mr Simon Kühne (SOEP at DIW Berlin and BGSS at HU Berlin)

2. Collecting Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) by Household Proxy

Ms Nancy Bates (US Census Bureau)

Dr Jennifer Ortman (US Census Bureau)

3. Designing a sampling frame for same-sex couples and families: the UNICON study

Ms Mirjam Fischer (University of Amsterdam)

Dr Stephanie Steinmetz (University of Amsterdam)

4. Statistical recording of contested categories. Criticism of binary categories in a survey on gender violence (Virage-LGBT)

Mr Mathieu Trachman (Ined)

Mrs Tania Lejbowicz (Ined)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 108

Mixed methods

Chair Miss Aida Montenegro (University of Bonn)

Session Details

1. Gently untying the Gordian knot: Culturometric un-confounding of basic human values in attitudinal survey responses

Professor Beatrice Boufoy-Bastick (The University of the West Indies)

2. Using a Mixed Method to Analyse Students' Proactive Behaviours in a University Context

Miss Aida Montenegro (University of Bonn)

3. Exploring social solidarity actions during the Greek recession: Empirical findings and methodological implications

Dr Stefania Kalogeraki (University of Crete)

4. Meta-findings through Discourse Mapping in Mixed-Method Studies.

Dr Eugene Kritski (GlobeScan Inc.)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 109

The Study of Value Change Using European Values Surveys 1

Chair Professor Hermann Duelder (University of Cologne)

Coordinator 1 Professor Ruud Luijkx (Tilburg University)

Coordinator 2 Dr Malina Voicu (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Cologne)

Session Details

Various surveys carried out during the last decades provide a large amount of information about values and attitudes shared by people living in various countries around the globe. European Values Study was the pioneer of the surveys on values, collecting data every nine years, since 1981 and having an extensive geographical coverage in Europe. EVS still includes an impressive number of unchanged questions since 1981 allowing overtime comparisons on values related to a very broad spectrum of life domains: family and marriage, economics, work, leisure, politics, religion, morality. Other surveys, such as World Values Survey, International Social Survey Program, complement EVS in terms of geographical coverage and provide information

about values and attitudes of people living not only in Europe but also in other regions of the world. This session focuses on the analysis of value change under the impact of contextual factors and encourages submissions that make use of the comparative potential of surveys on values and attitudes from a methodological and a substantive perspective. To give a few examples: What is the impact of recent political events on attitudes and values? What are the basic empirical findings on long-term change and what are the main cross national differences? Which are the best methods to investigate overtime changes in values and attitudes? How to combine data coming from different surveys to study overtime trends? Do the measurement instruments that have been used in these surveys guarantee comparability across time and space? Submissions making use of comparative surveys data like European Values Study, World Values Survey, International Social Survey Program, European Social Survey or Eurobarometer are welcome.

1. Examining National Pride across Time and Countries, 1995-2013

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

2. Work values and job preferences in Europe: gender aspect

Ms Natalia Soboleva (Laboratory for Comparative Social Research Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia)

3. Modernisation, Culture, and Moral Change in Europe: From Universalism to Contextualism

Professor Hermann Dülmer (University of Cologne)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N AUD4

Adaptive and Responsive Designs in Complex Surveys: Recent Advancements and Challenges 1

- Chair** Mr Jason Fields (U.S. Census Bureau)
Coordinator 1 Dr Asaph Young Chun (U.S. Census Bureau)
Coordinator 2 Professor James Wagner (University of Michigan)
Coordinator 3 Dr Barry Schouten (Statistics Netherlands)
Coordinator 4 Ms Nicole Watson (University of Melbourne)

Session Details

Adaptive and responsive survey designs (Groves and Heeringa, 2006; Wagner, 2008) have attempted to respond to a changing survey environment that has become increasingly multimode, multiple data sources-driven and multilingual. The Journal of Official Statistics will be publishing in 2017 a Special Issue on Adaptive Design in complex surveys and censuses (Edited by Chun, Schouten and Wagner, forthcoming). In our efforts to address multiple challenges affecting the survey community and the fundamental interest of the community of survey methodologists to produce quality data, we propose a session of papers that discuss the latest methodological solutions and challenges in adaptive and responsive designs for complex surveys. We encourage submission of papers on the following topics of adaptive or responsive design:

1. Applied and theoretical contributions, and comparisons of variants of adaptive design that leverage strengths of administrative records, big data, census data, and paradata. For instance, what cost-quality tradeoff paradigm can be operationalized to guide development of cost and quality metrics and their use around the survey life cycle? Under what conditions can administrative records or big data be adaptively used to supplement survey data collection and improve data quality?
2. Papers addressing the following triple drivers of adaptive/responsive design: cost, respondent burden, and data quality. For instance, what indicators of data quality can be integrated to monitor the course of the data collection process? What stopping rules for data collection can be used across the phases of a multi-mode survey?
3. Papers involving longitudinal survey designs where data collection systems need to fulfill their panel focus and provide data for the same units over time, and leverage adaptive processes to reduce cost, reduce burden, and/or increase quality. For instance, how can survey managers best engage the complexity of issues around implementing adaptive and responsive designs, especially for panel surveys that are in principle focused on measuring change over time? How are overrepresented or low priority cases handled in a longitudinal context?
4. Papers involving experimental designs or simulations of adaptive survey design. For instance, experimental implementation of an adaptive design, especially those involving multiple data sources, a mixed mode of data collection or a cross-national design.
5. Papers that apply Bayesian methods to build adaptive designs. For example, adaptive designs where the design parameters are given priors and then updated as additional data are collected.

1. Aggressive, Relaxed, or Simply the Default? Adaptive Survey Design Strategies to Reduce Nonresponse Error

Dr Antje Kirchner (RTI International)

Dr Nicole Tate (RTI International)
Dr Emilia Peytcheva (RTI International)
Mrs Jennifer Cooney (RTI International)
Dr Natasha Janson (RTI International)

2. An adaptive design approach to web fieldwork on the UK Household Longitudinal Study

Miss Hannah Carpenter (Kantar Public)
Dr Jon Burton (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)

3. A Preliminary Development of a Methodological Approach to Case Prioritization using Composite R-Indicators for the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)

Dr Kevin Tolliver (U.S. Census Bureau)
Dr Jason Fields (U.S. Census Bureau)

4. Managing trade-offs between fieldwork cost, response bias and response rates in a large-scale longitudinal survey

Dr Lisa Calderwood (University College London)
Mr Martin Wood (NatCen Social Research)
Dr Pablo Cevera Alvarez (University of Salamanca)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N AUD5

It's the Interviewers! New developments in interviewer effects research 5

Chair Dr Salima Douhou (City University of London, CCSS)
Coordinator 1 Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 2 Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 3 Dr Kathrin Thomas (City University of London, CCSS)
Coordinator 4 Mr Joel Williams (TNS BMRB)

Session Details

To what extent do interviewers affect data collection and how can we better monitor and limit their impact?

Any deviation from the standardised protocol of the data collection process has the potential to induce bias to the data. Interviewer effects, defined as the distortions of survey responses in surveys with interviewer presence, may have a severe impact on data quality. These effects result from potential reactions to the social style and personality of interviewers, but also to their presentation of questions.

Analysis based on data that are biased by interviewer intervention and the conclusions drawn on the basis of this are likely to be incorrect. Hence, survey methodologists have improved the way in which interviewers are trained and briefed in order to limit the interviewers' influence. Yet, it remains open why even in surveys with exceptional efforts to train and monitor interviewers, interviewer effects occur.

Interviewers make (initial) contact with the prospective respondents and attempt to convince them to participate in the survey. The doorstep interaction between prospective respondents and interviewers is rarely documented, but an increasing number of studies indicates that some interviewers are more successful than others in convincing the prospective respondents to participate in a survey and to avoid non-response.

Once door-step interaction has been successful, interviewers may further affect the way in which respondents answer the survey questions on the questionnaire. Variation in survey responses may be due to the attitudes, interpersonal skills and personality of interviewers, but also relate to how the interviewers present particular questions and how strictly they follow the instructions. Any deviation from the standardised protocol provided by the core research team of the survey project decreases the comparability of the survey responses.

This session welcomes papers on new developments in the area of interviewer effects. Topics may include but are not restricted to:

- methodological developments in measuring and modelling interviewer effects,
- interviewer effects on measurement error,
- interviewer effects on nonresponse rates and nonresponse bias,
- interviewer influences on response latencies (timings),
- influence of personality traits, behaviour, attitudes, experience, and other characteristics of interviewers on survey estimates,
- implications for interviewer recruitment and training strategies,
- monitoring and evaluation of fieldwork efforts by interviewers,
- collection of GPS data or audio-visual material of door-step interactions.

Papers that discuss these issues from a comparative perspective are also welcome. We invite academic and non-academic researchers and survey practitioners to contribute to our session.

1. Interviewer effects on response latencies in a face-to-face interview survey

Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)
Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)
Professor Patrick Sturgis (University of Southampton)

2. Time is Money, or Is It? Using Module Lengths to Evaluate Interviewer Effects

Dr Kathrin Thomas (City, University of London)
Dr Salima Douhou (City, University of London)
Miss Virginia Ros (City, University of London)

3. The Impact of Interviewer Effects on Regression Coefficients

Mr Micha Fischer (University of Michigan)
Professor Brady T. West (University of Michigan)
Professor Michael R. Elliott (University of Michigan)
Professor Frauke Kreuter (University of Maryland)

4. Explaining interviewer effects: an alternative approach

Professor Geert Loosveldt (KU Leuven)
Dr Koen Beullens (KU Leuven)
Dr Caroline Vandenplas (KU Leuven)

5. Interviewer-respondent interactions in CAPI and CATI: Rapport through laughter?

Dr Yfke Ongena (University of Groningen)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N 101

Overview of open access European survey data 5

Chair Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (SHARE – Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)

Coordinator 1 Ms Sabine Friedel (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging, Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)

Session Details

In recent years, many large sets of survey data have been made available to the scientific community. Large national and European surveys, such as ESS, SHARE, SOEP, Understanding Society, etc., disseminate their data to registered users. For researchers it can be difficult to get a good overview of what is offered and to find the specific variables and samples of their interest.

This session aims to give researchers more insight into the variety of variables available in large survey datasets. For that purpose, we invite survey practitioners to present their data sets, longitudinal as well as cross-sectional, to potential users. Presentations should address the following survey characteristics: Research field, target population and sample, survey design, data access regulations, available survey variables and paradata, linked administrative data (if applicable), and some examples of data use. Moreover, we especially welcome overviews including information which can be used for methodological analysis, such as key stroke data, auxiliary information, interviewer characteristics and observations, response behavior, experimental designs, etc.

1. Design and Research Potential of the German Family Panel "Pairfam"

Ms Kristin Hajek (LMU Munich)
Professor Josef Brüderl (LMU Munich)

2. TwinLife – An open access twin family panel on genetic and social causes of inequalities

Professor Martin Diewald (Bielefeld University)
Mr Volker Lang (Bielefeld University)

3. The German PIAAC-Longitudinal Survey: A Wealth of Data

Ms Anouk Zabal (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Ms Silke Martin (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Assessing the Quality of Survey Data 1

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. Comparing Survey Data and Registry Data: How Reliable are Measures of Wages and Educations Degrees?

Mr Peter Valet (Bielefeld University)

Ms Jule Adriaans (Bielefeld University)

2. Quality metric for ongoing health surveys

Dr Margo Barr (University of Wollongong)

Professor David Steel (University of Wollongong)

3. Quality Controls and Their Application to Substantive Analyses of Data from International Survey Projects

Dr Irina Tomescu-Dubrow (Polish Academy of Sciences and CONSIRT)

Professor Kazimeirz Slomczynski (The Ohio State University, the Polish Academy of Sciences and CONSIRT)

4. Assessing and interpreting discontinuities in the transition to an integrated survey

Mr Paul Smith (S3RI, University of Southampton)

Professor Nikos Tzavidis (University of Southampton)

Dr Timo Schmid (Freie Universitat Berlin)

Professor Jan van den Brakel (University of Maastricht)

Mr Steven Marshall (Welsh Government)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Probability-based research panels 1

Chair Mr Darren Pennay (Social Research Centre, Australian National University)

Session Details

Around the world nowadays online panels are routinely used as a method for gathering survey data for many varied purposes; including for economic, political, public policy, marketing, and health research.

Web surveys, most of which are conducted via online panels, are a relatively recent development in the history of survey research; starting in the United States and Europe in the mid-1990s and then expanding elsewhere in the world. Worldwide expenditure on online surveys has quadrupled in the last 10 years from \$US1.5B in 2004 to \$US6B in 2014.

From the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s, there was an exponential growth in the creation of online panels and increases in the sizes of the membership of such panels. This led to a proliferation of unique panel vendors. But since 2005, the developing need for panels with extremely large number of panellists led to a consolidation of panel vendors through the means of corporate acquisition (cf. Callegaro, Baker, Bethlehem, Göritz, Krosnick and Lavrakas, 2014).

In 2015, the vast majority of online panels, as well as the vast majority of people who participate in them, have been established/recruited via non-probability sampling methods.

In United States, parts of Europe, and now in Australia, the increased use of the web for data collection also resulted in establishment of probability based online research panels to enable the scientific sampling of the population.

The intent of this session is to explore the development of probability-based online panels around the world and to encourage survey practitioners involved in probability-based online panels to present papers exploring the various methods used to establish and maintain these panels. Papers might explore issues such as the methods for including the offline population, methods to maximise response and minimise attrition and methods to reduce measurement error when administering questionnaires to panellists.

It is hoped that this session would be of interest to probability-based online panel practitioners as well as researchers who

routinely use probability and non-probability online panels or want to learn more about such panels

1. Usage of Online Panels in Survey Methodology Field: a Systematic Review

Miss Chiara Respi (University of Milano-Bicocca)
Professor Katja Lozar Manfreda (University of Ljubljana)

2. Building and Maintaining a True Probability-based Internet Panel

Mr Joris Mulder (CentERdata, Tilburg University)

3. Recruiting and Representativeness of a Probability Internet Panel

Ms Jill Darling (University of Southern California)
Dr Arie Kaptyn (University of Southern California)
Ms Tania Gutsche (University of Southern California)

4. The feasibility of establishing a cross-national probability-based online panel

Dr Ana Villar (City, University of London)
Ms Elena Sommer (City, University of London)
Mr Didrik Finnøy (Norwegian Centre for Research Data)
Mr Bjørn-Ole Johannesen (Norwegian Centre for Research Data)
Dr Mare Ainsaar (University of Tartu)
Professor Slavko Kurdija (University of Ljubljana)
Mr Alun Humphrey (NatCen Social Research)
Mr Indrek Soidla (University of Tartu)
Ms Tina Vovk (University of Ljubljana)

5. Design, setting-up and outcome indicators of a probability-based online panel in Spain

Ms Sara Pasadas del Amo (IESA/CSIC)
Ms Rafaela Sotomayor Lozano (IESA/CSIC)
Mr Manuel Trujillo Carmona (IESA/CSIC)
Mr Juan Antonio Domínguez Álvarez (IESA/CSIC)
Ms Carmela Gutiérrez Aranda (IESA/CSIC)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Response Format and Response Behavior 1

Chair Mr Jan Karem Höhne (University of Göttingen)
Coordinator 1 Dr Timo Lenzner (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 2 Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Measuring attitudes, opinions, or behaviors of respondents is a very widespread strategy in sociology, political science, economics, and psychology to investigate a variety of individual and social phenomena. A special challenge in measuring such characteristics of respondents is to employ appropriate response formats. Since they can have a profound impact on the cognitive and communicative response processes, and thus, on measurement quality. For this reason essential questions arise with respect to different response formats and their impact on the (cognitive) information processing of respondents.

This session welcomes contributions that are based on empirical studies as well as theoretical considerations dealing with the relationship between response format and response behavior:

With respect to empirical studies we especially invite contributions that are based on experimental designs which investigate, for instance, the influence of the response scale direction. Moreover, we welcome presentations using new (innovative) techniques and approaches as well as replication studies under different conditions such as survey modes and/or device types.

With respect to theoretical considerations we welcome presentations that discuss and reflect the relationship between response format and response behavior in the context of an interdisciplinary perspective. This includes contributions that deal with the merits and limits of experimental study designs, research methods, and statistical procedures.

For this session, we welcome contributions on the following research areas (but not limited to):

- Measuring cognitive effort and response quality associated with response formats,
- Comparisons of visual presentation forms (e.g., arrangement and presentation mode),
- Differences between several types of response formats (e.g., open vs. closed),
- Future perspectives and developments (e.g., gamification strategies),
- Measurement quality (e.g., reliability and validity),

- New methods and techniques (e.g., eye tracking and paradata),
- Replications of empirical studies and findings,
- Response bias (e.g., acquiescence),
- Theoretical considerations on response format and response behavior.

1. The impact of response scale format on measurement quality

Miss Anna DeCastellarnau (Tilburg University / European Social Survey - Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

2. Do 11-point scales guarantee better measurement quality than shorter scales in multi-lingual surveys?

Professor CAROLINE ROBERTS (UNIVERSITY OF LAUSANNE)

Dr ANA VILLAR (City University, London)

Dr Yongwei Yang (Google)

3. Measurement Attributes of Agree/Disagree and Item-Specific Questions

Professor Dagmar Dr. Krebs (University of Giessen, Germany)

4. Acquiescence responding: The effect of the number of labelling of response options

Dr Fanney Thorsdottir (University of Iceland)

5. The Influence of Public Opinion Polls: The Effects of Immediate Survey Feedback on Measurement and Respondent Satisfaction

Ms Franziska Gebhard (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim, Germany)

Professor Annelies G. Blom (German Internet Panel, SFB 884 and School of Social Sciences, University of Mannheim, Germany)

Ms Marina Fikel (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim, Germany)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q4 ANF1

Biomeasure Collection in Social Surveys - Challenges and Opportunities 1

Chair Mr Matt Brown (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Coordinator 1 Dr Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Coordinator 2 Ms Anne Conolly (Health and Biomedical team, NatCen Social Research)

Coordinator 3 Dr Shaun Scholes (Research Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London)

Session Details

It has become increasingly common for social surveys to incorporate the collection of biometrics. Self-reported health assessments, behaviours and measurements are useful, but it is known that they can be prone to bias. Objective health measures can augment survey data considerably, enabling researchers to discover things that cannot be captured through survey questions. The inclusion of objective measurements within social surveys allows us to assess health with significantly greater accuracy and therefore to deepen our understanding of the interplay between social and biological factors in explaining human behaviour. Such measurements encompass a range of anthropometric (e.g. height and weight), functional (e.g. grip strength, balance), and sensory measurements (e.g. hearing), as well as biological samples (e.g. blood, saliva, urine), other physiological health measurements (e.g. blood pressure, lung function), and device-based measurement of physical activity.

Typically this type of data is collected either in participants' homes or in a clinic and may be carried out by trained field interviewers or by those with medical training and expertise. Technological advances and the development of minimally invasive techniques of data collection have increased the feasibility of collecting biometrics at home and by fieldworkers with no medical training. Respondent-led collection of their own biomedical data is also now emerging as a data collection method – for example, some studies now ask respondents to self-collect buccal swabs. Additionally, there has been an increase in the use of wearable technology (e.g. fitness trackers, smart watches, smart eyewear) among the general population. There is growing interest in exploiting such technology for data collection in survey research, although this can be resource-intensive and expensive.

This session invites survey practitioners to share their experiences of incorporating the collection of biometrics into social surveys. We welcome submissions relating to:

- Innovative approaches to the collection of biometrics
- Comparisons of objective measures with self-reported data
- Training of fieldworkers to collect biometrics
- Respondent-led collection of biometrics
- Methods to maximise response to and/or representativeness of biometrics
- Collecting biometrics in special populations (e.g. older people)
- Ethical challenges (e.g. relating to feedback of results, consent for ongoing use of biological samples)

Papers need not be restricted to these specific examples.

1. Data collection in the MRC National Survey of Health and Development at 68-69 years

Ms Maria Popham (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Ms Hayley Cheshire (Kantar Public Associate)

Ms Carli Lessof (Kantar Public Associate and NCRM Doctoral Student)

Dr Andrew Wong (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Dr Nikhil Sharma (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Dr Mai Stafford (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Professor Rebecca Hardy (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Professor Marcus Richards (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Dr Rachel Cooper (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Professor Di Kuh (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

2. Using nurses as interviewers in a biomedical follow-up of the 1970 British Cohort Study.

Mr Matt Brown (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Dr Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Ms Kate Taylor (NatCen Social Research)

Ms Hannah Morgan (NatCen Social Research)

3. Estimating nurse effects on participating in bio-social surveys

Dr Alexandru Cernat (University of Manchester)

Dr Joe Sakshaug (University of Manchester)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Measurement Invariance: Testing for it and Explaining Why It Is Absent 1

Chair Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Cologne and University of Zurich)

Session Details

Measurement invariance tests are a popular approach to assess the cross-national comparability of data. However, researchers often have difficulties to establish the highest level of measurement invariance, scalar invariance (Davidov et al. 2012).

In recent years, the predominant approach to “fix” this issue is to opt for more statistical sophistication and relaxing certain requirements when testing for measurement invariance. Approaches, such as Bayesian structural equation modelling (BSEM) (Muthén and Asparouhov 2012; van de Schoot 2015) or alignment (Asparouhov and Muthén 2014) fall in this category.

However, these approaches cannot provide reasons as to why measurement invariance cannot be found. An alternative approach in this context is to view the lack of measurement invariance as a source of information on cross-group differences and to try explaining the individual, societal, or historical sources of measurement nonequivalence (Davidov et al. 2014). On the one hand, quantitative approaches—such as the multiple indicators multiple causes model (MIMIC) (Davidov et al. 2014) and the multilevel structural equation models (MLSEMs) (Davidov et al. 2012)—aim to substantively explain cases of noninvariance. On the other hand, there is an increasing awareness of the potential of mixed methods approaches to explain instances of measurement invariances (e.g., Latcheva 2011; Panyusheva & Efremova 2012; Meitinger 2016). These studies mostly use results from cognitive interviewing or online probing to explain why measurement invariance was not found. In contrast to the purely quantitative approaches, the mixed method approaches often reveal previously unknown and surprising causes for the incomparability of data.

This session aims at presenting studies that either test for measurement invariance or examine the reasons why tests for measurement invariances failed in certain research situations. We welcome (1) presentations that take a purely quantitative approach to test measurement invariance or explain non-invariance, and (2) presentations which apply a mixed method approach to explain instances of missing measurement invariance.

1. Does measurement equivalence between groups and over time mean that measured concepts have the same meaning? The relation between (sub)national consciousness and perceived ethnic threat in two Belgian regions 1991-2014

Professor Jaak Billiet (ISPO - KU Leuven)

Professor Koen Abts (Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Tilburg University and ISPO - KU Leuven)

Ms Cecil Meeusen (ISPO - KU Leuven)

2. Addressing measurement invariance form a mixed methods research framework

Dr Jose-Luis Padilla (University of Granada)

Dr Isabel Benitez (Universidad Loyola Andalucía)

3. Identifying causes of measurement non-invariance in studies with migrants: a mixed-method approach

Professor Patrick Brzoska (Chemnitz University of Technology, Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences, Epidemiology Unit)

4. Proximities in the Meaning of Latent Constructs: Explaining Structural Variance by the Application of Network Analysis

Ms Zsofia Ignacz (Freie University Berlin)

Wednesday 19th July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Measuring education across different institutional settings: Lessons from longitudinal and cross-national studies

Chair Ms Kerstin Hoenig (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi))

Coordinator 1 Professor Jon Miller (University of Michigan)

Coordinator 2 Dr Silke Schneider (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 3 Mr Frank Goßmann (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi))

Session Details

The comparative measurement of educational attainment is a continuing problem due to the complexity and heterogeneity of educational systems as well as the complexity of individual educational pathways within those systems. Challenges arise at each step of the survey process, from the correct mapping of educational systems to the questions that are asked in surveys and finally the coding standards employed to derive common classifications. Recall error and social desirability can cause significant problems when respondents are asked to provide information about their education history. The aim of this session is to combine experiences from cross-national and longitudinal studies to improve the measurement of educational credentials and educational pathways.

Due to time restrictions, cross-national surveys usually collect a standardized measure of respondents' highest educational degree. Classifications like ISCED and CASMIN aim to provide comparable indicators across countries, but a unified standard for the measurement and coding of the information that forms the basis for these classifications has yet to emerge. These problems are especially pronounced for comparisons between countries. But even within countries, education reforms and migration can lead to increased measurement error for subgroups who did not attend the education system the survey is geared to. An increased effort in mapping education systems and use of specialized software could reduce measurement error, respondent burden, and coding efforts.

Meanwhile, one of the main lessons from longitudinal surveys is that education is a continuing life-long experience, often requiring periodic updates, re-training, or additional programs. By focusing on a single degree, authors of cross-sectional surveys often think of educational attainment as being something that is attained early in life with minimal changes thereafter. We argue that cross-sectional and especially cross-national research might benefit greatly from this life-course perspective.

Finally, measurements of educational pathways and credentials are challenged by educational reforms and technological change. Two important examples are the adoption of vocational training qualifications and the growth of online educational services in various countries.

Topics might include:

- Advances in the measurement and coding of educational credentials
- Advances in the measurement of educational pathways, especially ways to collect educational change and pattern data in a cross-national survey
- Papers that address the continuing nature of education and focus on non-traditional forms of education
- Comparisons of different educational classifications – ISCED, CASMIN, or national classifications
- Measuring the education of migrants and other subgroups

1. The measurement of education in longitudinal and cross-sectional studies: Lessons from the Longitudinal Study of American Youth and national US adult surveys

Dr Jon Miller (University of Michigan USA)

2. Measuring “Education” in interviews of cross-national social surveys with an emphasis on comparative research

Dr Uwe Warner (na)

Professor Jürgen H.P. Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik (University of Giessen/Germany)

3. Measurement errors within education history: Extent and Determinants

Mr Frank Gossmann (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Dr Michael Bayer (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 102

Administrative Records for Survey Methodology 2

Chair Dr Asaph Young Chun (US Census Bureau)
Coordinator 1 Professor Mike Larsen (George Washington University)
Coordinator 2 Dr Ingegerd Jansson (Statistics Sweden)
Coordinator 3 Dr Manfred Antoni (Institute for Employment Research)
Coordinator 4 Dr Daniel Fuss (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 5 Dr Corinna Kleinert (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

Incorporation of administrative records have long been regarded as a way of improving the quality and interpretability of surveys and censuses and of controlling the rising cost of surveys (Chun and Scheuren, 2011). The increasing number of linked datasets, such as Health and Retirement Study in the U.S., National Educational Panel Study in Germany, and Understanding Society in UK, are accompanied by growing empirical evidence about the selectivity of linked observations. The extent and pace of using administrative data varies from continent to continent and from country to country. This is partly due to differential concerns about privacy, confidentiality, and legal constraints, as well as variability in acceptance and implementation of advances in statistical techniques to control such concerns.

The primary goal is to control data quality and reduce total survey error. This session will feature papers that implement "total administrative records error" and "total linked data error" methods and provide case studies and best practices of using administrative data tied to the survey life cycle (Chun and Larsen, a forthcoming Wiley book). The session invites papers that discuss fundamental challenges and recent advancements involved in the collection and analysis of administrative records, integration with surveys, censuses, and auxiliary data. We also encourage submission of papers discussing institutional collaboration on linked data, sustainable data access, provision of auxiliary tools and user support. For example, papers in this session include, but are not limited to the following topics:

1. Innovative use of administrative data in household surveys and censuses to improve the survey frame, reduce nonresponse follow-up, and assess coverage error.
2. Quality evaluations of administrative data and quality metrics for linked data
3. Recent advancements in processing and linking administrative data with survey data (one-to-one) and with multiple sources of data (one-to-many).
4. Recent methods of disclosure limitation and confidentiality protection in linked data, including linkages with geographical information.
5. Bayesian approaches to using administrative data in surveys, censuses, small area estimation, and nonresponse control.
6. Implementation of new tools that facilitate the use of linked data by simplifying complex data structures or handling inconsistent information in life-course data
7. Strategies for developing and maintaining a user-friendly infrastructure for the analysis and dissemination of linked data and solutions for collaboration
8. Applications that transform administrative data into information that is useful and relevant to policymaking in public health, economics, science and education.

1. Measuring and Controlling for Non-Consent Bias in Linked Survey and Administrative Data

Dr Joseph Sakshaug (University of Manchester)

2. Save as many as possible: How to reduce selectivity in the record linkage process

Ms Christin Czaplicki (German Pension Insurance)
Ms Dina Frommert (German Pension Insurance)
Mrs Anne Langelüddeke (German Pension Insurance)
Ms Dagmar Zanker (German Pension Insurance)

3. Innovative Applications for Linking Health Survey Data to Vital and Administrative Data

Ms Lisa Mirel (CDC/NCHS/OAE/SPB)
Mr Cordell Golden (CDC/NCHS/OAE/SPB)
Mr Marc Roemer (AHRQ/CFACT)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 103

Handling missing data 2

Chair Professor George Ploubidis (University College London)
Coordinator 1 Mr Brian Dodgeon (University College London)

Session Details

Selection bias, in the form of incomplete or missing data is unavoidable in surveys. It results in smaller samples, incomplete histories, lower statistical power and bias in sample composition if missingness is related to the observed and unobserved characteristics of respondents. It is well known that unbiased estimates cannot be obtained without properly addressing the implications of incompleteness. In this session we focus on item missingness, survey non-response, and attrition over time in longitudinal surveys. We aim to identify best practices when dealing with missing data.

Under Rubin's framework, three types of missingness exist: Missing completely at random (MCAR) where the likelihood of response is unrelated to the respondents' characteristics. Missing at random (MAR) where the likelihood of response is explained by the observed characteristics of respondents, and missing not at random (MNAR) where the likelihood of response is related to both observed and unobserved characteristics of respondents.

The objective of our session is to examine the principled techniques commonly used to deal with missing data. These include, inverse probability weights, multiple imputation, and full information maximum likelihood (FIML). All techniques rely on the MAR assumption, and therefore, their plausibility depends on the ability of the researcher to identify the predictors of response.

Contributors are welcomed to contrast these techniques with other procedures such as case-wise deletion, mean replacement, regression imputations, selection models (e.g. Heckman selection models), and others. Moreover, theoretical, empirical, and substantive applications of these techniques will be considered for presentation.

1. Multiple Imputation of Missing Values: Opportunities and limitations in “real-life” applications

Ms Laura Ravazzini (FORS)
Dr Michael Ochsner (FORS)

2. Using missing data to impute missing data

Mr Micha Fischer (University of Michigan)
Mrs Felicitas Mittereder (University of Michigan)

3. Handling non-response bias in polls: the Spanish general elections (1979-2015)

Mr Pablo Cabrera Alvarez (Universidad de Salamanca)
Mr Modesto Escobar Mercado (Universidad de Salamanca)

4. Nonvoters as a missing data problem – Evaluating multiple imputation to predict party preferences

Mr Stefan Haußner (University of Duisburg-Essen)

5. Weighting and reweighting in social surveys

Professor Seppo Laaksonen (University of Helsinki)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 104

Life course research 2

Chair Professor Bogdan Voicu (Romanian Academy & Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu)

Session Details

1. Risk-averse or reproducing status? Gender, parenthood, and employer discrimination: Insights from a survey experiment

Mr Gabriele Mari (University of Trento)

2. How do Changes in Family Policies Influence the Individual Life Course?

Mrs Gesche Brandt (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))

3. Fringed life-satisfaction? A life-course perspective over the impact of international migration on subjective wellbeing

Professor Bogdan Voicu (Romanian Academy & Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 105

Analyzing Social Mechanisms in Life-Course Research 1

Chair Dr Tilo Beckers (Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf)
Coordinator 1 Dr Dominik Becker (Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen)
Coordinator 2 Dr Nicole Hiekel (University of Cologne)

Session Details

This session links mechanism-based explanations to longitudinal survey research and builds on a recently initiated debate aiming at improving theoretically grounded and empirically sound explanations in life-course research. We aim to bring together pioneer work in the field of life course research that comprises empirical applications using advanced statistical methods to unravel why various life course patterns and outcomes exist by studying how they came about. A key principle of the life course approach is the linkage between contextual characteristics and situations on the one hand (situational mechanisms), and the linkage between situations and action or attitude formation on the other hand (action formation mechanisms). Life course researchers have developed powerful statistical techniques to examine panel data, yet mechanism-based explanations underlying the life course process of interest are rare.

The last decade has seen a growing interest in the concept of social mechanisms (Demeulenaere 2011; Tranow/Beckers/Becker 2016*). The debate focuses on the question of which principles define a satisfactory way of doing social sciences. Most advocates of the social mechanism approach agree that social phenomena should be explained by opening up the black box of explanation and making explicit the causal “cogs and wheels” (Elster 1989) by which these social phenomena are brought into existence.

Life course research provokes questions about social processes and mechanisms, i.e. the identification of patterns and trajectories of stability and change but also of catalysts, drivers and the “wheelworks” (Shanahan/Elder 1997; Keijer/Nagel/Liefbroer 2016). Within the life course approach, analyses and explanations may engage in the identification of i) social mechanisms related to the opportunity structure such as institutional arrangements (e.g., provision of family- or job-related subsidies), ii) belief-driven mechanisms (e.g. rational imitation or self-fulfilling prophecies), and iii) desire-driven mechanisms (e.g. educational or job-related preference formation; dissonance reduction).

We invite the submission of abstracts on (emergent) research projects with statistically advanced empirical applications that specify and link social mechanisms to life course patterns and outcomes. Submitted abstracts should include a research question, theoretical and tested social mechanism(s), research design, data and technique of analysis of social mechanisms and (preliminary) results.

* English language Special Issue & Introduction in *Analyse und Kritik* 38(1): 1-30
(<http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/auk.2016.38.issue-1/issue-files/auk.2016.38.issue-1.xml>)

1. Kinship Effects on Residential Mobility and Ancestry Segregation in Sweden

Dr Benjamin Jarvis (Linköping University)
Dr Guilherme Chihaya (Umeå University)

2. Still an open question? Assessing the causal relationship between students' aspirations and school success.

Mr Thomas Zimmermann (University of Kassel)

3. Tracking and Educational Careers: Is Strict Sorting by Ability Really Responsible for the Increase of Social and Ethnic Inequalities in Educational Success (Only)? A Comparison of the Educational Systems of German Country States with Dates from the “National Educational Panel Study” (NEPS).

Professor Hartmut Esser (University of Mannheim/Mannheim Centre for European Social research)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 106

Methodological, Practical and Theoretical Challenges in Research on Refugees

2

Chair Dr Roman Auriga (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 1 Dr Gisela Will (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 2 Dr Christoph Homuth (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

The massive increase in the number of refugees since 2015 poses significant socio-political challenges to the receiving

countries. For this reason, policy makers are looking for appropriate policies supporting effective and efficient social integration of refugees based on well-grounded empirical research. However, previous research on migration can only partly meet this need. There are first studies with the recent refugee groups (like IAB-SOEP-BAMF sample and the Re-GES study at LIfBi in Germany, or projects from Statistics Canada) but it is still little known about how to do appropriate research and how to conduct studies with these very specific target persons.

Therefore, the session focuses on methodological and practical challenges in research on refugees (cross-sectional and panel). We also aim at the exchange of experiences on interviewing refugees and bringing scholars together, which focus on both prior waves on refugees and recent migration of asylum seekers as well as migration researchers in general. We aim at addressing mainly the following questions:

Study design

Refugees are a very special group of migrants as their legal statuses, return aspirations or trajectories differ e. g. from working migrants. However, refugees resemble other migrants due to similar challenges in the receiving countries. Due to this duality the following questions arise: Are the migrant groups really that distinct? What is similar? Which experience of former migration research can be used? What has to be adjusted or newly developed? How can research designs cope with the expected special challenges of refugee studies (e.g. traumatic experiences)? What innovative designs can be used to analyse existing data sets regarding these questions?

Sampling

What is the best way to identify refugees? How to deal with non-complete or non-existing registers? How can small groups of refugees be studied adequately? What strategies exist to reach undocumented migrants?

Tracking

Refugees are often a very mobile group. In panel studies, tracking of participants is especially challenging in case of illegal or non-registered persons. What special strategies exist/are needed to track refugees? How do they differ from tracking other migrants? Are special incentive schemes needed?

Languages

There exist good strategies for translation of questionnaires. However, experience and expertise of interviewing and translating into rare languages as well as about the comparability of findings are restricted. How can we deal with various and infrequent languages in one study and how comparable are the results?

1. How to Track Refugees on their Way to German Universities?

Mr Michael Grüttner (DZHW)

2. Challenges in a survey on refugees in Hanover

Dr Karina Hoekstra (Institute of Sociology, University of Hanover)

Mrs Irina Gewinner (Institute of Sociology, University of Hanover)

3. Measuring skills of refugees and migrants entering Europe

Mr Quy-Toan Do (World Bank)

Mr Gero Carletto (World Bank)

Mrs Maria Davalos (World Bank)

Mrs Marta Encinas-Martin (OECD)

Ms Harriet Mugeru (World Bank)

4. Surveying Refugees. Two Experiments on Anonymity and Incentivation.

Dr Johannes Bauer (Ludwig-Maximilians Universität Munich, Institute for Sociology)

Mr Felix Bader (University of Mannheim)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 107

Analyzing the lives of LGBTI people - survey approaches to LGBTI persons, couples and families 2

Chair Dr Stephanie Steinmetz (Sociology Department, University of Amsterdam)

Coordinator 1 Ms Mirjam Fischer (Sociology Department, University of Amsterdam)

Coordinator 2 Ms Nancy Bates (Research and Methodology Directorate, U.S. Census Bureau)

Session Details

In recent years, much progress has been made in the US, Europe and beyond with regard to legislation that is supportive and protective of LGBTs (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans persons). While these achievements are laudable, it is important to keep evaluating to what extent they truly improve the lives of LGBTs. There are still many sources of inequality and discrimination that remain deeply embedded in the social fabric of societies. Compared to research on other minority groups, sexual orientation has

been studied quantitatively much less in the social sciences. Yet, quantitative scholars have continuously made efforts to overcome the methodological challenges associated with studying this population by using surveys. This is an important development which should be encouraged and continued.

This session welcomes contributions focusing on the wide range of issues that need to be addressed when studying LGBT populations with survey-based methods. For example, is the 2-step method (sex assigned at birth and sex identify with now) best for reducing undercounting of transgender populations? As younger people embrace non-binary or gender-nonconforming identities, how must our questions and categories for gender identity change? Can sexual orientation be collected by proxy in surveys that use a single household informant to provide all member's demographic information? How can concepts around sexual orientation and gender identity be translated for non-Western cultures and non-native languages? Are there interviewer effects when collecting SOGI in telephone and personal visit surveys? Does the addition of SOGI items harm unit response rates in surveys that do not typically collect such items (e.g. labor force or consumer expenditure surveys)? What are strategies for designing sampling frames intended at capturing LGBT populations? In addition, this session also invites submissions that focus on topical survey results around LGBT populations such as physical and mental health disparities, income inequality, hate crimes, and household and family structures. The session hopes to draw a cross-section of submissions from different countries and different survey experiences.

1. Comparing two versions of a 2-step assessment for identifying transgender respondents in a national sample of U.S. adults

Dr Ilan Meyer (UCLA)
Mr Evan Krueger (UCLA)
Ms Stephanie Marken (Gallup)
Dr Sari Reisner (Harvard)
Dr Walter Bockting (Columbia University)
Dr Jody Herman (UCLA)

2. Large-scale studies on small-scale groups: Sampling bias and other challenges in research on transgender individuals in the Netherlands

Dr Lisette Kuyper (The Netherlands Institute of Social Research)

3. Quality of Official Data on Cohabiting Same-Sex Couples in Germany

Dr Andrea Lengerer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. Sensitivity and specificity of a 1-item assessment of LGBT identity in a national sample of U.S. adults

Ms Stephanie Marken (Gallup)
Mr Evan Krueger (UCLA)
Dr Ilan Meyer (UCLA)
Dr Walter Bockting (Columbia University)
Dr Jody Herman (UCLA)
Dr Sari Reisner (Harvard)

5. The proportion of the population of England self-identifying as lesbian, gay and bisexual in England: producing modelled estimates based on national social surveys

Dr Sanne Christine van Kampen (University of Plymouth)
Mr Mauro Fornasiero (University of Plymouth)
Dr William Lee (University of Plymouth)
Dr Kerry Husk (University of Plymouth)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 108

Mixed Methods Sampling Procedures: Techniques, Methodological Problems, and Meta-Inferences

Chair Dr Andrea Hense (Sociological Research Institute Göttingen (SOFI))

Coordinator 1 Dr Leila Akreemi (TU Berlin)

Session Details

The term "mixed methods" usually indicates a mixture of qualitative and quantitative sampling procedures, data collections, or data analyses within a single study or longitudinal program of inquiry. This session will focus on sampling procedures that use qualitative data or results to take decisions regarding the quantitative sampling or vice versa. The topic of mixed methods sampling is largely neglected in the literature (some exceptions: Collins 2010; Teddlie/Yu 2007). Thus, the session will provide a forum for discussing different strategies of mixed methods sampling, their advantages and disadvantages. Papers should discuss sampling strategies with regard to specific empirical projects and explain in more detail why mixed methods sampling strategies were used. The sampling process comprises several decisions: defining the population/field of concern and sampling

units, specifying strategies to select cases before or during the research process, determining the sample size, getting access to the field and defining the role of the researcher, implementing the sampling strategy and dealing with refusals to participate, generating statistical/analytical inferences etc. Moreover, mixed methods sampling complicates the decision process because quantitative and qualitative approaches build upon different methodological considerations and quality criteria that have to be taken into account if both methods are treated equally. Papers should refer to some of these issues and discuss how mixed methods sampling helped to overcome sampling problems or created new challenges.

1. Sampling procedures on mixed-methods research with parental couples: challenges from joint interviews

Mrs Mariana Amorim (ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, nº 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal; Global Public Health Doctoral Programme; Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade do Porto, Alameda Prof. Hernâni Monteiro, 4200-319 Porto, Portugal)

Professor Elisabete Alves (ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, nº 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal; Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade do Porto, Alameda Prof. Hernâni Monteiro, 4200-319 Porto, Portugal)

Professor Catarina Samorinha (ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, nº 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal)

Professor Cláudia de Freitas (ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, nº 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal; Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology, University Institute of Lisbon (ISCTE-IUL), Avenida das Forças Armadas, 1649-026 Lisboa, Portugal)

Professor Susana Silva (ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, nº 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal; Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade do Porto, Alameda Prof. Hernâni Monteiro, 4200-319 Porto, Portugal)

2. Sampling Procedures in a Longitudinal Study Following a Two-Generation Preschool Program for Low-Income Canadian Families

Ms Carla Ginn (Faculty of Nursing, University of Calgary)

Dr Karen Benzies (Faculty of Nursing, University of Calgary)

Dr Leslie Anne Keown (Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University)

Dr Shelley Raffin Bouchal (Faculty of Nursing, University of Calgary)

Dr Wilfreda E. (Billie) Thurston (Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary)

3. Case Selection in Mixed Method Research: The Case of Explanatory Design

Mr Oded Mcdossi (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 109

The Study of Value Change Using European Values Surveys 2

Chair Professor Hermann Duellmer (University of Cologne)

Coordinator 1 Professor Ruud Luijkx (Tilburg University)

Coordinator 2 Dr Malina Voicu (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Cologne)

Session Details

Various surveys carried out during the last decades provide a large amount of information about values and attitudes shared by people living in various countries around the globe. European Values Study was the pioneer of the surveys on values, collecting data every nine years, since 1981 and having an extensive geographical coverage in Europe. EVS still includes an impressive number of unchanged questions since 1981 allowing overtime comparisons on values related to a very broad spectrum of life domains: family and marriage, economics, work, leisure, politics, religion, morality. Other surveys, such as World Values Survey, International Social Survey Program, complement EVS in terms of geographical coverage and provide information about values and attitudes of people living not only in Europe but also in other regions of the world.

This session focuses on the analysis of value change under the impact of contextual factors and encourages submissions that make use of the comparative potential of surveys on values and attitudes from a methodological and a substantive perspective. To give a few examples: What is the impact of recent political events on attitudes and values? What are the basic empirical findings on long-term change and what are the main cross national differences? Which are the best methods to investigate overtime changes in values and attitudes? How to combine data coming from different surveys to study overtime trends? Do the measurement instruments that have been used in these surveys guarantee comparability across time and space?

Submissions making use of comparative surveys data like European Values Study, World Values Survey, International Social Survey Program, European Social Survey or Eurobarometer are welcome.

1. The Measurement Instruments of Japanese Religiosity from a Comparative Perspective: Data Analysis of the WVS 6th Wave

Professor Kazufumi Manabe (Aoyama Gakuin University)

2. Dynamics of Social Change using Comparative Survey Data – a Polish Example

Professor Jerzy Bartkowski (Warsaw University)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N AUD4

Adaptive and Responsive Designs in Complex Surveys: Recent Advancements and Challenges 2

- Chair** Mr Jason Fields (U.S. Census Bureau)
Coordinator 1 Dr Asaph Young Chun (U.S. Census Bureau)
Coordinator 2 Professor James Wagner (University of Michigan)
Coordinator 3 Dr Barry Schouten (Statistics Netherlands)
Coordinator 4 Ms Nicole Watson (University of Melbourne)

Session Details

Adaptive and responsive survey designs (Groves and Heeringa, 2006; Wagner, 2008) have attempted to respond to a changing survey environment that has become increasingly multimode, multiple data sources-driven and multilingual. The Journal of Official Statistics will be publishing in 2017 a Special Issue on Adaptive Design in complex surveys and censuses (Edited by Chun, Schouten and Wagner, forthcoming). In our efforts to address multiple challenges affecting the survey community and the fundamental interest of the community of survey methodologists to produce quality data, we propose a session of papers that discuss the latest methodological solutions and challenges in adaptive and responsive designs for complex surveys. We encourage submission of papers on the following topics of adaptive or responsive design:

1. Applied and theoretical contributions, and comparisons of variants of adaptive design that leverage strengths of administrative records, big data, census data, and paradata. For instance, what cost-quality tradeoff paradigm can be operationalized to guide development of cost and quality metrics and their use around the survey life cycle? Under what conditions can administrative records or big data be adaptively used to supplement survey data collection and improve data quality?
2. Papers addressing the following triple drivers of adaptive/responsive design: cost, respondent burden, and data quality. For instance, what indicators of data quality can be integrated to monitor the course of the data collection process? What stopping rules for data collection can be used across the phases of a multi-mode survey?
3. Papers involving longitudinal survey designs where data collection systems need to fulfill their panel focus and provide data for the same units over time, and leverage adaptive processes to reduce cost, reduce burden, and/or increase quality. For instance, how can survey managers best engage the complexity of issues around implementing adaptive and responsive designs, especially for panel surveys that are in principle focused on measuring change over time? How are overrepresented or low priority cases handled in a longitudinal context?
4. Papers involving experimental designs or simulations of adaptive survey design. For instance, experimental implementation of an adaptive design, especially those involving multiple data sources, a mixed mode of data collection or a cross-national design.
5. Papers that apply Bayesian methods to build adaptive designs. For example, adaptive designs where the design parameters are given priors and then updated as additional data are collected.

1. Statistics Canada's Experiences in Using Paradata to Manage Responsive Collection Design CATI household surveys

Mr Francois Laflamme (Statistics Canada)

2. Interactive Adaptive Total Design Reports for Near Real-Time Survey Monitoring

Mr Joe Murphy (RTI International)
Dr Paul Biemer (RTI International)
Mr Michael Duprey (RTI International)
Mr Rob Chew (RTI International)

3. When to stop calling? Dataset representativeness during data collection: An assessment using linked 2011 UK Census data

Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)
Dr Jamie Moore (University of Southampton)
Professor Peter Smith (University of Southampton)

4. To Push or Not to Push: Tailoring Response Mode to Individual Respondents

Ms Cameron McPhee (American Institutes for Research)
Mr Michael Jackson (American Institutes for Research)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N AUD5

The role of interviewers in personal interviews and test situations

Chair Ms Manja Attig (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 1 Mr Felix Benjamin Grobe (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 2 Ms Claudia Karwath (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

This session deals with different kinds of interviewer effects in personal interviews and test situations.

Interviewers can affect the whole process of data collection and data quality in a positive or negative way, for example their sociodemographic background (e.g. sex, age, education), their behavior (e.g. interaction process on the doorstep), their attitude (e.g. while asking questions) as well as their experience as interviewer (e.g. while handling refusal or sensitive contents) can have an impact. Further, these factors are linked to and influence each other.

In addition, interviewers can be subject to other structural influences (e.g. payment, burden, continuity), which can affect the process of data collection and data quality as well. For these reasons it is important to investigate the effects of interviewers more closely.

Researchers are invited to submit abstracts focusing on the above mentioned research questions. Further, work concentrating on analyzes with longitudinal data, e.g. the German National Educational Panel Study, the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study or the 1970 British Cohort Study, are welcome.

We are interested in theoretical as well as empirical studies considering the influence of interviewers on data outcomes.

1. Adapting Clinical Protocols for Survey Research Administration: Implications for Interviewer Training and Data Quality

Ms Eva Leissou (University of Michigan, Survey research Center, Survey Research Operations)
Ms Lindsay Ryan (University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, Health and Retirement Study)
Ms Donnalee Grey-Farquharson (University of Michigan, Survey research Center, Survey Research Operations)

2. Let's ask interviewers! (Case: ESS Slovenia)

Mrs Ziva Broder (University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences)
Mrs Rebeka Falle Zorman (University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences)

3. Do interviewers affect test situations in households? Results from the newborn cohort study of the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS).

Miss Claudia Karwath (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Dr Manja Attig (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N 101

Comparative Survey Research Methodology using the European Social Survey

Chair Dr Kathrin Thomas (City, University of London)
Coordinator 1 Professor Rainer Schnell (City, University of London)

Session Details

The European Social Survey (ESS) is one of the largest comparative survey projects worldwide incorporating over 35 countries. The ESS data are available online for academic research without charge. Furthermore, the ESS is committed to transparency and extensive documentation about how the data are collected from planning stage to questionnaire design, field work to data cleaning and analysis. In providing detailed field work documentations by country and year as well as contact sheets, para data, and related materials, the ESS data allow addressing core questions of survey research methodology in a comparative framework.

While the large number of countries incorporated in this project provide an exceptionally large variety of different contexts, cultural diversity, and country specific peculiarities in how surveys are conducted, they also pose a particular challenge on comparative survey research with regard to the data quality and comparability. It is important to study what differences occur, why they occur, and what effect they have on the comparability and quality of the ESS data.

We thus invite papers that focus on studying the cross-country differences in survey methodology using the ESS data. We are particularly interested in all aspects relating to the conceptual framework of the Total Survey Error (TSE),

which describes statistical error properties of sample survey statistics, such as non-response, design effects, interviewer effects, para data, and response styles.

The aim of the session is to provide empirical analysis that allows evaluating whether potential issues with regard to the TSE are prominent in the ESS data, but also to provide informed suggestions on how to improve future ESS data collections.

The papers submitted to this session may also be relevant for other comparative survey projects beyond the ESS, which may face similar challenges and allow equivalent analysis strategies. In addition, the panel may attract representatives of field organisations for advice on how to improve the data collection process.

Disclaimer: This session is aimed at rigorous, state-of-the-art quantitative approaches to comparative survey methodology. We thus recommend that papers focusing on the qualitative approaches to pretesting, comparative questionnaire design, and language equivalence submit to other panels.

1. The Impact of Formal Question Characteristics on Design Effects in the ESS

Dr Kathrin Thomas (City, University of London)
Professor Rainer Schnell (City, University of London)

2. Comparing the quality of fieldwork execution of individual-name, household and address samples using internal criteria - comparative analysis based on European Social Survey data

Dr Piotr Jabkowski (University of Poznan, Poland)
Dr Piotr Cichocki (University of Poznan, Poland)

3. Effects of the Number of Contact Attempts on Survey Quality and Costs in the European Social Survey

Ms Tanja Kunz (Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim)
Mr Marek Fuchs (Darmstadt University of Technology)

4. No-opinions in anti-immigration attitudes across European countries

Dr Aneta Piekut (Sheffield Methods Institute, University of Sheffield)

5. Survey response bias and gender ideology: A multi-level study on cross-country differences in gender-of-interviewer effects

Miss Dragana Stojmenovska (University of Amsterdam)
Dr Stephanie Steinmetz (University of Amsterdam)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Assessing the Quality of Survey Data 2

Chair Professor Jörg 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. Loop-de-loos: Examining respondent reporting on looping questions

Dr Antje Kirchner (RTI International)
Dr Emilia Peytcheva (RTI International)
Ms Shauna Yates (RTI International)
Ms Ashley Wilson (RTI International)
Ms Lesa Caves (RTI International)
Dr Natasha Janson (RTI International)
Dr Rebecca J. Powell (RTI International)

2. Assessing the impact of late respondents on data quality in the German sample of the European Social Survey (ESS)

Dr Michael Weinhardt (Bielefeld University)

3. The effect of the number of calls on data quality in telephone surveys of older adults

Dr Andraž Petrov?i? (University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences)

Mr Gašper Stanovnik (GfK Slovenija)

Dr Jernej Berzelak (University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences)

4. Improving the Quality of Methodological Reports in Survey Research: Practical Guidelines and a Content Analysis of Published Reports

Dr Alexander Jedinger (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Mr Oliver Watteler (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Probability-based research panels 2

Chair Mr Darren Pennay (Social Research Centre, Australian National University)

Session Details

Around the world nowadays online panels are routinely used as a method for gathering survey data for many varied purposes; including for economic, political, public policy, marketing, and health research.

Web surveys, most of which are conducted via online panels, are a relatively recent development in the history of survey research; starting in the United States and Europe in the mid-1990s and then expanding elsewhere in the world. Worldwide expenditure on online surveys has quadrupled in the last 10 years from \$US1.5B in 2004 to \$US6B in 2014.

From the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s, there was an exponential growth in the creation of online panels and increases in the sizes of the membership of such panels. This led to a proliferation of unique panel vendors. But since 2005, the developing need for panels with extremely large number of panellists led to a consolidation of panel vendors through the means of corporate acquisition (cf. Callegaro, Baker, Bethlehem, Göritz, Krosnick and Lavrakas, 2014).

In 2015, the vast majority of online panels, as well as the vast majority of people who participate in them, have been established/recruited via non-probability sampling methods.

In United States, parts of Europe, and now in Australia, the increased use of the web for data collection also resulted in establishment of probability based online research panels to enable the scientific sampling of the population.

The intent of this session is to explore the development of probability-based online panels around the world and to encourage survey practitioners involved in probability-based online panels to present papers exploring the various methods used to establish and maintain these panels. Papers might explore issues such as the methods for including the offline population, methods to maximise response and minimise attrition and methods to reduce measurement error when administering questionnaires to panellists.

It is hoped that this session would be of interest to probability-based online panel practitioners as well as researchers who routinely use probability and non-probability online panels or want to learn more about such panels

1. Effects of contact letters and incentives in offline recruitment to a probability-based online panel survey

Mr Nicolas Pekari (FORS, Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences)

2. Is shorter always better? An experimental variation of the length of the recruitment interview for a probability-based online panel.

Ms Ines Schaurer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. From face-to-face to mobile Internet: replicate the French ESS questionnaire on the ELIPSS panel.

Miss Emmanuelle Duwez (CDSP (Sciences Po))

Mr Simon Le Corgne (CDSP (Sciences Po))

Mr Malick Nam (CDSP (Sciences Po))

Mr Mathieu Olivier (CDSP (Sciences Po))

4. Converting Panelists from Mail Mode to Web Mode in Pew Research Center's American Trends Panel

Mr Nick Bertoni (Pew Research Center)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Response Format and Response Behavior 2

Chair Mr Jan Karem Höhne (University of Göttingen)
Coordinator 1 Dr Timo Lenzner (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 2 Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Measuring attitudes, opinions, or behaviors of respondents is a very widespread strategy in sociology, political science, economics, and psychology to investigate a variety of individual and social phenomena. A special challenge in measuring such characteristics of respondents is to employ appropriate response formats. Since they can have a profound impact on the cognitive and communicative response processes, and thus, on measurement quality. For this reason essential questions arise with respect to different response formats and their impact on the (cognitive) information processing of respondents.

This session welcomes contributions that are based on empirical studies as well as theoretical considerations dealing with the relationship between response format and response behavior:

With respect to empirical studies we especially invite contributions that are based on experimental designs which investigate, for instance, the influence of the response scale direction. Moreover, we welcome presentations using new (innovative) techniques and approaches as well as replication studies under different conditions such as survey modes and/or device types.

With respect to theoretical considerations we welcome presentations that discuss and reflect the relationship between response format and response behavior in the context of an interdisciplinary perspective. This includes contributions that deal with the merits and limits of experimental study designs, research methods, and statistical procedures.

For this session, we welcome contributions on the following research areas (but not limited to):

- Measuring cognitive effort and response quality associated with response formats,
- Comparisons of visual presentation forms (e.g., arrangement and presentation mode),
- Differences between several types of response formats (e.g., open vs. closed),
- Future perspectives and developments (e.g., gamification strategies),
- Measurement quality (e.g., reliability and validity),
- New methods and techniques (e.g., eye tracking and paradata),
- Replications of empirical studies and findings,
- Response bias (e.g., acquiescence),
- Theoretical considerations on response format and response behavior.

1. Closed-ended versus open-ended behavioural frequency questions: Measuring media exposure and internet usage

Dr Salima Douhou (City, University of London)
Dr Ana Villar (City, University of London)

2. Getting to the Bottom of Response Behavior when using Forced Answering in Online Surveys

Dr Jean Philippe Décieux (Université du Luxembourg)
Mrs Alexandra Mergener (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)
Mr Philipp Sischka (Université du Luxembourg)
Mrs Kristina Marliese Neufang (University of Trier)

3. Buttons in Web Surveys: A test of visual languages and placement

Dr Michael Stern (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Dr Ipek Bilgen (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Ms Erin Fordyce (NORC at the University of Chicago)

4. Improving data quality in telephone interviews by providing a response scale sheet

Dr Christoph Homuth (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi))

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF1

Biomeasure Collection in Social Surveys - Challenges and Opportunities 2

Chair Mr Matt Brown (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)
Coordinator 1 Dr Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)
Coordinator 2 Ms Anne Conolly (Health and Biomedical team, NatCen Social Research)
Coordinator 3 Dr Shaun Scholes (Research Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London)

Session Details

It has become increasingly common for social surveys to incorporate the collection of biomeasures. Self-reported health assessments, behaviours and measurements are useful, but it is known that they can be prone to bias. Objective health measures can augment survey data considerably, enabling researchers to discover things that cannot be captured through survey questions. The inclusion of objective measurements within social surveys allows us to assess health with significantly greater accuracy and therefore to deepen our understanding of the interplay between social and biological factors in explaining human behaviour. Such measurements encompass a range of anthropometric (e.g. height and weight), functional (e.g. grip strength, balance), and sensory measurements (e.g. hearing), as well as biological samples (e.g. blood, saliva, urine), other physiological health measurements (e.g. blood pressure, lung function), and device-based measurement of physical activity.

Typically this type of data is collected either in participants' homes or in a clinic and may be carried out by trained field interviewers or by those with medical training and expertise. Technological advances and the development of minimally invasive techniques of data collection have increased the feasibility of collecting biomeasures at home and by fieldworkers with no medical training. Respondent-led collection of their own biomedical data is also now emerging as a data collection method – for example, some studies now ask respondents to self-collect buccal swabs. Additionally, there has been an increase in the use of wearable technology (e.g. fitness trackers, smart watches, smart eyewear) among the general population. There is growing interest in exploiting such technology for data collection in survey research, although this can be resource-intensive and expensive.

This session invites survey practitioners to share their experiences of incorporating the collection of biomeasures into social surveys. We welcome submissions relating to:

- Innovative approaches to the collection of biomeasures
- Comparisons of objective measures with self-reported data
- Training of fieldworkers to collect biomeasures
- Respondent-led collection of biomeasures
- Methods to maximise response to and/or representativeness of biomeasures
- Collecting biomeasures in special populations (e.g. older people)
- Ethical challenges (e.g. relating to feedback of results, consent for ongoing use of biological samples)

Papers need not be restricted to these specific examples.

1. Comparison of performance-based and self-reported measures of physical functioning

Dr Mary Beth Ofstedal (University of Michigan)

Ms Min Hee Kim (University of Michigan)

2. Testing for differences in measurement devices: findings from a randomized trial to compare measures of physiological function and physical performance

Ms Carli Lessof (National Centre for Research Methods, University of Southampton)

Dr Andrew Wong (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing, UCL)

Professor Rebecca Hardy (Medical Research Council Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing, UCL)

3. Determinants of consent rates for a dried blood spot collection in SHARE

Mrs Luzia Weiss (Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)

4. Validation of Blood-Based Assays Using Dried Blood Spots and Field-Collected Venous Blood in a Population-Based Study of Aging: Examination of the Health and Retirement Study

Dr Jessica Faul (University of Michigan)

Dr Jung Ki Kim (University of Southern California)

Dr Bharat Thyagarajan (University of Minnesota)

Dr Eileen Crimmins (University of Southern California)

Dr David Weir (University of Michigan)

5. Heterogeneity in polygenic scores for common human traits in a Population-based cohort

Dr Erin Ware (University of Michigan)

Dr Lauren Schmitz (University of Michigan)

Dr Jessica Faul (University of Michigan)

Ms Arianna Gard (University of Michigan)

Dr Colter Mitchell (University of Michigan)

Dr Jennifer Smith (University of Michigan)

Dr Wei Zhao (University of Michigan)

Dr David Weir (University of Michigan)

Dr Sharon Kardia (University of Michigan)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Measurement Invariance: Testing for it and Explaining Why It Is Absent 2

Chair Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Cologne and University of Zurich)

Session Details

Measurement invariance tests are a popular approach to assess the cross-national comparability of data. However, researchers often have difficulties to establish the highest level of measurement invariance, scalar invariance (Davidov et al. 2012).

In recent years, the predominant approach to “fix” this issue is to opt for more statistical sophistication and relaxing certain requirements when testing for measurement invariance. Approaches, such as Bayesian structural equation modelling (BSEM) (Muthén and Asparouhov 2012; van de Schoot 2015) or alignment (Asparouhov and Muthén 2014) fall in this category.

However, these approaches cannot provide reasons as to why measurement invariance cannot be found. An alternative approach in this context is to view the lack of measurement invariance as a source of information on cross-group differences and to try explaining the individual, societal, or historical sources of measurement nonequivalence (Davidov et al. 2014). On the one hand, quantitative approaches—such as the multiple indicators multiple causes model (MIMIC) (Davidov et al. 2014) and the multilevel structural equation models (MLSEMs) (Davidov et al. 2012)—aim to substantively explain cases of noninvariance. On the other hand, there is an increasing awareness of the potential of mixed methods approaches to explain instances of measurement invariances (e.g., Latcheva 2011; Panyusheva & Efremova 2012; Meitinger 2016). These studies mostly use results from cognitive interviewing or online probing to explain why measurement invariance was not found. In contrast to the purely quantitative approaches, the mixed method approaches often reveal previously unknown and surprising causes for the incomparability of data.

This session aims at presenting studies that either test for measurement invariance or examine the reasons why tests for measurement invariances failed in certain research situations. We welcome (1) presentations that take a purely quantitative approach to test measurement invariance or explain non-invariance, and (2) presentations which apply a mixed method approach to explain instances of missing measurement invariance.

1. Addressing Measurement Invariance with the Alignment Method – A Flexible and Powerful Approach to Explore Misfit in Large-scale Cross-National Surveys across Countries and Data collections

Professor Ingrid Munck (Department of Education and Special Education at Gothenburg University)
Professor Carolyn Barber (School of Education at University of Missouri-Kansas)

2. Unifying and extending methods for measurement invariance using Bayesian regularization

Ms Sara van Erp (Tilburg University)
Dr Joris Mulder (Tilburg University)
Dr Daniel Oberski (Utrecht University)

3. Testing 9- and 12-item versions of the Grasmick et al. (1993) self-control scale for measurement invariance across cultural-contexts: A comparison of different approaches

Dr Heinz Leitgöb (University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt)
Dr Daniel Seddig (University of Cologne)
Dr Dirk Enzmann (University of Hamburg)

4. Exact and approximate approaches to test the measurement invariance of gender role attitudes in 58 countries

Dr Vera Lomazzi (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Wednesday 19th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Measuring and Coding Complex Items: (Semi-) Automated Solutions 1

Chair Dr Eric Harrison (City University London)

Session Details

All social surveys rely heavily on socio-demographic information about respondents and design their instruments with a view to collecting the fullest most accurate measurements of these that are possible. Data about education, ethnicity, occupation, labour market situation - of both respondents and their families - form the essential backdrop to attitudes and behaviours measured elsewhere.

But they are problematic. They are complex to code, either because there is a huge range of possible answers (occupation), or because the context varies enormously between countries (education), or because respondents don't routinely undertake the task of self-categorisation (ethnicity/ancestry). Interviewers have to be trained to explore and probe in order to retrieve the fullest information from the field. This makes socio-demographic time-consuming and expensive to collect. Often the initial 'first pass' field data has then to be recoded by experts into smaller, more sociologically informed schemas.

As interest grows in using self-administered web surveys, we invite papers that report on the development or use of technological solutions to address some of these problems. Contributions addressing any complex categorical variables are welcome. These might include, but not be restricted to, measures of education, occupation, ethnicity, labour market experience, social class, social status, social distance, social networks, or reporting of medical conditions.

While papers will need to define and introduce the problem, the emphasis of this session is on solutions, so submissions will be

required to have a practical component and include, where relevant, some demonstration material.

1. Friends Forever? Measuring Changes in Personal Social Networks

Mrs Stephanie Stuck (Max-Planck-Institute for Social Law and Social Policy (MPISOC))

Mr Markus Kotte (Max-Planck-Institute for Social Law and Social Policy (MPISOC))

Mr Howie Litwin (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

Mrs Ella Schwartz (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

2. Measuring fields of education and training in cross-national surveys

Mrs Verena Ortmanms (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. From words to numbers

Professor Maria Francesca Romano (Scuola Superiore Sant Anna)

Ms Daniela Arlia (Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna)

Mr Lorenzo Bartalini (Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna)

Wednesday 19th July, 14.00 - 15.30, Room: Ground floor New Building

Poster session

Chair Professor Annelies Blom (University of Mannheim)

Session Details

Poster session

1. How individual coping resources moderate the effect of traffic noise exposure on physical and mental health: Results from the georeferenced German General Social Survey 2014

Mr Stefan Mueller (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Pascal Siegers (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. Examining respondent burden within the context of alternative methods of data collection.

Mr Brendan Read (University of Essex)

3. does postpartum depression affect employment?

Ms maria elena komodromou (ISER)

4. Experimental Study on the Methodology of Online Surveys (ESMO 1): Design and First Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial Among Students in Germany

Dr Nadin Kastirke (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))

5. Adjusting for selective non-participation with re-contact data in the FINRISK 2007 and 2012 surveys

Mr Juho Kopra (University of Jyväskylä)

Dr Tommi Härkänen (National Institute for Health and Welfare)

Dr Hanna Tolonen (National Institute for Health and Welfare)

Professor Pekka Jousilahti (National Institute for Health and Welfare)

Professor Kari Kuulasmaa (National Institute for Health and Welfare)

Dr Jaakko Reinikainen (National Institute for Health and Welfare)

Professor Juha Karvanen (University of Jyväskylä)

6. Study by gender of the factors influencing the scientific competence of the Andalusian students. A multilevel study of the PISA 2012 results

Mr David Molina (Department of Statistics and O. R. University of Granada)

Mrs Ana Lara (Department of Statistics and O. R. University of Granada)

Mr Francisco González-García (Department of Didactics of Experimental Sciences. University of Granada)

Mrs María del Pilar Jiménez-Tejada (Department of Didactics of Experimental Sciences. University of Granada)

Mr José Miguel Vilchez-González (Department of Didactics of Experimental Sciences. University of Granada)

Mrs María del Mar Rueda (Department of Statistics and O. R. University of Granada)

7. Transparency in cross-national survey research: Quality of reporting

Dr Elena Damian (KU Leuven)

Professor Bart Meuleman (KU Leuven)

Professor Wim van Oorschot (KU Leuven)

8. Educational level differences in participation rates increased during 25 years in Finnish health examination surveys

Dr Jaakko Reinikainen (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland)

Dr Hanna Tolonen (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland)
Dr Tommi Härkänen (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland)

9. Explaining trust in political institutions - before and after correction for measurement error

Dr Wiebke Weber (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)
Professor Willem Saris (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

10. Scale direction effect in attitudinal scale types: Agreement/Disagreement versus Item Specific Scale

Ms Vilma Agalioti-Sgompou (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex & Centre for Longitudinal Studies, IoE University College London)

11. Features of return questionnaires and characteristics of respondents in mail surveys

Dr Takahiro Tsuchiya (The Institute of Statistical Mathematics)
Professor Tsuyoshi Sugano (Nihon University)

12. Transparency in survey research - using metadata standards to enable open research

Dr Steven McEachern (Australian Data Archive)
Ms Janet McDougall (Australian Data Archive)

13. Considering Usage Patterns in Dual-Frame Telephone Surveys

Mr Matthias Sand (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

14. Differences between self-reported and measured anthropometric data in the first National Nutrition Survey menuCH

Dr Christine Anne Zuberbuehler (Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office)
Mrs Esther Camenzind-Frey (Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office)

15. Measurement invariance between employed and unemployed persons - An example using a multi-item health measure

Ms Stefanie Unger (Institute for Employment Research)

16. Are You Still Online? Measuring Internet Access from Home for School-Age Children

Ms Angelina Kewalramani (American Institutes for Research)

17. Does the Continuity of Web-Survey Processing Matter?

Mr Stephan Schlosser (University of Göttingen, Germany)
Mr Jan Karem Höhne (University of Göttingen, Germany)

18. The next European Company Survey – Reflections on survey modes and lessons learnt from the last wave

Mr Franz Eiffe (Eurofound)
Mr Gijs Van Houten (Eurofound)

19. Comparison of Techniques for Working with Zero Cell Counts for Log-Linear Analysis of Contingency Tables

Mr Alexey Shchetinin (Higher School of Economics)

20. What is the best approach to assessing pubertal stage in cohort studies and surveys?

Dr Janis Baird (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)
Dr Clare Smith (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)
Dr Inna Walker (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)
Professor Keith Godfrey (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)
Professor Hazel Inskip (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)

21. Analysing professionals' comprehension of social space in social work and education

Ms Levke Graf (Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg)

22. Documenting cross-national comparability of demographic surveys: the Online Codebook & Analysis of the Generations & Gender Programme

Dr Arianna Caporali (Institut national d'études démographiques (INED))

23. The "Student Life Cycle" – A New Panel Study for the Research in Higher Education

Mr Johann Carstensen (German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))
Mr Sebastian Lang (German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))
Professor Monika Jungbauer-Gans (German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))

24. Refugees in the Panel Study "Labor Market and Social Security" - Participation and Response Behavior

Dr Corinna Frodermann (Institute for Employment Research)
Mr Sebastian Bähr (Institute for Employment Research)
Mr Jonas Beste (Institute for Employment Research)
Dr Claudia Wenzig (Institute for Employment Research)

25. Interviewer and Area effects in the European Social Survey

Dr Koen Beullens (Centre for Sociological Research - KU Leuven)
Dr Stefan Zins (GESIS)
Dr Joost Kappelhof (The Netherlands Institute for Social Research / SCP)
Professor Geert Loosveldt (Centre for Sociological Research - KU Leuven)

26. Looking for hints on polarization

Dr Michael Tiemann (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)
Professor Robert Helmrich (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)
Miss Caroline Neuber-Pohl (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

27. The pilot study to design the questionnaire for young teenagers. The example of PrsvEs survey

Dr Domenico Trezza (University of Naples Federico II)
Miss Marianna Giordano (Second University of Naples)

28. Using weights in SEM – different results or not?

Ms Magdalena Poteralska (Warsaw School of Economics)
Dr Jolanta Perek-Bia?as (Jagiellonian University)

29. Comparing data from CAPI and CAWI surveys

Dr Paula Vicente (ISCTE-IUL)
Dr Elizabeth Reis (ISCTE-IUL)

30. Integration of Administrative Data in the Longitudinal Survey in Israel

Mrs Nerdit Stein Kapach (Israel Longitudinal Survey of Families)

31. How linkage error affects measurement error models

Ms Paulina Pankowska (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/ Statistics Netherlands)

32. Ordering Classes in Latent Class Analysis: comparison of three models

Ms Natalia Voronina (National Research University Higher School of Economics)
Ms Tatiana Razuvaeva (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

33. Statistics Portugal: telephone interviews: history, tools and main summarized paradata indicators

Mrs Teresa Silvestre (Statistics Portugal)
Mrs Tania Correia (Statistics Portugal)

34. A New Inflated Poisson Regression Model Incorporating a Latent Class Variable

Dr Ting Hsiang Lin (National Taipei University)

35. The feasibility of establishing a cross-national probability-based online panel

Mr Didrik Finnøy (NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data)

36. Evaluating Non-probability Samples: An Index of Sample Representativeness

Dr Hee-Choon Shin (CDC)
Professor Jibum Kim (Sungkyunkwan University)

37. Expanding Data Collection: Training Interviewers and Respondents to use multiple types of Technology

Ms Esther Ullman (University of Michigan)
Ms Heidi Guyer (University of Michiga)

38. BAuA Working Time Survey

Dr Susanne Gerstenberg (BAuA - Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin)
Dr Anne Marit Woehrmann (BAuA - Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin)

39. Cross-cultural measurement invariance among German migrants in welfare benefits receipt

Mr Jonas Beste (IAB)

40. Undertaking research with and for refugees, asylum-seekers and other migrants: lessons from the field

Dr Emilie Robert (Transcultural Research and Intervention Team, McGill University)
Miss Magalie Benoit (Institut de recherche en santé publique de l'Université de Montréal (IRSPUM))
Dr Daniel-Boleira Guimaraes (Université de Sherbrooke)
Dr Jill Hanley (McGill University)
Dr Lisa Merry (University of Ottawa)
Dr Monica Ruiz-Casares (McGill University)

41. Effectiveness of Different Mail Data Collection Methods

Mrs Mina Muller (Westat)
Mr Sherm Edwards (Westat)
Mrs Regina Yudd (Westat)

42. Addressing non-response in a probability-based mixed-mode panel in Spain.

Dr Maria del Mar Rueda (Universidad de Granada)
Dr Antonio Arcos (Universidad de Granada)
Mr Manuel Trujillo (Institute for Advanced Social Studies)
Dr Sara Pasadas (Institute for Advanced Social Studies)

43. Lifecourse socioeconomic position effects on biomarkers: compensating for missing data

Miss Georgia Chatzi (University of Manchester)

44. Comparing Cognitive Interviewing and Web Probing for Pretesting Survey Questions

Dr Cornelia Neuert (GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Timo Lenzner (GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

45. Comparison of textual and visual vignettes in factorial surveys

Mr Philip Adebahr (University of Technology Chemnitz)
Ms Judith Lehmann (University of Technology Chemnitz)

46. Analytic inference in the presence of informative sampling designs: Overview of existing approaches and occurring problems

Miss Angelina Hammon (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

47. Methodological Aspects of Measuring Policy Attitudes – An Investigation of Response Scale Effects and Survey Mode

Mrs Chariklia Hoefig (Bw Center for Military History and Social Sciences)

48. Expanding Access to Restricted Data: Researcher Credentialing

Dr Peter Granda (ICPSR, University of Michigan)

49. Development of an Instrument Assessing Learning Environments during Doctoral Studies

Ms Susanne de Vogel (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))
Ms Gesche Brandt (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))
Mr Kolja Briedis (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))
Mr Steffen Jaksztat (German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW))

50. National and Sub-National Self-Identification in Spain: Determinants and Stability under Identity Contestation

Miss Natalia Vasilenok (National Research University - Higher School of Economics)

51. Mixed-mode survey methods in multi-country surveys: Exploring online survey with CASI follow-up in an EU-wide survey on fundamental rights

Mr Sami Nevala (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA))
Dr Sabine Springer (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA))

52. Application of randomized response techniques for investigating cannabis

Miss Beatriz Cobo Rodríguez (University of Granada)
Mrs María del Mar Rueda García (University of Granada)
Mrs Francisca López Torrecillas (University of Granada)

53. Usability Testing of Web Surveys

Mr Marc Plate (Statistics Austria)
Dr Matea Paskvan (Statistics Austria)

54. The transformed UK Labour Force Survey; an overview of the qualitative research findings to date

Miss Laura Wilson (Office for National Statistics)
Miss Emma Dickinson (Office for National Statistics)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 102

Administrative Records for Survey Methodology 3

Chair Dr Asaph Young Chun (US Census Bureau)
Coordinator 1 Professor Mike Larsen (George Washington University)
Coordinator 2 Dr Ingegerd Jansson (Statistics Sweden)
Coordinator 3 Dr Manfred Antoni (Institute for Employment Research)
Coordinator 4 Dr Daniel Fuss (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 5 Dr Corinna Kleinert (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

Incorporation of administrative records have long been regarded as a way of improving the quality and interpretability of surveys and censuses and of controlling the rising cost of surveys (Chun and Scheuren, 2011). The increasing number of linked datasets, such as Health and Retirement Study in the U.S., National Educational Panel Study in Germany, and Understanding Society in UK, are accompanied by growing empirical evidence about the selectivity of linked observations. The extent and pace of using administrative data varies from continent to continent and from country to country. This is partly due to differential concerns about privacy, confidentiality, and legal constraints, as well as variability in acceptance and implementation of advances in statistical techniques to control such concerns.

The primary goal is to control data quality and reduce total survey error. This session will feature papers that implement "total

administrative records error" and "total linked data error" methods and provide case studies and best practices of using administrative data tied to the survey life cycle (Chun and Larsen, a forthcoming Wiley book). The session invites papers that discuss fundamental challenges and recent advancements involved in the collection and analysis of administrative records, integration with surveys, censuses, and auxiliary data. We also encourage submission of papers discussing institutional collaboration on linked data, sustainable data access, provision of auxiliary tools and user support. For example, papers in this session include, but are not limited to the following topics:

1. Innovative use of administrative data in household surveys and censuses to improve the survey frame, reduce nonresponse follow-up, and assess coverage error.
2. Quality evaluations of administrative data and quality metrics for linked data
3. Recent advancements in processing and linking administrative data with survey data (one-to-one) and with multiple sources of data (one-to-many).
4. Recent methods of disclosure limitation and confidentiality protection in linked data, including linkages with geographical information.
5. Bayesian approaches to using administrative data in surveys, censuses, small area estimation, and nonresponse control.
6. Implementation of new tools that facilitate the use of linked data by simplifying complex data structures or handling inconsistent information in life-course data
7. Strategies for developing and maintaining a user-friendly infrastructure for the analysis and dissemination of linked data and solutions for collaboration
8. Applications that transform administrative data into information that is useful and relevant to policymaking in public health, economics, science and education.

1. When Education Survey Data Come From Multiple Sources

Mr Peter Siegel (RTI International)
Mr Darryl Creel (RTI International)
Dr James Chromy (RTI International, retired)

2. Using 'black box' commercial databases to reduce costs in high quality UK sample surveys

Mr Joel Williams (Kantar Public)

3. Using Administrative Records and Parametric Models in 2014 SIPP Imputations

Dr Joanna Motro (US Census Bureau)
Dr Jason Fields (US Census Bureau)
Dr Gary Benedetto (US Census Bureau)
Dr Veronica Roth (US Census Bureau)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 103

Handling missing data 3

Chair Dr Tarek Mostafa (University College London)
Coordinator 1 Professor George Ploubidis (University College London)
Coordinator 2 Mr Brian Dodgeon (University College London)

Session Details

Selection bias, in the form of incomplete or missing data is unavoidable in surveys. It results in smaller samples, incomplete histories, lower statistical power and bias in sample composition if missingness is related to the observed and unobserved characteristics of respondents. It is well known that unbiased estimates cannot be obtained without properly addressing the implications of incompleteness. In this session we focus on item missingness, survey non-response, and attrition over time in longitudinal surveys. We aim to identify best practices when dealing with missing data.

Under Rubin's framework, three types of missingness exist: Missing completely at random (MCAR) where the likelihood of response is unrelated to the respondents' characteristics. Missing at random (MAR) where the likelihood of response is explained by the observed characteristics of respondents, and missing not at random (MNAR) where the likelihood of response is related to both observed and unobserved characteristics of respondents.

The objective of our session is to examine the principled techniques commonly used to deal with missing data. These include, inverse probability weights, multiple imputation, and full information maximum likelihood (FIML). All techniques rely on the MAR

assumption, and therefore, their plausibility depends on the ability of the researcher to identify the predictors of response.

Contributors are welcomed to contrast these techniques with other procedures such as case-wise deletion, mean replacement, regression imputations, selection models (e.g. Heckman selection models), and others. Moreover, theoretical, empirical, and substantive applications of these techniques will be considered for presentation.

1. Comparative Analysis of Approaches to Multiple Imputation Results Aggregation

Miss Irina Zangieva (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

Miss Anna Suleymanova (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

2. Handling Missing Data from Instrument Routing Errors

Dr Stephanie Zimmer (RTI International)

Dr Marcus Berzofsky (RTI International)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 104

Panel Conditioning in Longitudinal Surveys

Chair Dr Bella Struminskaya (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Dr Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)

Coordinator 2 Dr Henning Silber (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Panel conditioning poses a potential threat to data quality in longitudinal surveys. The increase of surveying frequency, for example, through the use of online panels, might aggravate potential errors. However, the literature on panel conditioning to date does not allow for drawing definite conclusions about the presence and the magnitude of panel conditioning. We seek presentations that report empirical evidence from longitudinal surveys conducted in all modes, from self-administered or interviewer-administered surveys, from panels that ask the same questions over time, and from panels with varying questionnaire content where panel conditioning might happen due to learning the survey procedure.

We especially welcome presentations of studies making use of validation data to assess the extent of panel conditioning as well as studies using experimental designs. Presentations can address following topics, for example:

- actual changes in behaviors or/and attitudes vs. changes in reporting
- panel conditioning in interviewer-administered surveys vs. conditioning in self-administered surveys
- influence of surveying frequency
- influence of question and questionnaire characteristics
- conditioning in panel surveys of specific populations (e. g., students, families, elderly)
- etc.

1. Comparing social attitudes and digital practices between experienced and fresh respondents in a probability-based web panel

Ms Anne Cornilleau (Sciences Po - CDSP)

Ms Anne-Sophie Cousteaux (Sciences Po - CDSP)

2. Panel conditioning in attitudinal and knowledge questions: Results of an experiment

Dr Bella Struminskaya (Utrecht University)

Dr Jette Schröder (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Henning Silber (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Professor Michael Bosnjak (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. An examination of differential panel conditioning, dependent on respondent characteristics

Mr Brendan Read (University of Essex)

4. Changes in labor market behavior due to panel survey participation

Mr Ruben Bach (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))

Dr Stephanie Eckman (RTI International)

5. The effects of panel conditioning on data quality in two panel surveys

Dr Hanyu Sun (Westat)

Dr Roger Tourangeau (Westat)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 105

Analyzing Social Mechanisms in Life-Course Research 2

Chair Dr Tilo Beckers (Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf)
Coordinator 1 Dr Dominik Becker (Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen)
Coordinator 2 Dr Nicole Hiekel (University of Cologne)

Session Details

This session links mechanism-based explanations to longitudinal survey research and builds on a recently initiated debate aiming at improving theoretically grounded and empirically sound explanations in life-course research. We aim to bring together pioneer work in the field of life course research that comprises empirical applications using advanced statistical methods to unravel why various life course patterns and outcomes exist by studying how they came about. A key principle of the life course approach is the linkage between contextual characteristics and situations on the one hand (situational mechanisms), and the linkage between situations and action or attitude formation on the other hand (action formation mechanisms). Life course researchers have developed powerful statistical techniques to examine panel data, yet mechanism-based explanations underlying the life course process of interest are rare.

The last decade has seen a growing interest in the concept of social mechanisms (Demeulenaere 2011; Tranow/Beckers/Becker 2016*). The debate focuses on the question of which principles define a satisfactory way of doing social sciences. Most advocates of the social mechanism approach agree that social phenomena should be explained by opening up the black box of explanation and making explicit the causal “cogs and wheels” (Elster 1989) by which these social phenomena are brought into existence.

Life course research provokes questions about social processes and mechanisms, i.e. the identification of patterns and trajectories of stability and change but also of catalysts, drivers and the “wheelworks” (Shanahan/Elder 1997; Keijer/Nagel/Liefbroer 2016). Within the life course approach, analyses and explanations may engage in the identification of i) social mechanisms related to the opportunity structure such as institutional arrangements (e.g., provision of family- or job-related subsidies), ii) belief-driven mechanisms (e.g. rational imitation or self-fulfilling prophecies), and iii) desire-driven mechanisms (e.g. educational or job-related preference formation; dissonance reduction).

We invite the submission of abstracts on (emergent) research projects with statistically advanced empirical applications that specify and link social mechanisms to life course patterns and outcomes. Submitted abstracts should include a research question, theoretical and tested social mechanism(s), research design, data and technique of analysis of social mechanisms and (preliminary) results.

* English language Special Issue & Introduction in *Analyse und Kritik* 38(1): 1-30
(<http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/auk.2016.38.issue-1/issue-files/auk.2016.38.issue-1.xml>)

1. Parenthood and Well-being: The Early Years

Dr Gerrit Bauer (LMU Munich)
Dr Thorsten Kneip (Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)
Professor Josef Brüderl (LMU Munich)

2. Mechanisms of the transition to adulthood in cross-national comparison: an application of Hidden Markov Models

Miss Yu Han (Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, The Hague (NIDI/KNAW),)
Professor Aart Liefbroer (Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, The Hague (NIDI/KNAW),)
Professor Cees Elzinga (Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, The Hague (NIDI/KNAW),)

3. Equity and divorce. New findings for Western Germany and the United States.

Dr DANIELA BELLANI (UNIVERSITAT POMPEU FABRA)
Professor GOSTA ESPING ANDERSEN (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 107

Analyzing the lives of LGBTI people - survey approaches to LGBTI persons, couples and families 3

Chair Dr Stephanie Steinmetz (Sociology Department, University of Amsterdam)
Coordinator 1 Ms Mirjam Fischer (Sociology Department, University of Amsterdam)
Coordinator 2 Ms Nancy Bates (Research and Methodology Directorate, U.S. Census Bureau)

Session Details

In recent years, much progress has been made in the US, Europe and beyond with regard to legislation that is supportive and protective of LGBTs (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans persons). While these achievements are laudable, it is important to keep

evaluating to what extent they truly improve the lives of LGBTs. There are still many sources of inequality and discrimination that remain deeply embedded in the social fabric of societies. Compared to research on other minority groups, sexual orientation has been studied quantitatively much less in the social sciences. Yet, quantitative scholars have continuously made efforts to overcome the methodological challenges associated with studying this population by using surveys. This is an important development which should be encouraged and continued.

This session welcomes contributions focusing on the wide range of issues that need to be addressed when studying LGBT populations with survey-based methods. For example, is the 2-step method (sex assigned at birth and sex identify with now) best for reducing undercounting of transgender populations? As younger people embrace non-binary or gender-nonconforming identities, how must our questions and categories for gender identity change? Can sexual orientation be collected by proxy in surveys that use a single household informant to provide all member's demographic information? How can concepts around sexual orientation and gender identity be translated for non-Western cultures and non-native languages? Are there interviewer effects when collecting SOGI in telephone and personal visit surveys? Does the addition of SOGI items harm unit response rates in surveys that do not typically collect such items (e.g. labor force or consumer expenditure surveys)? What are strategies for designing sampling frames intended at capturing LGBT populations? In addition, this session also invites submissions that focus on topical survey results around LGBT populations such as physical and mental health disparities, income inequality, hate crimes, and household and family structures. The session hopes to draw a cross-section of submissions from different countries and different survey experiences.

1. The social and geographical mobility of gays and lesbians in France An approach based on men and women in couples

Dr Wilfried Rault (Ined)

2. Barriers to Health Care Among Transgender and Gender Non-Conforming Adults in the United States

Professor Gilbert Gonzales (Vanderbilt University)

3. Capturing the experiences of gender-variant young people in a cross-sectional attitude survey

Dr Dirk Schubotz (Queen's University Belfast)

4. Analyzing the perception of discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity in EU28 countries: a model based approach

Dr Maurizio Curtarelli (Policy and Research, Ecorys UK)

Mrs Stefania Capecchi (Università Federico II di Napoli)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 108

Participatory survey design and survey data co-production

Chair Dr Dirk Schubotz (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)

Coordinator 1 Dr Katrina Lloyd (ARK, Queen's University Belfast)

Session Details

Often, participatory research projects which involve the co-production of data by academic researchers and community members or advocacy groups have used qualitative and interpretive methods, such as focus groups, interviews or action research methods. However increasingly co-researchers are also actively involved in research projects which involve survey research. Policy regulations in many European countries require decision makers to involve clients in the improvement of services. The participatory turn in social research means that there is a growing scope and understanding that the involvement of co-researchers in survey research can be meaningful and achievable. Examples of this are health research, children's rights based research approaches and research involving disabled or older people. Co-researchers 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 participatory survey design. We also invite papers discussing thoughts and challenges of co-researcher involvement in survey research from a more theoretical and epistemological perspective.

1. Designing Questionnaires for People with Intellectual Disabilities: a participatory approach

Mrs Kristel Vlot-vanAnrooij (Radboud University Medical Centre)

Dr Hilde Tobi (Wageningen University)

Dr Jenneken Naaldenberg (Radboud University Medical Centre)

2. Involving young children as advisors in the development of questions on cancer for use in surveys

Dr Katrina Lloyd (Queen's University Belfast)

Ms Lesley Emerson (Queen's University Belfast)

3. Weighting strategy for stacked Common core questionnaire of household survey database

Miss Céline Leroy (Insee - DMCSI)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N AUD4

Adaptive and Responsive Designs in Complex Surveys: Recent Advancements and Challenges 3

Chair Mr Jason Fields (U.S. Census Bureau)
Coordinator 1 Dr Asaph Young Chun (U.S. Census Bureau)
Coordinator 2 Professor James Wagner (University of Michigan)
Coordinator 3 Dr Barry Schouten (Statistics Netherlands)
Coordinator 4 Ms Nicole Watson (University of Melbourne)

Session Details

Adaptive and responsive survey designs (Groves and Heeringa, 2006; Wagner, 2008) have attempted to respond to a changing survey environment that has become increasingly multimode, multiple data sources-driven and multilingual. The Journal of Official Statistics will be publishing in 2017 a Special Issue on Adaptive Design in complex surveys and censuses (Edited by Chun, Schouten and Wagner, forthcoming). In our efforts to address multiple challenges affecting the survey community and the fundamental interest of the community of survey methodologists to produce quality data, we propose a session of papers that discuss the latest methodological solutions and challenges in adaptive and responsive designs for complex surveys. We encourage submission of papers on the following topics of adaptive or responsive design:

1. Applied and theoretical contributions, and comparisons of variants of adaptive design that leverage strengths of administrative records, big data, census data, and paradata. For instance, what cost-quality tradeoff paradigm can be operationalized to guide development of cost and quality metrics and their use around the survey life cycle? Under what conditions can administrative records or big data be adaptively used to supplement survey data collection and improve data quality?
2. Papers addressing the following triple drivers of adaptive/responsive design: cost, respondent burden, and data quality. For instance, what indicators of data quality can be integrated to monitor the course of the data collection process? What stopping rules for data collection can be used across the phases of a multi-mode survey?
3. Papers involving longitudinal survey designs where data collection systems need to fulfill their panel focus and provide data for the same units over time, and leverage adaptive processes to reduce cost, reduce burden, and/or increase quality. For instance, how can survey managers best engage the complexity of issues around implementing adaptive and responsive designs, especially for panel surveys that are in principle focused on measuring change over time? How are overrepresented or low priority cases handled in a longitudinal context?
4. Papers involving experimental designs or simulations of adaptive survey design. For instance, experimental implementation of an adaptive design, especially those involving multiple data sources, a mixed mode of data collection or a cross-national design.
5. Papers that apply Bayesian methods to build adaptive designs. For example, adaptive designs where the design parameters are given priors and then updated as additional data are collected.

1. Measurement error in proxy measures of key survey variables to estimate, reduce, and adjust for nonresponse bias

Professor Andy Peytchev (University of Michigan)
Dr Emilia Peytcheva (RTI International)
Dr Matt Jans (University of California at Los Angeles)

2. Designs for Reducing Nonresponse Bias

Dr Roger Tourangeau (Westat)
Dr Michael Brick (Westat)

3. Adaptive and Responsive Survey Design: Looking Back Last 10 Years and Looking Forward Next 10 Years

Dr Asaph Young Chun (U.S. Census Bureau)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N AUD5

Third-Party Presence in Face-to-Face Surveys

Session Details

The need to conduct face-to-face interviews in a private setting cannot be overemphasized. It is critical to protect the respondent's privacy, reduce social desirability bias and minimize measurement error. Interviewers' training usually include a discussion about the importance of confidentiality and the need to ask for a private setting in which to conduct the interview. Field observations show that interviewers vary greatly in how they request such a private setting and often times, one or more relatives (or even neighbors) want to listen to the interview. Even after extensive training, interviewers may not be able to conduct a one-on-one interview with a respondent, due to local customs and norms. For example, in many countries in sub-Saharan Africa, it may be inappropriate for a young female interviewer to be by herself with an older, married male respondent. Further, parents or custodians may insist they be present when their adolescent child (between the ages of 15 and 18) is the respondent. Surprisingly, scant empirical data are available to measure the effect of third-party individuals during face-to-face interviews.

This proposed research session seeks to achieve two main objectives. First, the session would present innovative methods researchers have used in recent years to strengthen interviewers' skills and techniques during training. What metrics and tools are being used to monitor interviewers' implementation of the privacy standard? In addition, what guidelines have researchers developed in settings where the privacy standard cannot be implemented due to local customs? The second objective of this research session is to present the latest empirical results about the effects of third-party presence in survey data. More specifically, it would be useful to have quantitative examples from a variety of settings (developed and developing countries) and types of questions (general and sensitive). This proposed session seeks to raise awareness about the importance of respondents' privacy and increasing knowledge about the successful implementation of such a standard in a face-to-face setting.

1. Effects of partner presence on responses to questions on the division of household labor

Dr Jette Schröder (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Claudia Schmiedeberg (University of Munich (LMU))

2. An analysis of third party presence/intervention in Spanish social and political attitudes surveys

Dr Mónica Méndez Lago (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas)

3. Third Party Presence Measurement of Respondent and Interviewer Predictors of Third Party Presence in Jordan

Professor Zeina Mneimneh (University of Michigan)

Ms Julie de Jong (University of Michigan)

Professor Mansoor Moaddel (University of Maryland)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N 101

Conducting high quality random probability surveys in Europe - problems, solutions and lessons learnt

Chair Miss Sally Widdop (Ipsos MORI)

Coordinator 1 Mr Andrew Cleary (Ipsos MORI)

Coordinator 2 Dr Koen Buellens (KU Leuven)

Coordinator 3 Dr Ineke Stoop (The Netherlands Institute for Social Research - SCP)

Session Details

Data users and commissioners of research interested in making comparisons across countries require high quality survey data that provide accurate, reliable and valid results. Collecting such data is challenging in any survey, but even more so in a cross-national context where multiple languages, fieldwork practices and national survey climates all come into play.

In particular, varying levels of experience of carrying out random probability surveys as well as practical or logistical factors such as fieldwork capacity, interviewer remuneration, availability of sampling frames, technical capacity for fieldwork monitoring as well as differing quality control measures can all have an impact on the success and cross-national comparability of the survey. Further to this, there is the challenge of narrowing the gap between rising expectations of quality and limited resources.

This session seeks to explore the challenges associated with conducting high quality, face to face random probability surveys in Europe. We aim to bring together national and international fieldwork agencies to present local initiatives and experiences and compare and discuss these.

We are particularly interested in exploring the following areas:

- interviewer training, remuneration and/or methods for controlling the quality of interviewer fieldwork;
- the lack of suitable sampling frames in some countries and/or techniques for ensuring high quality in random route sampling

approaches;

- the use of technology for enhancing fieldwork monitoring and/or making interventions during fieldwork
- and the trade-offs practitioners make in response to increasing demands and the rising costs of data collection.

We welcome papers that offer country-specific case studies as well as cross-national examples that illustrate the solutions that have been applied to overcome one or more of these challenges.

1. Quality targets and quality control in the European Social Survey

Dr Ineke Stoop (The Netherlands Institute for Social Research/SCP)
Dr Joost Kappelhof (The Netherlands Institute for Social Research/SCP)
Mr Achim Koch (GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften)

2. New elements introduced in the sampling strategy of the 4th European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS): challenges and lessons learnt

Ms Daphne Ahrendt (Eurofound)
Ms Eszter Sandor (Eurofound)
Dr Tadas Leoncikas (Eurofound)

3. Developing target-specific interviewer training for studies placing high demands on interviewers

Miss Anne Kersting (infas Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft GmbH (Institute for Applied Social Sciences), Bonn, Germany)
Miss Jennifer Weitz (University of Siegen, Germany)

4. Case-Studies on Data-Driven Interviewer Monitoring

Dr Zeina Mneimneh (University of Michigan)
Dr Lars Lyberg (Inizio)
Mr Sharan Sharma (TAM India and University of Michigan)
Mr Mahesh Vyas (Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy)
Mr Frederic Malter (Max-Planck- Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)
Mr Yuchieh Lin (University of Michigan)
Dr Yasmin Altwajiri (King Faisal Specialized Hospital and Research Center)

5. Improving data quality by optimizing fieldwork management

Mr May Doušák (Junior researcher, member of national ESS team (fieldwork, NC))

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Assessing the Quality of Survey Data 3

Chair Professor Jörg 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. Models for wording effects on the Rosenberg self-esteem scale, their nomological network and implications for scoring

Dr Michalis Michaelides (University of Cyprus)
Ms Chrystalla Koutsogiorgi (University of Cyprus)
Dr Georgia Panayiotou (University of Cyprus)

2. Interviewer effects in real and falsified survey data

Mrs Uta Landrock (University of Kaiserslautern)

3. Response Quality and Ideological Dispositions

Ms Alice Barth (University of Bonn)
Mr Andreas Schmitz (University of Bonn)

4. Old Friends Re-Visited: What Do We Know about the Golden Rules of Questionnaire Design?

Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Probability-based research panels 3

Chair Mr Darren Pennay (Social Research Centre, Australian National University)

Session Details

Around the world nowadays online panels are routinely used as a method for gathering survey data for many varied purposes; including for economic, political, public policy, marketing, and health research.

Web surveys, most of which are conducted via online panels, are a relatively recent development in the history of survey research; starting in the United States and Europe in the mid-1990s and then expanding elsewhere in the world. Worldwide expenditure on online surveys has quadrupled in the last 10 years from \$US1.5B in 2004 to \$US6B in 2014. From the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s, there was an exponential growth in the creation of online panels and increases in the sizes of the membership of such panels. This led to a proliferation of unique panel vendors. But since 2005, the developing need for panels with extremely large number of panellists led to a consolidation of panel vendors through the means of corporate acquisition (cf. Callegaro, Baker, Bethlehem, Göritz, Krosnick and Lavrakas, 2014).

In 2015, the vast majority of online panels, as well as the vast majority of people who participate in them, have been established/recruited via non-probability sampling methods.

In United States, parts of Europe, and now in Australia, the increased use of the web for data collection also resulted in establishment of probability based online research panels to enable the scientific sampling of the population.

The intent of this session is to explore the development of probability-based online panels around the world and to encourage survey practitioners involved in probability-based online panels to present papers exploring the various methods used to establish and maintain these panels. Papers might explore issues such as the methods for including the offline population, methods to maximise response and minimise attrition and methods to reduce measurement error when administering questionnaires to panellists.

It is hoped that this session would be of interest to probability-based online panel practitioners as well as researchers who routinely use probability and non-probability online panels or want to learn more about such panels

1. Nonresponse and Attrition in a Probability based Online Panel

Professor Edith De leeuw (Utrecht University)

Professor Joop Hox (Utrecht University)

Mr Benjamin Rosche (Utrecht University)

2. The Accuracy of Online Surveys: Coverage, Sampling, and Weighting

Professor Annelies Blom (School of Social Sciences, University of Mannheim)

Ms Daniela Ackermann-Piek (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim)

Ms Susanne Helmschrott (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim)

Ms Carina Cornesse (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim and GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Christian Bruch (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim)

Professor Joseph Sakshaug (School of Social Sciences, University of Manchester)

3. Experiments in Recruiting the Life in Australia probability-based online panel

Mr Darren Pennay (Social Research Centre, Australian National University)

Dr Paul Lavrakas (Social Research Centre, Australian National University)

Dr Lars Kaczmirek (GESIS, Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Mr Graham Challice (Social Research Centre, Australian National University)

4. Using probability samples to validate Voter Application Advice data

Dr Jill Sheppard (The Australian National University)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Response format & response behaviour

Session Details

1. Prevalence and Magnitude of Question Order Effects in Household Surveys

Dr David Richter (DIW Berlin)
Professor Martin Kroh (DIW Berlin)

2. Complex Laddering Path: a new approach to price sensitivity data collection

Dr Davide Lubian (Sapienza University Rome)

3. Capturing actual work hours and preferred work hours in Germany - Methodical differences in SOEP and the Mikrozensus

Mrs Julia Bringmann (German Institute for Economic Research in Berlin (DIW Berlin))
Mrs Elke Holst (German Institute for Economic Research in Berlin (DIW Berlin))

4. New methods for inquiring general population mobility. The example of an on-line questionnaire enhanced by interactive maps.

Miss Emmanuelle Duwez (CDSP (Sciences Po))

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q4 ANF1

Biomeasure Collection in Social Surveys - Challenges and Opportunities 3

Chair Mr Matt Brown (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Coordinator 1 Dr Emily Gilbert (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Coordinator 2 Ms Anne Conolly (Health and Biomedical team, NatCen Social Research)

Coordinator 3 Dr Shaun Scholes (Research Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London)

Session Details

It has become increasingly common for social surveys to incorporate the collection of biometrics. Self-reported health assessments, behaviours and measurements are useful, but it is known that they can be prone to bias. Objective health measures can augment survey data considerably, enabling researchers to discover things that cannot be captured through survey questions. The inclusion of objective measurements within social surveys allows us to assess health with significantly greater accuracy and therefore to deepen our understanding of the interplay between social and biological factors in explaining human behaviour. Such measurements encompass a range of anthropometric (e.g. height and weight), functional (e.g. grip strength, balance), and sensory measurements (e.g. hearing), as well as biological samples (e.g. blood, saliva, urine), other physiological health measurements (e.g. blood pressure, lung function), and device-based measurement of physical activity.

Typically this type of data is collected either in participants' homes or in a clinic and may be carried out by trained field interviewers or by those with medical training and expertise. Technological advances and the development of minimally invasive techniques of data collection have increased the feasibility of collecting biometrics at home and by fieldworkers with no medical training. Respondent-led collection of their own biomedical data is also now emerging as a data collection method – for example, some studies now ask respondents to self-collect buccal swabs. Additionally, there has been an increase in the use of wearable technology (e.g. fitness trackers, smart watches, smart eyewear) among the general population. There is growing interest in exploiting such technology for data collection in survey research, although this can be resource-intensive and expensive.

This session invites survey practitioners to share their experiences of incorporating the collection of biometrics into social surveys. We welcome submissions relating to:

- Innovative approaches to the collection of biometrics
- Comparisons of objective measures with self-reported data
- Training of fieldworkers to collect biometrics
- Respondent-led collection of biometrics
- Methods to maximise response to and/or representativeness of biometrics
- Collecting biometrics in special populations (e.g. older people)
- Ethical challenges (e.g. relating to feedback of results, consent for ongoing use of biological samples)

Papers need not be restricted to these specific examples.

1. Comparisons of the socioeconomic gradient in health using objective and self-reported measures of the same

condition: Evidence from the Health Survey for England 2014

Dr Shaun Scholes (Health and Social Surveys Research Group, University College London)

Miss Sarah Morris (National Centre for Social Research)

Miss Anne Conolly (National Centre for Social Research)

2. Hypertension and hypercholesterolemia: comparison of self-reported information and objective measures from the first Portuguese National Health Examination Survey (INSEF)

Ms Irina Kislaya (Departamento de Epidemiologia, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisboa, Portugal; Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal)

Ms Ana Paula Rodrigues (Departamento de Epidemiologia, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisboa, Portugal)

Dr Marta Barreto (Departamento de Epidemiologia, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisboa, Portugal; Centro de Investigação em saúde Pública, Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal)

Ms Vânia Gaio (Departamento de Epidemiologia, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisboa, Portugal; Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal)

Ms Liliana Antunes (Departamento de Epidemiologia, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisboa, Portugal)

Ms Ana João Santos (Departamento de Epidemiologia, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisboa, Portugal)

Dr Sónia Namorado (Departamento de Epidemiologia, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisboa, Portugal)

Dr Ana Paula Gil (CICS.NOVA - Centro Interdisciplinar de Ciências Sociais, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal)

Dr Carlos Matias Dias (Departamento de Epidemiologia, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisboa, Portugal; Centro de Investigação em saúde Pública, Escola; Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal)

Dr Baltazar Nunes (Departamento de Epidemiologia, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisboa, Portugal;

Centro de Investigação em saúde Pública, Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal)

3. What is the best estimate of pre-pregnancy weight: recalled weight or measured weight in early pregnancy?

Professor Hazel Inskip (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton & NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust)

Dr Sarah Crozier (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)

Dr Janis Baird (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)

Ms Julia Hammond (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)

Professor Sian Robinson (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton & NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust)

Professor Cyrus Cooper (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton & NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust)

Professor Keith Gpdfrey (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton & NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust)

4. Using Body Mass Index Classifications in Social Network Data Collection

Dr Stacey Giroux (Indiana University)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Measurement Invariance: Testing for it and Explaining Why It Is Absent 3

Chair Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Professor Eldad Davidov (University of Cologne and University of Zurich)

Session Details

Measurement invariance tests are a popular approach to assess the cross-national comparability of data. However, researchers often have difficulties to establish the highest level of measurement invariance, scalar invariance (Davidov et al. 2012).

In recent years, the predominant approach to “fix” this issue is to opt for more statistical sophistication and relaxing certain requirements when testing for measurement invariance. Approaches, such as Bayesian structural equation modelling (BSEM) (Muthén and Asparouhov 2012; van de Schoot 2015) or alignment (Asparouhov and Muthén 2014) fall in this category.

However, these approaches cannot provide reasons as to why measurement invariance cannot be found. An alternative approach in this context is to view the lack of measurement invariance as a source of information on cross-group differences and to try explaining the individual, societal, or historical sources of measurement nonequivalence (Davidov et al. 2014). On the one hand, quantitative approaches—such as the multiple indicators multiple causes model (MIMIC) (Davidov et al. 2014) and the multilevel structural equation models (MLSEMs) (Davidov et al. 2012)—aim to substantively explain cases of noninvariance. On the other hand, there is an increasing awareness of the potential of mixed methods approaches to explain instances of measurement invariances (e.g., Latcheva 2011; Panyusheva & Efremova 2012; Meitinger 2016). These studies mostly use results from cognitive interviewing or online probing to explain why measurement invariance was not found. In contrast to the purely quantitative approaches, the mixed method approaches often reveal previously unknown and surprising causes for the incomparability of data.

This session aims at presenting studies that either test for measurement invariance or examine the reasons why tests for

measurement variances failed in certain research situations. We welcome (1) presentations that take a purely quantitative approach to test measurement invariance or explain non-invariance, and (2) presentations which apply a mixed method approach to explain instances of missing measurement invariance.

1. The Middleton Alienation Scale: Explaining Measurement Invariance Absence

Ms Ekaterina Lytkina (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

2. Do mode effects matter in cross-national surveys? An assessment of measurement invariance across data collection methods and countries

Dr Michèle Ernst Stähli (FORS, Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences)

Dr Oriane Sarrasin (University of Lausanne)

Professor Caroline Roberts (University of Lausanne)

3. Exploring language effects in cross-cultural survey research: Does the language of administration affect answers about politics?

Miss Diana Zavala-Rojas (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

4. Causal equivalence of moderator effects of attitude accessibility in comparative international studies

Mr Henrik Andersen (Technische Universität Kaiserslautern)

Mr Christoph Giehl (Technische Universität Kaiserslautern)

Dr Jochen Mayerl (Technische Universität Kaiserslautern)

5. Assessing Political Efficacy comparability: measurement invariance and correction for measurement error

Dr Andre Pirralha (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Dr Wiebke Weber (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Wednesday 19th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Measuring and Coding Complex Items: (Semi-) Automated Solutions 2

Chair Dr Eric Harrison (City University London)

Session Details

All social surveys rely heavily on socio-demographic information about respondents and design their instruments with a view to collecting the fullest most accurate measurements of these that are possible. Data about education, ethnicity, occupation, labour market situation - of both respondents and their families - form the essential backdrop to attitudes and behaviours measured elsewhere.

But they are problematic. They are complex to code, either because there is a huge range of possible answers (occupation), or because the context varies enormously between countries (education), or because respondents don't routinely undertake the task of self-categorisation (ethnicity/ancestry). Interviewers have to be trained to explore and probe in order to retrieve the fullest information from the field. This makes socio-demographic time-consuming and expensive to collect. Often the initial 'first pass' field data has then to be recoded by experts into smaller, more sociologically informed schemas.

As interest grows in using self-administered web surveys, we invite papers that report on the development or use of technological solutions to address some of these problems. Contributions addressing any complex categorical variables are welcome. These might include, but not be restricted to, measures of education, occupation, ethnicity, labour market experience, social class, social status, social distance, social networks, or reporting of medical conditions.

While papers will need to define and introduce the problem, the emphasis of this session is on solutions, so submissions will be required to have a practical component and include, where relevant, some demonstration material.

1. The variety of requirements in job advertisements: From semi automatic to full automatic detection and classification (coding) into a hierarchical taxonomy.

Mr Manuel Schandock (research associate at Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

2. Occupation and industry coding in the Next Steps Age 25 Survey

Ms Darina Peycheva (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Mr Matthew Brown (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)

Ms Anni Oskala (NatCen Social Research)

3. Self-identification of occupation in web-surveys: respondents' choice between autosuggest and search tree

Dr Kea Tijdens (University of Amsterdam / AIAS)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 102

Administrative Records for Survey Methodology 4

- Chair** Dr Asaph Young Chun (US Census Bureau)
Coordinator 1 Professor Mike Larsen (George Washington University)
Coordinator 2 Dr Ingegerd Jansson (Statistics Sweden)
Coordinator 3 Dr Manfred Antoni (Institute for Employment Research)
Coordinator 4 Dr Daniel Fuss (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 5 Dr Corinna Kleinert (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

Incorporation of administrative records have long been regarded as a way of improving the quality and interpretability of surveys and censuses and of controlling the rising cost of surveys (Chun and Scheuren, 2011). The increasing number of linked datasets, such as Health and Retirement Study in the U.S., National Educational Panel Study in Germany, and Understanding Society in UK, are accompanied by growing empirical evidence about the selectivity of linked observations. The extent and pace of using administrative data varies from continent to continent and from country to country. This is partly due to differential concerns about privacy, confidentiality, and legal constraints, as well as variability in acceptance and implementation of advances in statistical techniques to control such concerns.

The primary goal is to control data quality and reduce total survey error. This session will feature papers that implement "total administrative records error" and "total linked data error" methods and provide case studies and best practices of using administrative data tied to the survey life cycle (Chun and Larsen, a forthcoming Wiley book). The session invites papers that discuss fundamental challenges and recent advancements involved in the collection and analysis of administrative records, integration with surveys, censuses, and auxiliary data. We also encourage submission of papers discussing institutional collaboration on linked data, sustainable data access, provision of auxiliary tools and user support. For example, papers in this session include, but are not limited to the following topics:

1. Innovative use of administrative data in household surveys and censuses to improve the survey frame, reduce nonresponse follow-up, and assess coverage error.
2. Quality evaluations of administrative data and quality metrics for linked data
3. Recent advancements in processing and linking administrative data with survey data (one-to-one) and with multiple sources of data (one-to-many).
4. Recent methods of disclosure limitation and confidentiality protection in linked data, including linkages with geographical information.
5. Bayesian approaches to using administrative data in surveys, censuses, small area estimation, and nonresponse control.
6. Implementation of new tools that facilitate the use of linked data by simplifying complex data structures or handling inconsistent information in life-course data
7. Strategies for developing and maintaining a user-friendly infrastructure for the analysis and dissemination of linked data and solutions for collaboration
8. Applications that transform administrative data into information that is useful and relevant to policymaking in public health, economics, science and education.

1. Level of education – measuring the quality of questions in survey interviews by administrative records on education. Experiences from the Norwegian European Social Survey 2004 - 2014.

Mr Øyvind Kleven (Statistics Norway)

Professor Kristen Ringdal (Department of Sociology and Political Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology)

2. Using Administrative Records to Evaluate Absolute and Relative Reporting Accuracy in Surveys

Ms Joanne Pascale (US Census Bureau)

3. Record linkage and anonymization. What impact in data quality?

Ms Filipa Ribeiro (INE)

Mr Pedro Cunha (INE)

Mr António Portugal (INE)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 103

Using Survey Data for Spatial Analysis

Chair Professor Nina Baur (TU Berlin)
Coordinator 1 Ms Linda Hering (TU Berlin)
Coordinator 2 Ms Cornelia Thierbach (TU Berlin)

Session Details

The session aims at exploring new developments in spatial methods, 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.

Based on these observations and building on the prior debates at the ESRA Conference in Reykjavik, the RC33 Conferences in Sydney, Leicester and Taipeh as well the HSR Special Issue on "Spatial Analysis in the Social Sciences and Humanities. Towards Integrating Qualitative, Quantitative and Cartographic Approaches" (2014), the session asks how to further spatial analysis. Papers thus should address one of the questions below either at a more general methodological level or by 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. Investigating regional differences in economic and social participation using survey and public structural data

Mrs Caroline Neuber-Pohl (German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)
Professor Robert Helmrich (German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

2. Bringing Space into the equation - Using spatial econometrics to untangle neighbourhood effects on educational outcomes

Mr Christoph Zangger (University of Bern)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 104

Panel attrition 1

Chair Mr Joaquin Prieto (Department of Social Policy, The London School of Economics)

Session Details

1. Panel Consent and Panel Attrition: The Influence of Survey Mode and the Effectiveness of Post-Interview Panel Maintenance

Mr Peter Valet (Bielefeld University)
Dr Carsten Sauer (Radboud University Nijmegen)

2. Moving the UK Household Longitudinal Study to mixed mode: effects on response and attrition

Miss Hannah Carpenter (Kantar Public)
Dr Jon Burton (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)

3. Using short surveys to minimize panel attrition between two waves

Mrs Petra Knerr (infas Institut for Applied Social Sciences)

4. Understanding the attrition bias in Chile: evidence from two longitudinal surveys

Mr Joaquin Prieto (Department of Social Policy, The London School of Economics)
Dr Luis Maldonado (Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Pontificia Universidad Catolica of Chile.)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 106

Integrating migrants into representative cross-sectional and longitudinal

survey designs 1

Chair Professor Jürgen Schupp (SOEP/DIW Berlin)
Coordinator 1 Professor Lucinda Platt (LSE)
Coordinator 2 Professor Narayan Sastry (ISR/Univ Michigan)

Session Details

This session explores the challenges involved in integrating migrants into cross-sectional and longitudinal survey designs such as household panel surveys. In it, we hope to bring together quantitative researchers who can contribute their experiences in integrating migrants and/or refugees into these kinds of survey designs. The specific aim of this session is to identify good practices for designing and running cross-sectional and longitudinal surveys that include migrants and refugees, and to discuss specific problems and obstacles that arise when integrating these populations into those survey designs, and potential strategies for overcoming these problems.

In the session, we would particularly like to explore innovative strategies for drawing representative samples of migrants. We therefore welcome contributions that present approaches to sampling this specific population or discuss the shortcomings, sampling difficulties, coverage, and selectivity of such sampling strategies.

Issues of incorporating particular groups of immigrants such as refugees are welcome as well. We also invite contributions that discuss the challenges that ethnic and linguistic diversity pose to both questionnaire translation and selection of interviewers and other challenges of survey management.

We particularly encourage submissions that offer a comparative perspective on the following dimensions of survey research:

- Identification and definition of target groups
- Availability and accessibility of different sampling frames and their impacts
- Approaches to reaching target populations
- Challenges of attrition, follow-up rules, and identification of return migration
- Innovative tracking techniques for longitudinal designs
- Application of different sampling strategies within a single survey
- Differences in fieldwork organization, training of interviewers
- Modes of interviewing and survey design
- Questionnaire design and translation
- Weighting

1. The Sampling Design of the IAB-BAMF-SOEP Refugee Survey

Professor Martin Kroh (SOEP at DIW Berlin and HU Berlin)
Mr Simon Kühne (SOEP at DIW Berlin and BGSS at HU Berlin)
Dr Manuel Siegert (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF-FZ))
Mr Jannes Jacobsen (SOEP at DIW Berlin)

2. Challenges of and strategies for integrating a sample of refugees in the German panel study „Labour Market and Social Security“

Mr Sebastian Bähr (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Mr Jonas Beste (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Dr Corinna Frodermann (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))
Dr Claudia Wenzig (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))

3. How to deal with refugees in a household panel survey?

Mrs Birgit Jesske (infas, Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft GmbH)

4. Sampling Migrants in Europe: How to develop a comparative design?

Professor Hans-Jürgen Andreß (Universität zu Köln)
Professor Romana Careja (Syddansk Universitet, Odense)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 108

Different methods, same results? Comparing the consequences of alternative methods of data collection and analysis 1

Chair Professor Elmar Schlueter (Justus-Liebig-University Giessen)
Coordinator 1 Professor Jochen Mayerl (University of Kaiserslautern)

Session Details

No doubt about it – recent years have seen an ever increasing proliferation of methods for survey data collection and analysis. Think about the growing administration of surveys via the internet and mobile devices, the combination of large-scale surveys with experimental designs, the multiple approaches available to examine data from respondents nested in different levels of analysis or the wider application of Bayesian statistics. Such methodological innovations certainly help to open up important novel avenues for research. However, a central yet somewhat understudied question coupled with the plurality of methods is: To what extent do different strategies of survey data collection and analysis applied to the same research question lead to converging conclusions? Specifically, this session starts from the observation that for most research problems a single appropriate strategy of data collection or analysis does not exist. Instead, researchers typically face alternative defensible methods which may or may not converge in their results. Thus, the aim of this session is to stimulate the debate on the methodological as well as substantive issues that might arise when applying multiple methods of survey data collection or analysis. Does the application of alternative research designs or statistical methods lead to converging results? Are social science results with different methods replicable? We invite researchers to submit papers discussing the consequences of applying alternative methods of survey data collection or analysis in the following two scenarios:

- A. Same research question, comparing at least two different methods of data collection
- B. Same research question, comparing at least two methods of data analysis

Please send your paper proposals (no more than 500 words in length) to:

JProf. Dr. Jochen Mayerl, jochen.mayerl@sowi.uni-kl.de
Prof. Dr. Elmar Schlüter, elmar.schlueter@sowi.uni-giessen.de

1. Taking stock: Twenty years of research on conversational interviewing

Dr Frederick Conrad (University of Michigan)
Dr Michael Schober (New School for Social Research)

2. Comparing 2016 Election Results from Traditional Phone Studies with Web-based Methodologies

Ms Stephanie Marken (Gallup)
Mr Zac Auter (Gallup)
Dr Jennifer Dineen (University of Connecticut)

3. Must We All Become Bayesians Now? Accurate Frequentist Inference for Multilevel Analyses Based on Small Cluster Samples

Professor Merlin Schaeffer (University of Cologne)
Professor Martin Elff (Zeppelin University)
Dr Jan Paul Heisig (WZB)
Professor Susumu Shikano (University of Konstanz)

4. Female labor force participation in cross-country comparison. Applying multilevel regression analysis and Qualitative Comparative Analysis

Dr Thomas Laux (University of Bamberg)
Mrs Stefanie Heyne (University of Bamberg)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N AUD4

Putting data in the driver's seat: The role of active (meta-)data in survey data management 1

Chair Mr Knut Wenzig (DIW Berlin)
Coordinator 1 Mr Daniel Bela (LIfBi Bamberg (Germany))
Coordinator 2 Dr Arne Bethmann (DJI München (Germany))

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. 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.

With the increasing availability of metadata systems, their usage as a reference tool—e. g. for researchers looking for specific variables or questionnaire developers drawing on questions from other surveys—becomes more common. In this session we want to discuss uses of structured metadata that go beyond their passive reference function.

Since structured metadata are machine readable by definition, we are interested in exploring how and at which points in the data management lifecycle we can put metadata to use in a more active role. This may be as a means of automatically

generating human readable questionnaires, automated plausibility checks during fieldwork, recoding raw survey data from the field and probably in numerous other ways. In order to implement data-driven data management processes, other sources of information come into play: for example paradata or sampling frame data can potentially be used in the same manner to enhance survey data management and gain the same benefits.

Papers presented in the session should thus focus on examples of the active use of such structured information. We would like to learn about your experiences with implementing data-driven routines as part of the data management process. The session will also provide room to discuss how much automation in the data management lifecycle is feasible and/or desirable.

1. The DASISH Questionnaire Design Documentation Tool – functionalities and real life examples from the tool

Mr Benjamin Beuster (NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data)

Mrs Hilde Orten (NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data)

2. CLOSER Repository: Modernising Longitudinal Study Management

Mr Will Poynter (CLOSER, UCL)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N AUD5

Deviations and Fraud in Surveys - the Impact of Motivation and Incentives 1

Chair Professor Katrin Auspurg (LMU Munich)

Coordinator 1 Professor Thomas Hinz (University of Konstanz)

Coordinator 2 Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)

Coordinator 3 Professor Peter Winker (University of Giessen)

Session Details

Credibility of social science was repeatedly jeopardized by recent and spectacular cases of deviant behavior in conducting surveys or fraud in presenting survey based research results. Several times researchers published path-breaking results that turned out to be 'too good to be true.' Because the incentive system in science commonly rewards originality higher than accurateness, most probably, the detected cases of making up data or trimming results are only the tip of the iceberg.

What makes the situation in survey research even more complex is the fact that several actors are involved who have manifold incentives to manipulate data. These include the researchers, survey institutes, survey supervisors, interviewers and respondents. Contributions to the session will discuss the motivation, prevalence and implications of misbehavior of actors in survey research. Of interest are theoretical approaches and empirical studies on the motivation, detection and prevention of data manipulations. Strategies to detect fraud deserve specific attention, but we also welcome empirical work on causal mechanisms: Which conditions most likely trigger fraud? Which interventions could accordingly work?

Some examples along the survey process highlight possible topics for the session:

(1) Respondents often share an interest with the interviewers to save time by taking inaccurate short cuts in the questionnaires. Additionally, they are prone to provide false answers, for instance, if questions are sensitive. Both kinds of behavior yield inaccurate measurements.

(2) Interviewers often may have a high discretion on many decisions in the process of conducting a survey (e.g. when selecting households in a random walk sample, by shortening the interview time through steering the respondents to filter options in questionnaires, or making up interviews (partly) from the scratch). The motivation for deviant behavior can be influenced by factors such as task difficulty, interviewers' ability, and experience, but also by the quality of questionnaires and instructions and other administrative characteristics of the survey.

(3) Survey institutes often operate commercially under high cost and time pressure. In order to fulfill their contractual obligations to their clients they might have incentives to change, for instance, complex screening procedures without documenting, to manipulate statistics on non-response or even produce (near) duplicates to satisfy quota.

(4) Finally, researchers in survey research can engage in questionable practices as well when they select cases and statistical models just in purpose to get most sensational results.

1. Assuring the quality of survey data: Incentives, detection and documentation of deviant behavior

Professor Peter Winker (Justus-Liebig-University Giessen)

2. Bias and efficiency loss in regression estimates due to duplicated observations: a Monte Carlo simulation

Dr Francesco Sarracino (STATEC and HSE)

Dr Malgorzata Mikucka (Université Catholique de Louvain and HSE)

3. Exit polls in Georgia: achieving accurate measurements in a challenging environment

Mr Nicolas Becuwe (Kantar Public)

Mr Christopher Hanley (Kantar Public)

4. Time trends and risk-factors in publication bias: An analysis of the caliper test in the Quarterly Journal of Economics 1960 – 2015

Ms Julia Jerke (University of Zurich)

Professor Heiko Rauhut (University of Zurich)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N 101

Challenges of long-term repeated cross sectional attitude surveys

Chair Dr Oshrat Hochman (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Science)

Coordinator 1 Mr Michael Blohm (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Science)

Coordinator 2 Ms Martina Wasmer (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Science)

Session Details

Long-term repeated cross sectional attitude surveys are crucial for monitoring society and social change across time. At the same time, these surveys are also influenced by social changes and new realities. One consequence of this relationship is the tension between the need to replicate questions across the waves and the need to be innovative: On the one hand, repeated measures are meant to allow the monitoring of social changes over time, requiring the regular repetition of items. On the other hand, in the light of such social changes, but also considering advances in survey research, cross-sectional surveys must be up-to-date, and allow the scientific community to investigate new emerging issues and utilize the best measures for existing trends.

The production of high-quality data in Long-term cross sectional attitude surveys also relies on its reliability and representativeness. Long-term cross sectional attitude surveys are thus required to deal with the process of declining response rates to scientific surveys especially in the western world, characteristic also for other survey types. Whether in Telephone, or in face to face interviews, in Postal questionnaires or online, individuals are more reluctant than ever to respond to surveys or to get in contact with target persons. Declining response rates require survey producers to invest more thought and more resources and efforts in the implementation of -social science- surveys. Among others, thought must be given to incentives, interviewer training, fieldwork monitoring, mixed mode, and adaptive designs securing high response rates and high data quality.

The proposed session will foster the exchange of ideas regarding current and prospective challenges in long-term repeated cross sectional attitude surveys. We invite papers especially to the topics a) reconstruction and modification of survey items and b) measures securing high response rates in long-term repeated cross sectional surveys.

1. Decreasing Response Rates in the German General Social Survey: A Threat for Data Quality?

Mrs Jessica Walter (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Mr Michael Blohm (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Mrs Martina Wasmer (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. What if the interviewer decides: Effects of interviewer-based additional incentives for response enhancement in the German sub-study of the European Social Survey (ESS)

Ms Julia Harand (infas Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft GmbH (Institute for Applied Social Sciences), Bonn, Germany)

3. Monetary incentives in face-to-face surveys of the general population - what works best?

Mr Michael Blohm (GESIS - Institute for the Social Sciences)

Mr Achim Koch (GESIS - Institute for the Social Sciences)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Assessing the Quality of Survey Data 4

Chair Professor Jörg 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. Same Question, Different Answer: Discrepancies in Spousal Reports on the Division of Labor

Mrs Miriam Truebner (Department of Sociology, University of Bonn)

2. Explaining the decline in subjective well-being over time in panel data

Dr Katia Iglesias (University of Neuchâtel)

Mrs Pascale Gazareth (University of Neuchâtel)

Professor Christian Suter (University of Neuchâtel)

3. Move over Cronbach alpha – Here comes Culturometrics Q-Correlation!

Professor Beatrice Boufoy-Bastick (The University of the West Indies)

4. Testing Measurements of Environmental Concern: Does a simple question outperform multi-item scales?

Professor Axel Franzen (University of Bern)

Mr Sebastian Mader (University of Bern)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Adapting online surveys for mobile devices 1

Chair Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)

Coordinator 1 Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)

Coordinator 2 Mr Tim Hanson (Kantar Public)

Session Details

The substantial recent increase in levels and ownership and use of mobile devices (particularly smartphones) has been reflected in a rise in the proportion of respondents completing surveys using these devices. For some large social surveys in the UK, for example, between 10% and 20% of respondents now use a smartphone to complete the questionnaire.

This recent shift poses challenges for survey designers, as they seek to enable respondents to complete on their device of choice without any loss of data quality. Solutions to this challenge are varied, and range from minimal adaptation to major overhaul. The latter may include steps to fully optimise the survey layout and presentation for mobile devices, revisions to questionnaire content (e.g. reduced questionnaire length, shorter questions) or alternative completion formats (e.g. splitting surveys into ‘chunks’ that can be completed over a period of time).

For this session we welcome papers on a range of topics relating to adapting surveys for mobile devices, including the following:

- Attempts to produce ‘mobile optimised’ versions of questionnaires
- New question formats that may be better suited to mobile devices (e.g. more interactive)
- Issues with question formats that are known to be problematic on mobile devices (e.g. grids)
- Experimentation to assess the impact of different survey or question formats
- Analysis of data quality indicators that highlights particular issues relating to mobile devices
- Usability testing conducted on mobile devices to identify common issues

We are interested in examples from a range of different types of online survey, including ad hoc studies, tracking projects, longitudinal studies, online panels and mixed mode surveys that include online components. We encourage papers from researchers with a variety of backgrounds and across different sectors, including academia, national statistics and research agencies.

This session aims to foster discussion, knowledge exchange and shared learning among researchers and methodologists around issues related to increased use of mobile devices for survey completion. The format of the session will be designed to encourage interaction and discussion between the presenters and audience.

1. The effect on smartphone participation of switching to a mobile-first design

Dr Christian Bruch (University of Mannheim)

Professor Annelies Blom (University of Mannheim)

Dr Barbara Felderer (University of Mannheim)

Ms Jessica Herzing (University of Mannheim)

2. The journey from Mobile Agnostic to Mobile First

Ms Sue York (The University of Queensland)

3. Adapting a Multi-mode Household Survey for Mobile Devices

Ms Brenda Schafer (IRS)

Mr Pat Langetieg (IRS)

Dr Saurabh Datta (IRS)

Ms Jennifer McNulty (Westat)

Dr Jocelyn Newsome (Westat)

Ms Hanyu Sun (Westat)

Dr Kerry Levin (Westat)

4. National Travel Survey digital diary development

Ms Katriina Lapanjuuri (NatCen Social Research)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Online probing: Cognitive interviewing techniques in online surveys and online pretesting 1

Chair Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 2 Dr Lars Kaczmirek (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Online probing is a cognitive interviewing technique which can be used in online surveys and is especially useful in cross-cultural research (see Willis 2015 for a research synthesis on cross-cultural cognitive interviewing). The main advantages are: large sample sizes, explanation of response patterns in subpopulations, possible evaluation of prevalence of question problems and themes, higher likelihood of identifying problems during pretesting, and higher anonymity. Online probing is a fully scripted approach and the procedure is highly standardized (Braun et al. 2015; Meitinger & Behr 2016). Automatic on-the-fly analysis and coding of answers during the interview is also possible which can be used to ask automatically issued follow-up questions (for example to detect and reduce item nonresponse, Kaczmirek, Meitinger, Behr, forthcoming).

Online probing has already been applied to reveal diverging or overlapping interpretations and perspectives with regard to a variety of substantive topics, such as gender attitudes (Behr et al. 2013), xenophobia (Braun, Behr, & Kaczmirek 2013), civil disobedience (Behr et al. 2014a), satisfaction with democracy (Behr & Braun 2015), health (Lee et al. forthcoming), and national identity (Meitinger & Behr 2016).

Several methodological studies have addressed the optimal design and implementation of online probing, e.g., on the size of answer boxes (Behr et al. 2014), on sequence effects of multiple probes (Meitinger, Braun, Behr, forthcoming) and on its feasibility for Amazon MTurk (Fowler et al. 2016).

Although online probing has been successfully applied to several substantive and methodological topics, several research gaps remain. For example, due to the large sample size and qualitative nature of the probes, data analysis is rather work-intensive and time-consuming. Also, most of the previous online probing studies focused on Western countries and the majority of studies used the method after official data collection to follow-up on problematic items. Thus, the full potential of the method has not been explored, yet.

For this session, we invite papers on the method of online probing for substantial research and as part of pretests or methods research, and studies that compare online probing with other pretest methods. We especially welcome (1) presentations with a substantive application of online probing and (2) presentations that address some of the methodological challenges and considerations of online probing

1. Finding the Optimal Sample Size for Online Probing: How Many Respondents are Enough?

Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Lars Kaczmirek (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Michael Braun (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. Evaluating survey questions with different levels of comprehension difficulty using crowdsourced online probes

Dr Ana Slavec (University of Ljubljana)

Dr Vasja Vehovar (University of Ljubljana)

3. Examining Response Processes underneath Numerical Reports of Subjective Longevity Expectations: Evidence from Simple Probing Questions

Dr Pamela Giustinelli (University of Michigan Survey Research Center)

Dr Sunghee Lee (University of Michigan Survey Research Center)

Miss Michelle Tran (University of Michigan)

Miss Erica Dawson (University of Michigan)

Ms Colleen McClain (University of Michigan)
Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS)
Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS)
Professor Gabor Kezdi (Central European University)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Advancements in Adjusting for Measurement Error in Statistical Models

Chair Dr Malcolm Fairbrother (University of Bristol)
Coordinator 1 Dr Diana Zavala Rojas (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Session Details

Social and political surveys measure social attitudes, political opinions, preferences and behaviours. Yet the measurement of such phenomena is never completely precise: it is inevitably subject to measurement error. Yet statistical models in published studies often ignore such error, at the risk of producing substantially biased (often attenuated) results.

Despite the development and refinement of techniques capable of adjusting for measurement error, these techniques are generally ignored in applied work, in part because many applied researchers do not know about them, or even about the consequences of measurement error generally.

This session is twofold: we invite both methodological papers dealing with techniques for adjusting for measurement error and papers that present interesting applications making use of such methods.

From a methodological perspective, we are particularly keen to include papers that will, in some way, encourage applied researchers to adjust for measurement error--such as by presenting, validating, or demonstrating techniques that are accessible to non-specialists. Papers may touch on topics such as:

- correction for measurement error in hierarchical models;
- measurement error in categorical data;
- procedures to estimate measurement error;
- adjustment for measurement error in generalized linear models;
- correction for measurement error using latent class models and structural equation modelling.

From an applied perspective we are interested in presentations from diverse areas of the social and political sciences that use survey data and adjust for measurement error in their analyses.

1. The multi-trait multi-error approach to estimating measurement error

Dr Alexandru Cernat (University of Manchester)
Dr Daniel Oberski (University of Tilburg)

2. Mass Public Decisions to Promote Democracy: the Role of Foreign Policy Dispositions

Ms Lala Muradova (Universitat Pompeu Fabra; KU Leuven)

3. Latent classes analysis to detect social desirability answering patterns: An application to the 7th round of the European Social Survey.

Dr Caroline Vandenplas (KU Leuven)
Dr Alexandru Cernat (University of Manchester)

4. Correcting for Measurement Error in Multilevel Models

Dr Malcolm Fairbrother (University of Bristol)
Dr Diana Zavala-Rojas (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Thursday 20th July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Occupation coding 1

Chair Professor Matthias Schonlau (University of Waterloo)
Coordinator 1 Mr Malte Schierholz (IAB)

Session Details

Occupation coding refers to coding a respondent's text answer (or the interviewer's transcription of the text answer) about the respondent's job into one of many hundreds of occupation codes. We welcome any papers on this topic, including, but not limited to:

- measurement of occupations (e.g., mode, question design, ...)
- handling of different occupational classifications (e.g., ISCO and national classifications)
- problems of coding (e.g., costs, data quality, ...)
- techniques for coding (e.g., automatic coding, computer-assisted coding, manual coding, interview coding)
- computer algorithms for coding (e.g., machine learning, rule-based, ...)
- cross-national and longitudinal issues
- Measurement of derived variables (e.g., ISEI, ESeC, SIOPS, job-exposure matrices, ...)
- other methodological aspects related to occupation coding

1. Occupation Coding in The German Health Update (GEDA-Study 2014/15)

Mr Stefan Albrecht (Robert Koch Institute)
Mrs Marike Varga (Robert Koch Institute)
Mr Patrick Schmich (Robert Koch Institute)

2. Computer Assisted Manual Coding of Occupations - Best Practice from the German National Educational Panel Study (NEPS) and First Results on Differences in Reliability, Productivity and Derived Scales using Alternative Approaches.

Mr Markus Zielonka (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Mr Gregor Czermer (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

3. Coding and scaling of parental occupations in the European Social Survey R1-R7

Professor Harry B.G. Ganzeboom (Department of Sociology, VU University Amsterdam)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 102

Administrative Records for Survey Methodology 5

- Chair** Dr Asaph Young Chun (US Census Bureau)
Coordinator 1 Professor Mike Larsen (George Washington University)
Coordinator 2 Dr Ingegerd Jansson (Statistics Sweden)
Coordinator 3 Dr Manfred Antoni (Institute for Employment Research)
Coordinator 4 Dr Daniel Fuss (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 5 Dr Corinna Kleinert (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

Incorporation of administrative records have long been regarded as a way of improving the quality and interpretability of surveys and censuses and of controlling the rising cost of surveys (Chun and Scheuren, 2011). The increasing number of linked datasets, such as Health and Retirement Study in the U.S., National Educational Panel Study in Germany, and Understanding Society in UK, are accompanied by growing empirical evidence about the selectivity of linked observations. The extent and pace of using administrative data varies from continent to continent and from country to country. This is partly due to differential concerns about privacy, confidentiality, and legal constraints, as well as variability in acceptance and implementation of advances in statistical techniques to control such concerns.

The primary goal is to control data quality and reduce total survey error. This session will feature papers that implement "total administrative records error" and "total linked data error" methods and provide case studies and best practices of using administrative data tied to the survey life cycle (Chun and Larsen, a forthcoming Wiley book). The session invites papers that discuss fundamental challenges and recent advancements involved in the collection and analysis of administrative records, integration with surveys, censuses, and auxiliary data. We also encourage submission of papers discussing institutional collaboration on linked data, sustainable data access, provision of auxiliary tools and user support. For example, papers in this session include, but are not limited to the following topics:

1. Innovative use of administrative data in household surveys and censuses to improve the survey frame, reduce nonresponse follow-up, and assess coverage error.
2. Quality evaluations of administrative data and quality metrics for linked data
3. Recent advancements in processing and linking administrative data with survey data (one-to-one) and with multiple sources of data (one-to-many).
4. Recent methods of disclosure limitation and confidentiality protection in linked data, including linkages with geographical information.

5. Bayesian approaches to using administrative data in surveys, censuses, small area estimation, and nonresponse control.
6. Implementation of new tools that facilitate the use of linked data by simplifying complex data structures or handling inconsistent information in life-course data
7. Strategies for developing and maintaining a user-friendly infrastructure for the analysis and dissemination of linked data and solutions for collaboration
8. Applications that transform administrative data into information that is useful and relevant to policymaking in public health, economics, science and education.

1. Combining Administrative and Survey Data to Improve Both Surveys and Policy

Professor Pablo Celhay (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile)
Professor Bruce D. Meyer (University of Chicago, NBER)
Mr Nikolas Mittag (CERGE-EI)

2. Enhancement of health surveys with data linkage

Mr Cordell Golden (National Center for Health Statistics)
Mrs Lisa Mirel (National Center for Health Statistics)

3. Lessons from linked data: Quality of data about income and education from SHARE-RV

Ms Tatjana Mika (German Pension Insurance)
Ms Imke Herold (Munich Institute for the Economics of Aging)

4. An Investigation of Record Linkage Refusal and Its Implications for Empirical Research

Mr Arne Jonas Warnke (ZEW Mannheim)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 103

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

Chair Dr Stephanie Eckman (RTI)
Coordinator 1 Mr Ned English (NORC)

Session Details

The techniques of remote sensing and geographic information systems (GIS) can provide new methods for frame creation and sample selection and help us study and reduce coverage, nonresponse and measurement error. GIS-based tools are also used in the analysis of survey data and presentation of results. As these technologies become less expensive and easier to use, and geographic data availability grows, we expect survey researchers to make more use of GIS. While we embrace geospatial methods, however, we should also maintain a healthy skepticism about their capabilities and limitations.

This series of sessions at the ESRA 2017 conference in Lisbon 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. Exit Polling and Geolocation Technology

Dr Rene Bautista (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Dr David Sterrett (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Dr Jennifer Benz (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Mr David Pace (The Associated Press)
Mrs Emily Swanson (The Associated Press)
Mr Trevor Tompson (NORC at the University of Chicago)

2. Geo-Sampling for Establishment Survey Enumeration and Sampling: Nigeria Non-facility Based Health Service Providers Case Study

Miss Justine Allpress (RTI International)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 104

Panel attrition 2

Chair Dr Christian Bruch (University of Mannheim)

Session Details

1. Effects of Competence Tests on Panel Attrition in the NEPS School-Leavers' Panel Survey

Mr Michael Ruland (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences, Germany)

Ms Jennifer Weitz (University of Siegen, Germany)

2. The Effect of Interview Lengths on Panel Attrition in the NEPS Adult Study

Mrs Annette Trahms (Institute for Employment Research, Nuremberg)

3. Success and failure of recruitment of respondents into an international web panel

Mr Indrek Soidla (University of Tartu)

Mrs Mare Ainsaar (University of Tartu)

4. Maintaining participation at older ages in a birth cohort study: Evidence from the MRC National Survey of Health and Development

Dr Andrew Wong (MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Professor Diana Kuh (MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Miss Maria Popham (MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Dr Rachel Cooper (MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing at UCL)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 105

Electoral research & polling 1

Chair Dr Andreas Goldberg (University of Amsterdam)

Session Details

1. Who gets lost, and what difference it makes? Mixed modes, survey participation and nonresponse bias

Dr Andreas Goldberg (University of Amsterdam)

Professor Pascal Sciarini (University of Geneva)

2. Analysing electoral non-response bias in electoral contexts

Mr Yamil Nares (DEFOE)

Mr René Bautista (DEFOE)

Mr Daniel Gonzalez (DEFOE)

3. An Alternative Approach to Election Polling in the United States: The USC Dornsife / Los Angeles Times 2016 "Daybreak" Poll

Ms Jill Darling (University of Southern California Center for Economic and Social Research)

Dr Arie Kaptyn (University of Southern California Center for Economic and Social Research)

Ms Tania Gutsche (University of Southern California Center for Economic and Social Research)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 106

Integrating migrants into representative cross-sectional and longitudinal survey designs 2

Chair Professor Jürgen Schupp (SOEP/DIW Berlin)

Coordinator 1 Professor Lucinda Platt (LSE)

Coordinator 2 Professor Narayan Sastry (ISR/Univ Michigan)

Session Details

This session explores the challenges involved in integrating migrants into cross-sectional and longitudinal survey designs such as household panel surveys. In it, we hope to bring together quantitative researchers who can contribute their experiences in integrating migrants and/or refugees into these kinds of survey designs. The specific aim of this session is to identify good practices for designing and running cross-sectional and longitudinal surveys that include migrants and refugees, and to discuss specific problems and obstacles that arise when integrating these populations into those survey designs, and potential strategies for overcoming these problems.

In the session, we would particularly like to explore innovative strategies for drawing representative samples of migrants. We therefore welcome contributions that present approaches to sampling this specific population or discuss the shortcomings, sampling difficulties, coverage, and selectivity of such sampling strategies.

Issues of incorporating particular groups of immigrants such as refugees are welcome as well. We also invite contributions that discuss the challenges that ethnic and linguistic diversity pose to both questionnaire translation and selection of interviewers and other challenges of survey management.

We particularly encourage submissions that offer a comparative perspective on the following dimensions of survey research:

- Identification and definition of target groups
- Availability and accessibility of different sampling frames and their impacts
- Approaches to reaching target populations
- Challenges of attrition, follow-up rules, and identification of return migration
- Innovative tracking techniques for longitudinal designs
- Application of different sampling strategies within a single survey
- Differences in fieldwork organization, training of interviewers
- Modes of interviewing and survey design
- Questionnaire design and translation
- Weighting

1. Measuring educational attainment and participation on education in the target group of persons with migrant background

Miss Alexandra Strauss (Kantar Public, TNS Deutschland GmbH)

Mrs Frauke Bilger (Kantar Public, TNS Deutschland GmbH)

Mrs Sara Reiter (University of Muenster)

Professor Halit Oeztuerk (University of Muenster)

2. Designing and Implementing a New Immigrant Refresher Sample for a Longitudinal Survey: Plans and Results from the U.S. Panel Study of Income Dynamics

Dr Narayan Sastry (University of Michigan)

3. Using controlled network sampling to over-represent second-generation immigrants in a national survey

Mrs Karen Brändle (University of Lausanne)

Dr Guy Elcherath (University of Lausanne)

4. Surveying migrants without a sample frame: experiences with location sampling

Mr Andrew Cleary (Ipsos MORI)

Ms Tanja Stajadinovic (Ipsos MORI)

Ms Rossalina Latcheva (EU Agency for Fundamental Rights)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 107

Recruiting and surveying special populations 1

Chair Dr Anna B. Sandoval Girón (Center for Survey Measurement, U.S. Census Bureau)

Coordinator 1 Dr Susanne Vogl (University of Vienna)

Session Details

In recent years, researchers have shown an increased interest in research in special populations. This growing interest is in part due to difficulties in recruiting and surveying these populations. The difficulty in collecting data has significant negative effects on the quality of data and findings derived from studies. Special populations refer to subgroups of “mainstream” population that are usually difficult to reach and research for different reasons. These reasons may include living and life conditions and socio economic background, or individuals reluctant about being found or contacted. Special populations include but are not limited to children, the elderly, the disabled, ethnic minorities, elites, people with special illnesses, migrants and refugees, the incarcerated, those who don’t speak the dominant language of the community, and people experiencing homelessness.

Compared to interviews in the general adult population, special requirements and precautions might arise with respect to procedures when recruiting respondents and conducting interviews with members of a special population. Choosing an interview method, interview mode, sample design, gaining acceptance and consent, tailoring the instrument, defining the interview setting, and establishing rapport are just a few of the key aspects to consider when designing an interview and

conducting a study with a special population.

In this session, "Recruiting and Surveying Special Populations," we want to stimulate a discussion of methodological reflections and practical experiences from the field as well as of results from field-experimental or laboratory experimental studies on various aspects of the research process when dealing with special populations. We welcome papers from standardized, qualitative and mixed methods approaches with a focus on methodology and substantive applications.

We suggest but do not limit the session to the following aspects:

- Data quality
- Sample frame and coverage issues
- Sampling procedures, problems of accessibility
- Locating, contacting, and recruiting hard-to reach populations
- The role of social media and other electronic communication in recruitment and interviewing
- Unit- and Item-Nonresponse
- Interview modes
- New technologies and techniques in data collection
- Question properties
- Response sets
- Interviewer-Respondent interaction
- Interviewer effect

1. Reaching Hard-to-Survey Populations in Comparative Perspective

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

2. Why should I participate? Challenges in reaching young people who grew up in poverty

Dr Jelena Ogresta (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Law, Department of Social Work)

Dr Tanja Vučković (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Law, Department of Social Work)

Professor Ivan Rimac (University of Zagreb, Faculty of Law, Department of Social Work)

3. Work Commitment and Interview Effects in Cross-Cultural Studies

Mr Michael Ruland (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences, Germany)

Dr Hans Dietrich (Institute for Employment Research (IAB), Germany)

Mrs Angelika Steinwede (infas Institute for Applied Social Sciences, Germany)

4. Web surveys and the study of victims of dictatorships

Ms Sofia Serra da Silva (Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon and CIES-IUL)

Dr Filipa Raimundo (Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon)

5. Reaching the LGBT population in a representative survey of the general population and in a voluntary online survey: survey strategies, representativeness and comparability

Mrs Tania Lejbowicz (Ined)

Mr Mathieu Trachman (Ined)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: F2 108

Different methods, same results? Comparing the consequences of alternative methods of data collection and analysis 2

Chair Professor Elmar Schlueter (Justus-Liebig-University Giessen)

Coordinator 1 Professor Jochen Mayerl (University of Kaiserslautern)

Session Details

No doubt about it – recent years have seen an ever increasing proliferation of methods for survey data collection and analysis. Think about the growing administration of surveys via the internet and mobile devices, the combination of large-scale surveys with experimental designs, the multiple approaches available to examine data from respondents nested in different levels of analysis or the wider application of Bayesian statistics. Such methodological innovations certainly help to open up important novel avenues for research. However, a central yet somewhat understudied question coupled with the plurality of methods is: To what extent do different strategies of survey data collection and analysis applied to the same research question lead to converging conclusions? Specifically, this session starts from the observation that for most research problems a single appropriate strategy of data collection or analysis does not exist. Instead, researchers typically face alternative defensible methods which may or may not converge in their results. Thus, the aim of this session is to stimulate the debate on the methodological as well as substantive issues that might arise when applying multiple methods of survey data collection or analysis. Does the application of alternative research designs or statistical methods lead to converging results? Are social science results with different methods replicable? We invite researchers to submit papers discussing the consequences of applying alternative methods of survey data collection or analysis in the following two scenarios:

A. Same research question, comparing at least two different methods of data collection

B. Same research question, comparing at least two methods of data analysis

Please send your paper proposals (no more than 500 words in length) to:

JProf. Dr. Jochen Mayerl, jochen.mayerl@sowi.uni-kl.de
Prof. Dr. Elmar Schlüter, elmar.schlueter@sowi.uni-giessen.de

1. Hello, neighbour! Comparing different modes and instruments as a measurement for individual housing preferences in a survey-based implementation of Schellings' segregation model

Mr Andreas Schneck (Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich)
Dr Christiane Bozoyan (Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich)

2. Neighbor's influence: Different strategies to model spatial spillover effects

Mr Tobias Rüttenauer (TU Kaiserslautern)

3. A potential pitfall in modelling the link between education and social network quality

Professor Peter Winker (University of Giessen)
Dr Marina Trebbels (University of Hamburg)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N AUD4

Putting data in the driver's seat: The role of active (meta-)data in survey data management 2

Chair Mr Knut Wenzig (DIW Berlin)
Coordinator 1 Mr Daniel Bela (LIfBi Bamberg (Germany))
Coordinator 2 Dr Arne Bethmann (DJI München (Germany))

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. 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.

With the increasing availability of metadata systems, their usage as a reference tool—e. g. for researchers looking for specific variables or questionnaire developers drawing on questions from other surveys—becomes more common. In this session we want to discuss uses of structured metadata that go beyond their passive reference function.

Since structured metadata are machine readable by definition, we are interested in exploring how and at which points in the data management lifecycle we can put metadata to use in a more active role. This may be as a means of automatically generating human readable questionnaires, automated plausibility checks during fieldwork, recoding raw survey data from the field and probably in numerous other ways. In order to implement data-driven data management processes, other sources of information come into play: for example paradata or sampling frame data can potentially be used in the same manner to enhance survey data management and gain the same benefits.

Papers presented in the session should thus focus on examples of the active use of such structured information. We would like to learn about your experiences with implementing data-driven routines as part of the data management process. The session will also provide room to discuss how much automation in the data management lifecycle is feasible and/or desirable.

1. From passive to active – how a focus on archiving can work to improve data collection and management

Dr Steven McEachern (Australian Data Archive)
Ms Janet McDougall (Australian Data Archive)

2. Metadata-driven Scientific Use File data management

Mr Daniel Bela (LIfBi)

3. Facilitating metadata capture and reuse in the social sciences with the example of social media data

Miss Kerrin Borschewski (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Mr Wolfgang Zenk-Möltgen (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N AUD5

Deviations and Fraud in Surveys - the Impact of Motivation and Incentives 2

Chair Professor Katrin Auspurg (LMU Munich)
Coordinator 1 Professor Thomas Hinz (University of Konstanz)
Coordinator 2 Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Coordinator 3 Professor Peter Winker (University of Giessen)

Session Details

Credibility of social science was repeatedly jeopardized by recent and spectacular cases of deviant behavior in conducting surveys or fraud in presenting survey based research results. Several times researchers published path-breaking results that turned out to be 'too good to be true.' Because the incentive system in science commonly rewards originality higher than accurateness, most probably, the detected cases of making up data or trimming results are only the tip of the iceberg.

What makes the situation in survey research even more complex is the fact that several actors are involved who have manifold incentives to manipulate data. These include the researchers, survey institutes, survey supervisors, interviewers and respondents. Contributions to the session will discuss the motivation, prevalence and implications of misbehavior of actors in survey research. Of interest are theoretical approaches and empirical studies on the motivation, detection and prevention of data manipulations. Strategies to detect fraud deserve specific attention, but we also welcome empirical work on causal mechanisms: Which conditions most likely trigger fraud? Which interventions could accordingly work?

Some examples along the survey process highlight possible topics for the session:

- (1) Respondents often share an interest with the interviewers to save time by taking inaccurate short cuts in the questionnaires. Additionally, they are prone to provide false answers, for instance, if questions are sensitive. Both kinds of behavior yield inaccurate measurements.
- (2) Interviewers often may have a high discretion on many decisions in the process of conducting a survey (e.g. when selecting households in a random walk sample, by shortening the interview time through steering the respondents to filter options in questionnaires, or making up interviews (partly) from the scratch). The motivation for deviant behavior can be influenced by factors such as task difficulty, interviewers' ability, and experience, but also by the quality of questionnaires and instructions and other administrative characteristics of the survey.
- (3) Survey institutes often operate commercially under high cost and time pressure. In order to fulfill their contractual obligations to their clients they might have incentives to change, for instance, complex screening procedures without documenting, to manipulate statistics on non-response or even produce (near) duplicates to satisfy quota.
- (4) Finally, researchers in survey research can engage in questionable practices as well when they select cases and statistical models just in purpose to get most sensational results.

1. Interviewers' motivation, influencing factors and impact on data accuracy – results from an in-field experiment

Dr Natalja Menold (GESIS)
Professor Peter Winker (University of Giesen)
Mrs Uta Landrock (TU Kaiserslauten)

2. "Curbstoning": case study of an elaborate interviewer falsification scheme and new procedures to prevent interviewer fabrication

Dr Frederic Malter (Max-Planck-Institute for Social Law and Social Policy (MPISOC))

3. Identifying fake interviews in a cross-national panel study (SHARE).

Dr Karin Schuller (Max-Planck-Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)
Dr Michael Bergmann (Max-Planck-Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: N 101

Essential Survey Data for Market Analytics

Chair Dr LinChiat Chang (Independent Consultant)
Coordinator 1 Dr Sen Deng (WebMD)
Coordinator 2 Mr Jochen Ertl (Kantar Health)

Session Details

Despite the plethora of behavioral data and administrative records available today, survey data continues to fill a unique and essential need in the measurement of subjective latent constructs. These latent constructs are captured in direct self-reports from customers and stakeholders about their experiences, perceptions, needs, values, attitudes, interests, preferences, lifestyle and personality attributes; and are often essential in market analytics to predict or explain choices and actions.

Market analytics on survey data draw on a wide spectrum of longstanding to innovative techniques that serve to inform and support business decisions. Solutions include market segmentation, churn/retention analysis, choice designs and experiments embedded in surveys, marketing mix modeling, pricing models, product feature testing, and much more.

For our session, we invite submissions from statisticians and data scientists who have executed advanced analytics on survey data to successfully address a real world business problem. Data could be drawn from proprietary custom surveys, or probability-based sample surveys in the public domain. We would particularly love to include projects that demonstrate the unique value of surveys in capturing critical measures not available in non-survey sources, or multi-stream analytics where survey data is integrated with ancillary sources.

1. A case study of order effects in responses to tasks commonly included in surveys to obtain marketing data

Dr Chung-Tung Jordan Lin (U.S. Food and Drug Administration)
Dr LinChiat Chang (Independent Consultant)

2. Developing marketing personas of senior mobile phone (non-)users with survey data

Dr Ana Slavec (University of Ljubljana)
Dr Vesna Dolničar (University of Ljubljana)
Dr Andraž Petrovič (University of Ljubljana)

3. Market Segmentation of U.S. Adults Suffering from Chronic Pain

Dr LinChiat Chang (Independent Consultant)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Assessing the Quality of Survey Data 5

Chair Professor Jörg 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. Attitudes towards Surveys, Evaluation of Survey Experience and Respondents' Susceptibility to Nonresponse in Online Panels

Mr Niklas Jungermann (University of Kassel, Germany)
Professor Volker Stocké (University of Kassel, Germany)

2. Does Undercoverage on the United States Address-based Sampling Frame Translate to Coverage Bias?

Dr Ashley Amaya (RTI International)
Dr Stephanie Zimmer (RTI International)
Ms Katherine Morton (RTI International)
Dr Rachel Harter (RTI International)

3. Data quality in PIAAC – International standards and national procedures

Mr Markus Bönisch (Statistics Austria)

4. Fabricated Interviews in Survey Research

Professor Jörg Blasius (University of Bonn)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Adapting online surveys for mobile devices 2

Chair Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 1 Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)
Coordinator 2 Mr Tim Hanson (Kantar Public)

Session Details

The substantial recent increase in levels and ownership and use of mobile devices (particularly smartphones) has been reflected in a rise in the proportion of respondents completing surveys using these devices. For some large social surveys in the UK, for example, between 10% and 20% of respondents now use a smartphone to complete the questionnaire.

This recent shift poses challenges for survey designers, as they seek to enable respondents to complete on their device of choice without any loss of data quality. Solutions to this challenge are varied, and range from minimal adaptation to major overhaul. The latter may include steps to fully optimise the survey layout and presentation for mobile devices, revisions to questionnaire content (e.g. reduced questionnaire length, shorter questions) or alternative completion formats (e.g. splitting surveys into 'chunks' that can be completed over a period of time).

For this session we welcome papers on a range of topics relating to adapting surveys for mobile devices, including the following:

- Attempts to produce 'mobile optimised' versions of questionnaires
- New question formats that may be better suited to mobile devices (e.g. more interactive)
- Issues with question formats that are known to be problematic on mobile devices (e.g. grids)
- Experimentation to assess the impact of different survey or question formats
- Analysis of data quality indicators that highlights particular issues relating to mobile devices
- Usability testing conducted on mobile devices to identify common issues

We are interested in examples from a range of different types of online survey, including ad hoc studies, tracking projects, longitudinal studies, online panels and mixed mode surveys that include online components. We encourage papers from researchers with a variety of backgrounds and across different sectors, including academia, national statistics and research agencies.

This session aims to foster discussion, knowledge exchange and shared learning among researchers and methodologists around issues related to increased use of mobile devices for survey completion. The format of the session will be designed to encourage interaction and discussion between the presenters and audience.

1. Data Chunking in a longitudinal probability-based survey

Dr Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)
Dr Peter Lugtig (Utrecht University)

2. Comparing grids, vertical and horizontal item-by-item formats for PCs and Smartphones

Dr Melanie Revilla (RECSM-Universitat Pompeu Fabra)
Professor Mick Couper (University of Michigan)

3. Slider bars in multi-device Web surveys

Miss Angelica Maineri (Tilburg University/University of Trento)
Mr Ivano Bison (University of Trento)
Mr Ruud Luijkx (Tilburg University)

4. Applying Usability Features of Popular Apps to Mobile Surveys: A Content Analysis

Dr Jessica Broome (Jessica Broome Research / University of Michigan)
Dr Christopher Antoun (US Census Bureau)
Mr Randall Evans (Jessica Broome Research)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Online probing: Cognitive interviewing techniques in online surveys and online pretesting 2

Chair Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 1 Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Coordinator 2 Dr Lars Kaczmirek (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Online probing is a cognitive interviewing technique which can be used in online surveys and is especially useful in cross-cultural research (see Willis 2015 for a research synthesis on cross-cultural cognitive interviewing). The main advantages are: large sample sizes, explanation of response patterns in subpopulations, possible evaluation of prevalence of question problems and themes, higher likelihood of identifying problems during pretesting, and higher anonymity. Online probing is a fully scripted approach and the procedure is highly standardized (Braun et al. 2015; Meitinger & Behr 2016). Automatic on-the-fly analysis and coding of answers during the interview is also possible which can be used to ask automatically issued follow-up questions (for example to detect and reduce item nonresponse, Kaczmirek, Meitinger, Behr, forthcoming).

Online probing has already been applied to reveal diverging or overlapping interpretations and perspectives with regard to a variety of substantive topics, such as gender attitudes (Behr et al. 2013), xenophobia (Braun, Behr, & Kaczmirek 2013), civil disobedience (Behr et al. 2014a), satisfaction with democracy (Behr & Braun 2015), health (Lee et al. forthcoming), and national identity (Meitinger & Behr 2016).

Several methodological studies have addressed the optimal design and implementation of online probing, e.g., on the size of answer boxes (Behr et al. 2014), on sequence effects of multiple probes (Meitinger, Braun, Behr, forthcoming) and on its feasibility for Amazon MTurk (Fowler et al. 2016).

Although online probing has been successfully applied to several substantive and methodological topics, several research gaps remain. For example, due to the large sample size and qualitative nature of the probes, data analysis is rather work-intensive and time-consuming. Also, most of the previous online probing studies focused on Western countries and the majority of studies used the method after official data collection to follow-up on problematic items. Thus, the full potential of the method has not been explored, yet.

For this session, we invite papers on the method of online probing for substantial research and as part of pretests or methods research, and studies that compare online probing with other pretest methods. We especially welcome (1) presentations with a substantive application of online probing and (2) presentations that address some of the methodological challenges and considerations of online probing

1. Online Probing of the LFS Questionnaire

Dr Matea Paškvan (Statistics Austria)

Mr Marc Plate (Statistics Austria)

2. Methodological Considerations for the Use of Close-Ended Online Probes

Dr Paul Scanlon (National Center for Health Statistics)

3. Use of closed probes in a probability panel to validate cognitive pretesting

Professor Nick Allum (University of Essex)

Mr Matt Shapley (University of Essex)

Mr Curtis Jessop (NatCen Social Research)

Ms Sophie Pilley (NatCen Social Research)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Direction of Response Scales

Chair Dr Ting Yan (Westat)

Coordinator 1 Dr Florian Keusch (University of Mannheim)

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 descend 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 ascend 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 welcome presentations that analyze the influence of scale direction (1) on data quality, (2) under different modes of data collection, especially emerging modes, such as mobile Web and SMS/texting, (3) considering moderating effects of scale- and question-level characteristics, such as number of scale points, scale alignment, and question content, and (4) in a cross-cultural context.

1. Response-order Effect in Radio Button Rating Questions

Mrs Natalia Maloshonok (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

2. Scale Direction Effects in Agree/Disagree and Item-Specific Questions: A Comparison of Question Formats

Mr Jan Karem Höhne (University of Göttingen)

Professor Dagmar Krebs (University of Gießen)

3. The interaction effect of interviewer characteristics and scale direction in attitudinal items

Ms Vilma Agalioti-Sgompou (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex & Centre for Longitudinal Studies, IoE University College London)

4. In your opinion, in which direction should the answer categories go?

Professor Florian Keusch (University of Mannheim)

Dr Ting Yan (Westat)

5. Scale Direction Effects for Chinese Respondents

Dr Ting Yan (Westat)

Dr Chan Zhang (Fu Dan University)

Thursday 20th July, 14:00 - 15:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Occupation coding 2

Chair Professor Matthias Schonlau (University of Waterloo)

Coordinator 1 Mr Malte Schierholz (IAB)

Session Details

Occupation coding refers to coding a respondent's text answer (or the interviewer's transcription of the text answer) about the respondent's job into one of many hundreds of occupation codes. We welcome any papers on this topic, including, but not limited to:

- measurement of occupations (e.g., mode, question design, ...)
- handling of different occupational classifications (e.g., ISCO and national classifications)
- problems of coding (e.g., costs, data quality, ...)
- techniques for coding (e.g., automatic coding, computer-assisted coding, manual coding, interview coding)
- computer algorithms for coding (e.g., machine learning, rule-based, ...)
- cross-national and longitudinal issues
- Measurement of derived variables (e.g., ISEI, ESeC, SIOPS, job-exposure matrices, ...)
- other methodological aspects related to occupation coding

1. Changing from manual to automatic coding for Economic activity and Occupation using previous experience in manual coding

Mr Rui Alves (Statistics Portugal)

2. Three Methods for Occupation Coding based on Statistical Learning

Mr Hyukjun Gweon (University of Waterloo)

Professor Matthias Schonlau (University of Waterloo)

Dr Lars Kaczmirek (GESIS)

Mr Michael Blohm (GESIS)

Professor Stefan Steiner (University of Waterloo)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 103

Proper and robust multiple imputation of complex data

Chair Dr Kristian Kleinke (University of Hagen)

Coordinator 1 Professor Martin Spiess (University of Hamburg)

Coordinator 2 Professor Jost Reinecke (University of Bielefeld)

Session Details

Allison (2001) states that the best solution to the missing data problem is prevention. This is especially true for complex data sets like multilevel data. Here, missingness may occur at various levels: in the outcome variable(s), in level-1 predictors, level-2 predictors, or even higher levels, and finally even in the group identifier(s). Many researchers still handle missingness (e.g. in multilevel data in level-1 and level-2 predictors) by excluding the incomplete cases from the analysis – a wasteful practice, which may lead to biased inferences. On the other hand, also none of the currently existing multiple imputation solutions for complex data can be described as optimal, as they either rely rather heavily upon strong distributional assumptions, often including

homoscedasticity, which are frequently violated in “real life” situations. On the other hand, non- or semiparametric imputation methods often lack justification. Recent papers that contrast and review various strategies to impute complex or multilevel data are Drechsler (2015) and Enders, Mistler and Keller (2016). Shortcomings of some imputation techniques or consequences of misspecifications even in simple data sets are considered, e.g. in de Jong, van Buuren and Spiess (2016) or He and Raghunathan (2009).

All in all, missing data in complex data structures is a field where a lot of research still has to be done. Feasible and robust software solutions need to be developed that work, even when empirical data do not exactly follow the convenient statistical distributions assumed by the respective procedures.

We invite colleagues to present their research on multiple imputation solutions for complex data structures (e.g. clustered data, longitudinal data, panel data, cohort-sequential designs, etc.). We especially encourage proposals for robust procedures for “non-normal” missing data problems, i.e. when convenient distributional assumptions of standard MI procedures (normality, homoscedasticity) are violated. Also simulations that evaluate/compare different MI procedures regarding their robustness against violated assumptions are highly welcome.

(For a list of references, see: <http://e.feu.de/esra2017>)

1. Imputation of missing data by design using neural networks – How to shorten questionnaire length without sacrificing the amount of information collected

Ms Sarah Jensen (University of Wuppertal - Schumpeter School of Business and Economics - Chair of Methods of Economic and Social Research)

Professor Dirk Temme (University of Wuppertal - Schumpeter School of Business and Economics - Chair of Methods of Economic and Social Research)

2. Quantile regression based multiple imputation

Dr Kristian Kleinke (University of Hagen)

Professor Mark Stemmler (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)

Professor Friedrich Lösel (University of Cambridge and University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)

3. How robust are multiple imputation based inferences in multilevel models?

Professor Martin Spiess (University of Hamburg)

Dr Kristian Kleinke (FernUniversität Hagen)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 104

Panel and Survival Techniques for Complex Survey Data

Chair Dr Arne Bethmann (German Youth Institute)

Coordinator 1 Dr Ulrich Pötter (German Youth Institute)

Session Details

Many modern statistical methods ranging from panel and survival analysis techniques to bootstrap methods, are routinely used for the study of data generated by longitudinal survey designs. However, survey design issues and in particular the impact of longitudinal accrual of information combined with panel attrition are very rarely discussed when advanced statistical methods are applied to data from complex surveys. This is certainly no accident: statistical methods are generally developed, analyzed and justified based on the assumption of independent and identically distributed observations. These results can then often be transferred to the simplest sampling situations like (stratified) simple random sampling without non-response, using only minor adjustments.

But the increasing availability of data from complex survey designs, including longitudinal studies and multi-frame surveys as well as the decrease in response rates through the years also increases the disparity between simple justifications of statistical procedures and their practical applications. In fact, it is quite unclear how crucial features of the survey design as well as non-response can be combined with standard statistical procedures in order to provide valid inferences. In some special cases, it is possible to justify weighting schemes derived from design information for procedures based on estimating equations. But this approach is mainly restricted to generalized regression type models as well as Cox-models without time-dependent covariates. For general statistical procedures, there is little experience and scarce theoretical guidance how one may combine information on the sampling design and non-response process

with the standard estimation strategies.

We invite contributions that enrich analytical practice by reporting on current approaches to combine survey design aspects with modern statistical techniques. We welcome theoretical considerations and/or simulations to compare different approaches, as well as applied techniques for dealing with complex longitudinal designs and non-response in substantive research.

Topics may include (but are not restricted to):

- General uses of (non-response) weights in dynamic regression- or survival models including the use of time-varying covariates and the estimation of time-varying effects.
- Using augmented inverse probability weighting.
- Non-weighting methods to deal with design and non-response including response modeling.
- Bootstrapping methods preserving sampling designs.
- Using sampling process information as well as population level information to increase credibility of statistical estimates.

1. Weighted moments cum likelihood estimation in a survey population setup for longitudinal categorical data
Professor Brajendra Sutradhar (Carleton University)

2. Projecting long-term trends in mobility limitations: impact of excess weight, smoking and physical inactivity
Dr Tommi Härkänen (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland)
Ms Päivi Sainio (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland)
Dr Sari Stenholm (University of Turku, Finland)
Dr Annamari Lundqvist (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland)
Dr Heli Valkeinen (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland)
Professor Arpo Aromaa (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland)
Professor Seppo Koskinen (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland)

3. A comparison between variance estimation with bootstrap replicate weights and TSL
Dr Tobias Schmidt (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Mr Matthias Kaeding (RWI Essen)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 105

Electoral research & polling 2

Chair Professor Michael Schober (New School for Social Research)

Session Details

1. Lies, Damn Lies, and Exit Polls: Minority Sub-samples and the Dangers of Design
Professor Gary Segura (UCLA)

2. Communicating Uncertainty in Data Visualizations
Professor Michael Schober (New School for Social Research)
Professor Aaron Hill (Parsons School of Design)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 106

Sampling Migrants and Other Mobile Groups as Hard-to-Reach Populations

Chair Dr Joanna Napierala (Centre of Migration Research, University of Warsaw)
Coordinator 1 Dr Agata Górný (Centre of Migration Research, University of Warsaw)

Session Details

Conceptually mobile groups as i.e. refugees, second generation migrants, circular or temporary migrants, internal EU-migrants, belong to “hard-to-reach” populations. Population registries in receiving countries are not done in real time and information about some mobile groups is not provided at all (vide posted-workers), which additionally correlate with tendency to avoid registration (for different motives) among mobile groups. For that reasons drawing representative samples of mobile persons constitutes a real challenge for researchers and poses even more problems than response behaviour. These problems are relevant for (a) large national surveys that often underrepresent immigrants and (b) specific immigrant oriented surveys that often fail to produce data suitable for sophisticated statistical analysis. In some migrant oriented surveys Respondent Driven Sampling proposed over two decades ago by Douglas Heckathorn constitutes a satisfactory sampling design. However this method works effectively only when population under study is socially networked. Therefore, other more universal solutions are still being searched for.

The aim of the proposed session is to attract contributions that address the methodological challenges in sampling of mobile groups in quantitative studies, especially when an appropriate sample frame is not available.

The session welcomes contributions that address the following topics:

- 1) Assessment of different sampling strategies and designs in migration quantitative research.
- 2) Evaluation of survey data quality, especially in relation to migrant groups’ coverage bias in representative surveys.
- 3) Challenges in international comparative research on migrant groups, particularly related to sampling frames variations across countries.
- 4) Sampling strategies and coverage bias in quantitative web based surveys on migrants.

Presentations of particular quantitative surveys on mobile groups focusing on sampling techniques are also welcome for this session.

1. Respondent Driven Sampling for Immigrant Koreans in the U.S.: Evaluation from the Total Survey Error Perspectives

Professor Sunghee Lee (University of Michigan)
Ms Daayun Chung (University of Michigan)
Ms Jae-Kyung Ahn (University of Michigan)
Ms Wenyi He (University of Michigan)
Professor Michael Elliott (University of Michigan)

2. What matters for recruitment process in RDS migration studies? Analysis of four studies on Ukrainian migrants in Poland.

Dr Agata Górny (Centre of Migration Research, University of Warsaw)
Dr Joanna Napierala (Centre of Migration Research, University of Warsaw)
Dr Zuzanna Brunarska (Centre of Migration Research, University of Warsaw)

3. Surveying the hard-to-reach: An example using Facebook to sample Polish migrants in a cross-national study

Mr Steffen Pöttschke (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)
Professor Michael Braun (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. Squaring the circle: sampling respondent search profiles

Dr Sebastian Rinken (Institute for Advanced Social Studies (IESA), Spanish Research Council (CSIC))

5. The Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-MIDIS II)

Dr Rossalina Latcheva (EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA))

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 107

Recruiting and surveying special populations 2

Chair Dr Anna B. Sandoval Girón (Center for Survey Measurement, U.S. Census Bureau)
Coordinator 1 Dr Susanne Vogl (University of Vienna)

Session Details

In recent years, researchers have shown an increased interest in research in special populations. This growing interest is in part due to difficulties in recruiting and surveying these populations. The difficulty in collecting data has significant negative effects on the quality of data and findings derived from studies. Special populations refer to subgroups of “mainstream” population that are usually difficult to reach and research for different reasons. These reasons may include living and life conditions and socio economic background, or individuals reluctant about being found or contacted. Special populations include but are not limited to children, the elderly, the disabled, ethnic minorities, elites, people with special illnesses, migrants and refugees, the incarcerated, those who don’t speak the dominant language of the community, and people experiencing homelessness.

Compared to interviews in the general adult population, special requirements and precautions might arise with respect to procedures when recruiting respondents and conducting interviews with members of a special population. Choosing an interview method, interview mode, sample design, gaining acceptance and consent, tailoring the instrument, defining the

interview setting, and establishing rapport are just a few of the key aspects to consider when designing an interview and conducting a study with a special population.

In this session, "Recruiting and Surveying Special Populations," we want to stimulate a discussion of methodological reflections and practical experiences from the field as well as of results from field-experimental or laboratory experimental studies on various aspects of the research process when dealing with special populations. We welcome papers from standardized, qualitative and mixed methods approaches with a focus on methodology and substantive applications.

We suggest but do not limit the session to the following aspects:

- Data quality
- Sample frame and coverage issues
- Sampling procedures, problems of accessibility
- Locating, contacting, and recruiting hard-to reach populations
- The role of social media and other electronic communication in recruitment and interviewing
- Unit- and Item-Nonresponse
- Interview modes
- New technologies and techniques in data collection
- Question properties
- Response sets
- Interviewer-Respondent interaction
- Interviewer effect

1. How to Estimate the Prevalence of Honor-Based Violence

Ms Teresa Koenig (Westat)
Miss Mariel Leonard (Univ. of Mannheim)
Dr Cynthia Helba (Westat (retired))
Ms Erin Bauer (Westat)

2. Using a non-probabilistic internet survey to correct for undercoverage and to increase the sample size of a rare subpopulation in a random telephone survey

Mr Stéphane Legleye (INED)
Miss Géraldine Charrance (INED)
Miss Christelle Hamel (INED)

3. Sampling rare youth populations in developing countries in PISA-D

Mr Thomas Krenzke (Westat)
Dr Leyla Mohadjer (Westat)

4. Recruitment of Targeted Populations via Social Media: Examination of Non-probability Based Sampling Approaches

Dr Ipek Bilgen (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Ms Ilana Ventura (NORC at the University of Chicago)
Dr Michael Stern (NORC at the University of Chicago)

5. A comparison of two samples (Facebook and telephone) in a health survey

Mr Patrick Schmich (Robert Koch Institut)
Mr Matthias Wetzstein (Robert Koch Institut)
Mrs Lena Bös (Robert Koch Institut)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: F2 108

Different methods, same results? Comparing the consequences of alternative methods of data collection and analysis 3

Chair Professor Elmar Schlueter (Justus-Liebig-University Giessen)
Coordinator 1 Professor Jochen Mayerl (University of Kaiserslautern)

Session Details

No doubt about it – recent years have seen an ever increasing proliferation of methods for survey data collection and analysis. Think about the growing administration of surveys via the internet and mobile devices, the combination of large-scale surveys with experimental designs, the multiple approaches available to examine data from respondents nested in different levels of analysis or the wider application of Bayesian statistics. Such methodological innovations certainly help to open up important novel avenues for research. However, a central yet somewhat understudied question coupled with the plurality of methods is: To what extent do different strategies of survey data collection and analysis applied to the same research question lead to converging conclusions? Specifically, this session starts from the observation that for most research problems a single appropriate strategy of data collection or analysis does not exist. Instead, researchers typically face alternative defensible methods which may or may not converge in their results. Thus, the aim of this session is to stimulate the debate on the

methodological as well as substantive issues that might arise when applying multiple methods of survey data collection or analysis. Does the application of alternative research designs or statistical methods lead to converging results? Are social science results with different methods replicable? We invite researchers to submit papers discussing the consequences of applying alternative methods of survey data collection or analysis in the following two scenarios:

- A. Same research question, comparing at least two different methods of data collection
- B. Same research question, comparing at least two methods of data analysis

Please send your paper proposals (no more than 500 words in length) to:

JProf. Dr. Jochen Mayerl, jochen.mayerl@sowi.uni-kl.de
Prof. Dr. Elmar Schlüter, elmar.schlueter@sowi.uni-giessen.de

1. In the maze of model specifications in panel regressions. Same data, same question, different specifications, converging conclusions?

Mrs Katharina Loter (Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg)
Professor Oliver Arránz Becker (Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg)

2. Data-driven Prediction of Panel Nonresponse

Mr Christoph Kern (University of Mannheim)

3. Estimating the Causal Effect of Children on Parental Happiness

Dr Gerrit Bauer (LMU Munich)
Dr Thorsten Kneip (Max Planck Institute for Social Law and Social Policy)

4. The Nexus Between Social Background and Educational Inequalities: What can we learn by Comparing Results of Linear and Unconditional Quantile Regression?

Dr Dennis Köthemann (University of Wuppertal)
Mr Sebastian E. Wenz (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

5. Racism and Ageism in Health Care- Comparing results of a survey and experiments

Dr Karina Hoekstra (Institute of Sociology, University of Hanover)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N AUD4

Quality Improvement and Increase of Cost Efficiency in Telephone Surveys for Researchers and Agencies: Metadata and Model based Optimization of Response Rates and Production Rates

Chair Ms Teresa Silvestre (Statistics Portugal)

Session Details

A major focus in telephone surveys is optimizing contact attempts to reach people (i.e. being able to speak) and to achieve positive outcomes (i.e. being able to conduct interviews). This holds true for scientific studies where the major focus is on high response rates but also for commercial market research where production rates are a relevant and cost related measures. Much research has been done on response rates and on non-response related issue. In this session we invite papers that deal with the technical – i.e. not interviewer related - aspects to achieve high contact rates and high response rates in telephone surveys.

We are interested to see techniques applied to optimize call schedules, call sequences, and speaking time for high response rates and high production rates and how these are based on statistical models applied on metadata such as call protocols. With this session we also want to initiate discussion under which conditions and to what level these targets conflict with each other.

1. Validating Mobile Phone Numbers: How Volatile are Results of HLR-Lookup-Procedures?

Mr Matthias Sand (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Mr Tobias Gramlich (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Mr Patrick Schmich (Robert Koch-Institute)

2. Increase efficiency in mobile phone samples using HLR-lookup: results from an experiment for (German) mobile phone numbers

Mr Tobias Gramlich (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)
Mr Matthias Sand (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. Coverage Bias in Mobile Phone Samples - a Comparison with Landline/Dual Frame Samples

Mrs Elena Lupu (Darmstadt University of Technology, Darmstadt (Germany))

Professor Marek Fuchs (Darmstadt University of Technology, Darmstadt (Germany))

4. The use of paradata in telephone interviews to define adaptive case management tools: the case of LFS

Mrs Teresa Silvestre (Statistics Portugal)

Mrs Tania Correia (Statistics Portugal)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: N 101

Matrix design for social surveys

Chair Professor Christof Wolf (GESIS -- Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Professor Dominique Joye (University of Lausanne)

Session Details

General social surveys increasingly face problems of low response rates and increasing cost. In this situation alternatives to the traditional face-to-face mode are gaining interest. For these other modes, e.g. web surveys, the typical length of a general social survey is a challenge. Instead of 60 or more minutes one is probably restricted to 20 minutes. In this situation a matrix design for the questionnaire could be promising solution. In this design the original questionnaire is divided into modules and then only some of these are presented to groups of respondents. As a result we obtain a data matrix with many "holes" or missing data.

We welcome papers that address one or more of the following questions:

How to divide questions into modules? (How many modules? Thematic or random distribution of items? Should a core module be used or not? In how far does the specific mix of modules affect response behavior?)

How to distribute modules over respondents and how to implement this in the field? In particular if mixed mode approach is applied to data collection.

How must the resulting data be prepared to ease analysis? Should missing data be imputed? How can replicability be ensured?

Do we need special methods to analyze the data?

Which problems does a matrix design pose for repeated cross-sectional studies concerning comparability over time? In the same way we can ask about the consequences for cross-national comparability?

1. Reduction of Survey Length through Split Questionnaire Design: Consequences for Nonresponse and Measurement Error

Professor Andy Peytchev (University of Michigan)

Dr Emilia Peytcheva (RTI International)

Professor Trivelloro Raghunathan (University of Michigan)

2. Splitting the questionnaire an alternative to matrix design in social surveys

Miss Evangelia Kartounidou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)

Professor Ioannis Andreadis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)

3. How useful is data fusion when employing matrix designs in surveys? Illustrating potential benefits and limitations using the Austrian and European Social Survey

Mr Dimitri Prandner (Johannes Kepler University of Linz (Austria))

Professor Johann Bacher (Johannes Kepler University of Linz (Austria))

4. Preparing a mobile survey design for official statistics

Mr Peter Lugtig (utrecht university)

Mrs Annemiek Luiten (Statistics Netherlands)

Mrs Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Data quality in non-probabilistic online surveys

Chair Miss Chiara Respi (University of Milano-Bicocca)

Coordinator 1 Dr Emanuela Sala (University of Milano-Bicocca)

Session Details

Non-probabilistic online surveys are being increasingly used in research and policy analysis. The reasons for their recent success are mainly related to the relatively low costs of setting up, maintenance, and data collection associated to the large

sample sizes available for the analysis. However, non-probabilistic online surveys pose a number of issues that mainly concern the generalization of the findings derived from the analysis of survey data. The session fosters discussion on the issues concerning the assessment of the representativeness of non-probabilistic samples and the methods to correct for non response.

1. Effects of sampling procedure on data quality in a web survey

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. Comparing opt-in panels with web surveys based on probability-samples: a consideration of costs and errors

Mr Nicolas Pekari (FORS, Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences)
Dr Oliver Lipps (FORS, Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences)
Professor Caroline Roberts (University of Lausanne)
Professor Georg Lutz (FORS, Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences)

3. Comparing the findings from probability surveys with non-probability online panels in an Australian research context

Mr Darren Pennay (Social Research Centre, Australian National University)
Dr Dina Neiger (Social Research Centre, Australian National University)
Dr Paul Lavrakas (Social Research Centre, Australian National University)

4. Assessing the Representativeness of Nonprobability Online Panels. The Italian Case.

Miss Chiara Respi (University of Milano-Bicocca)
Professor Emanuela Sala (University of Milano-Bicocca)
Mr Angelo Tomaselli (Demetra opinioni.net s.r.l.)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Improving Mobile Web Questionnaires

Chair Mr Arnaud Wijnant (CentERdata)

Session Details

As a growing number of respondents choose to complete Web surveys using their smartphones as opposed to laptops and desktops, there is increasing interest among survey researchers about how to design questionnaires for smartphones.

Some features of mobile Web surveys are shared with conventional Web surveys (e.g., both are self-administered, computerized, and interactive) but other features are distinct. As a result, survey researchers have to consider design principles for conventional Web surveys while taking into account the unique features of mobile Web surveys that have implications for questionnaire design. These include the fact that smartphones have small narrow touchscreens that can reduce the size of response options (or partially hide them from view) and that respondents using smartphones can have fragmented attention because of interference from their outside environment. This session invites presentations that explore this relatively new topic of mobile Web questionnaire design.

We especially welcome presentations with a focus on:

1. approaches to optimizing questionnaires for smartphones; 2. the impact of different question types (text boxes, drop boxes, sliders, spinners) on data quality; 3. adapting grids for smartphones; and 4. grouping questions on the page.

1. How Should We Adapt Questionnaires for Smartphones? Evidence from UK Surveys and an Experiment on Grids

Mr Tim Hanson (Kantar Public)

2. Development of standards and guidelines for mobile survey instruments

Dr Lin Wang (U.S. Census Bureau)
Dr Christopher Antoun (U.S. Census Bureau)
Mr Russell Sanders (U.S. Census Bureau)
Ms Elizabeth Nichols (U.S. Census Bureau)
Ms Erica Olmsted Hawala (U.S. Census Bureau)
Mr Brian Falcone (U.S. Census Bureau)
Ms Ivonne Figueroa (U.S. Census Bureau)

3. The effect of matrix and single questions on the response behavior when switching to a mobile first design

Ms Katharina Burgdorf (University of Mannheim)
Professor Annelies Blom (University of Mannheim)
Dr Christian Bruch (University of Mannheim)
Mr Melvin John (University of Mannheim)
Professor Florian Keusch (University of Mannheim)

4. PC and mobile web surveys: grids or item-by item format?

Mrs Aigul Mavletova (Higher School of Economics)

Mr Daniil Lebedev (Higher School of Economics)

Dr Mick Couper (University of Michigan)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Online probing: Cognitive interviewing techniques in online surveys and online pretesting 3

Chair Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 2 Dr Lars Kaczmirek (GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Session Details

Online probing is a cognitive interviewing technique which can be used in online surveys and is especially useful in cross-cultural research (see Willis 2015 for a research synthesis on cross-cultural cognitive interviewing). The main advantages are: large sample sizes, explanation of response patterns in subpopulations, possible evaluation of prevalence of question problems and themes, higher likelihood of identifying problems during pretesting, and higher anonymity. Online probing is a fully scripted approach and the procedure is highly standardized (Braun et al. 2015; Meitinger & Behr 2016). Automatic on-the-fly analysis and coding of answers during the interview is also possible which can be used to ask automatically issued follow-up questions (for example to detect and reduce item nonresponse, Kaczmirek, Meitinger, Behr, forthcoming).

Online probing has already been applied to reveal diverging or overlapping interpretations and perspectives with regard to a variety of substantive topics, such as gender attitudes (Behr et al. 2013), xenophobia (Braun, Behr, & Kaczmirek 2013), civil disobedience (Behr et al. 2014a), satisfaction with democracy (Behr & Braun 2015), health (Lee et al. forthcoming), and national identity (Meitinger & Behr 2016).

Several methodological studies have addressed the optimal design and implementation of online probing, e.g., on the size of answer boxes (Behr et al. 2014), on sequence effects of multiple probes (Meitinger, Braun, Behr, forthcoming) and on its feasibility for Amazon MTurk (Fowler et al. 2016).

Although online probing has been successfully applied to several substantive and methodological topics, several research gaps remain. For example, due to the large sample size and qualitative nature of the probes, data analysis is rather work-intensive and time-consuming. Also, most of the previous online probing studies focused on Western countries and the majority of studies used the method after official data collection to follow-up on problematic items. Thus, the full potential of the method has not been explored, yet.

For this session, we invite papers on the method of online probing for substantial research and as part of pretests or methods research, and studies that compare online probing with other pretest methods. We especially welcome (1) presentations with a substantive application of online probing and (2) presentations that address some of the methodological challenges and considerations of online probing

1. Measuring attitudes towards Social Justice and Fairness across Europe: Assessing cross-cultural validity of related concepts, items and response scales

Dr Michael Weinhardt (Bielefeld University)

Mrs Jule Adriaans (Bielefeld University)

2. "Individual solutions" for the division of labor between men and women

Professor Michael Braun (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Dorothee Behr (GESIS - Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

3. Detecting and explaining Inequivalence: the case of patriotic feelings

Professor Peter Schmidt (University of Giessen and Humboldt Research Fellow Cardinal Wyscinski University Warsaw)

Dr Katharina Meitinger (GESIS Mannheim)

Professor Michael Braun (GESIS Mannheim)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q4 ANF1

Assessing Sleep, Diet and Physical Activity in Survey Research: Measurement Methods and Potential Issues

Chair Ms Heidi Guyer (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)

Session Details

The impact of the duration and quality of sleep on health, cognition, employment and many other facets of life is gaining recognition. Lack of sleep, poor quality sleep and excessive sleep have been linked to various conditions including obesity, cardiovascular disease, an increase in missed days of work, decreased memory and many other conditions affecting quality of life. Sleep measurements of importance include sleep duration, sleep efficiency and quality of sleep, each of which can impact quality of life as well as have direct effects in many important facets of life. Both short and long sleep duration are related to poor health. Sleep efficiency is a measurement of the proportion of time spent actually sleeping compared to the amount of time spent with the intention of sleeping. Sleep quality is a subjective measure of sleep which has only recently been identified as a potential risk factor. While sleep studies requiring overnight clinical monitoring, polysomnography, are considered the gold standard, measurement techniques in population based research have increased in recent years. Non-invasive measurement techniques range from self-reported sleep and wake times on average or at one point in time (the day prior to the survey for example), time diaries of specific periods of time, inclusion of nap times as well as sleep and wake times and the use of actigraphy and other wearable devices. Panelists will be invited to present on operational considerations related to sleep measurement in population-based survey research. Operational issues such as interviewer and respondent training and instructions, the number of days of measurement, methods for providing and collecting wearable devices, and data transfer from wearable devices will be discussed. Panelists will be invited to discuss measurement issues related to the various data collection methods including paper, web and interviewer-administered surveys as well as wearable devices. Additionally, panelists will be invited to present the results of population-based validation studies of sleep measurement, including duration and efficiency, via wearable devices.

1. Using wearable devices to assess the validity of diary and stylized sleep measures

Dr Robin Kaplan (Bureau of Labor Statistics)
Dr Brandon Kopp (Bureau of Labor Statistics)
Dr Polly Phipps (Bureau of Labor Statistics)

2. What They Say and What They Do: Comparing Physical Activity across U.S., England, and the Netherlands

Dr Arie Kapteyn (Center for Economic and Social Research, University of Southern California)
Dr Htay Wah Saw (Center for Economic and Social Research, University of Southern California)

3. A Sociological Observational Study on Nutrition in Italians Children and Their Parents

Professor Alessandra Decataldo (University of Milano Bicocca)
Professor Carla Facchini (University of Milano Bicocca)
Dr Brunella Fiore (Eureka Research)

4. Assessing Sleep and Wake Times in a Complex Survey: Mobile versus Interviewer-Administered

Ms Heidi Guyer (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)
Ms Esther Ullman (Survey Research Center, University of Michigan)

5. Developing short questionnaires to assess diet quality in population studies: from the under 5's to the over 60's

Professor Sian Robinson (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)
Dr Sarah Crozier (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)
Professor Hazel Inskip (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)
Dr Megan Jarman (University of Alberta)
Professor Elaine Dennison (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)
Professor Keith Godfrey (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)
Professor Cyrus Cooper (MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton)

Thursday 20th July, 16:00 - 17:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Occupation coding 3

Chair Professor Matthias Schonlau (University of Waterloo)
Coordinator 1 Mr Malte Schierholz (IAB)

Session Details

Occupation coding refers to coding a respondent's text answer (or the interviewer's transcription of the text answer) about the respondent's job into one of many hundreds of occupation codes. We welcome any papers on this topic, including, but not limited to:

- measurement of occupations (e.g., mode, question design, ...)
- handling of different occupational classifications (e.g., ISCO and national classifications)
- problems of coding (e.g., costs, data quality, ...)
- techniques for coding (e.g., automatic coding, computer-assisted coding, manual coding, interview coding)
- computer algorithms for coding (e.g., machine learning, rule-based, ...)
- cross-national and longitudinal issues

- Measurement of derived variables (e.g., ISEI, ESeC, SIOPS, job-exposure matrices, ...)
- other methodological aspects related to occupation coding

1. German classification of occupations and occupational fields: A suitable way to smooth breaks between KldB88/92 and KldB2010?

Dr Michael Tiemann (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)
Mr Tobias Maier (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

2. Job Activity Descriptions and an Auxiliary Classification for Simultaneous Coding into two Official Classifications

Mr Malte Schierholz (Institute for Employment Research)

3. Occupational classifications in Germany. Same same but different?

Dr Florian G. Hartmann (Universität der Bundeswehr München (University of the federal armed forces Munich))

4. Structured Derivation of Variables from Occupational Classifications with Stata

Mr Daniel Bela (LifBi)
Mr Knut Wenzig (DIW/SOEP)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 102

Quantitative Spatial Analysis of Micro and Macro Data: Methodological Challenges and Solutions 1

Chair Professor Henning Best (TU Kaiserslautern)
Coordinator 1 Professor Corinna Kleinert (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)
Coordinator 2 Mr Tobias Ruettenauer (TU Kaiserslautern)
Coordinator 3 Dr Michaela Sixt (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

The session intends to bring together methodological experiences made when working with spatial data in quantitative empirical social research. On the one hand, spatial data offers the opportunity to investigate the relationship between regional characteristics on the macro level. On the other hand, spatial data can be used to enrich survey data with structural information on a certain regional level, either to control for context effects or to explicitly analyse these effects and their interplay with mechanisms on the individual level. By using GIS, addresses of survey participants can be linked with objective measures of their neighbourhood (e.g. pollution data) or proximity to institutions (e.g. of educational institutions or workplaces). Thus, these data allow investigating the relevance of infrastructure distances for social action as well as processes of spatial spillovers and diffusion.

In doing so, several methodological questions arise: What kind of regional level is adequate to what kind of question ("MAUP")? And how can we handle social action at borders of administrative units? To derive closer estimates of real individual distances and potential spaces of action a possible solution could be to weight the importance of neighbouring regions by information on actual traveling times with different means of transport. What are the challenges and limitations of these approaches and how can it be done reliably?

Furthermore, innovative statistical methods are necessary to adequately analyse spatial data. Various regression models (e.g. SAR, SARAR, SLX, Durbin and others) address the spatial dependence in different ways and offer alternative approaches to identify different types of spatial spillovers or spatial interdependences, in cross-sectional and longitudinal data. Which types of models are adequate for which type of questions? Which models can be used to simultaneously analyse individual and aggregate data?

In sum, in this session we are especially interested in methodological and applied studies dealing with topics of:

1. Choice of adequate regional level and handling of borders when using administrative data
2. Connection of individual data and spatially aggregate as well as infrastructural data
3. Spatial analysis of time-series and cross-sectional data
4. Modelling spatial relationships (e.g. commuting flows, distances, traveling times, social interactions)
5. Modelling spatial interaction, spillover or diffusion processes
6. Further challenges and solutions when using georeferenced data

1. Local social contexts and educational aspirations: spatial references and group-specific spatial effects of academic composition.

Mr Andreas Hartung (University of Tuebingen)
Professor Steffen Hillmert (University of Tuebingen)

2. Ethnic Diversity, Institutional Capacity, and Social Cohesion in European Cities

Dr Conrad Ziller (University of Cologne)

Professor Hans-Jürgen Andreß (University of Cologne)

3. The Halo Effect: Are people who live in homogenous neighborhoods that border ethnically diverse neighborhoods (or are even encircled by them) more xenophobic?

Professor Merlin Schaeffer (University of Cologne)

Mrs Julia Klinger (University of Cologne)

Mr Stefan Mueller (Gesis - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

4. The Causes of Environmental Inequality: Evidence from Spatial Time-Series Analysis in Germany

Mr Tobias Rüttenauer (TU Kaiserslautern)

Professor Henning Best (TU Kaiserslautern)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 103

Matching, weighting and related techniques for the estimation of causal effects

Chair Dr Bruno Arpino (Pompeu Fabra University)

Session Details

This session will start at 9.45.

Propensity score matching (PSM) has become a popular technique in several fields as it has been proven to be more robust than standard parametric regression models for the estimation of causal effects. Related techniques such as weighting and stratification on the propensity score have also been widely used. Combinations of these techniques are also possible. Moreover, it has been shown that estimators that combine propensity score based methods and regression adjustment are “doubly robust”. Matching algorithms alternative to PSM are also available to the investigators (coarsened exact matching, entropy matching, etc).

Despite the flourishing methodological and applied research on the abovementioned techniques, a lot of methodological work still needs to be done to identify optimal ways of specifying the propensity score model, analyzing covariates balance, treat missing data and measurement error, etc. Moreover, given all the different available techniques, methodological works are needed to clarify what method should be preferred and under what circumstances.

The panel will focus on recent developments in propensity score methods and alternative techniques that address one or more of the previous issues. Submissions regarding innovative use of these methods in applied works are also welcome.

1. Propensity-score matching as a tool for monitoring the comparability of examination standards in England

Mr Nadir Zanini (Ofqual)

2. Better together? Comparing and Combining Coarsened Exact Matching and Propensity Score Matching

Dr Massimo Cannas (University of Cagliari)

Professor Bruno Arpino (Pompeu Fabra University)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 105

Measuring the change (or the lack of) of political attitudes 1

Chair Dr Roula Nezi (GESIS-Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Dr Theofanis Exadaktylos (University of Surrey)

Session Details

Since the onset of the financial crisis in Europe in 2008 a series of tumultuous events have unfolded across Europe. The European Union is confronted with a series of social and political challenges that affect European citizens across all member states, such as the rise of austerity as a result of the economic crisis, the migration influx from inside and outside the European Union, terrorism and security threats, as well as the rise of new political forces questioning the future of European Integration. This chain of events has not only challenged the political elites of the European Union and its member states but it has also affected citizens' political attitudes.

The purpose of this panel is the understanding of the stability or change of citizens' behaviour as an essential element in

political science and comparative politics, especially within the context of turbulence in Europe. The panel incorporates ideas linked to the wider topics of the rise of populism, the questioning of established democratic values, norms and institutions by European citizens, and the rise of support for extreme and radical voices within mainstream politics.

This panel accepts papers that use survey based research including survey experiments and experimental designs to gauge short or long term changes of political attitudes, including but not limited to:

- Attitudes towards democracy
- Political preferences including party choice
- Perceptions of authoritarian personalities, and
- Support for populist or anti-systemic parties and political formations.

The focus of the panel is not the case(s) selected but rather the application of the method and its connection to rigorous empirical analysis.

1. Ethnic parties, ethnic tensions? Results of an original survey panel study in Romania

Dr Anaid Flesken (University of Bristol)

2. Can Individual's Perceived Notion on State Provide an Explanation on Institutional Trust?

Mr Baniamin Hasan Muhammad (University of Bergen, Norway)

3. How do External Events Affect Natives' Acceptance of Different Immigrant Subgroups? Evidence from a Two-wave Factorial Survey Experiment

Mr Christian Czymara (Cologne Graduate School, University of Cologne)

Dr Alexander Schmidt-Catran (Institute of Sociology and Social Psychology, University of Cologne)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 106

Surveying non-native speakers of the survey language(s): Representation, coverage, data quality

Chair Dr Michael Ochsner (FORS Lausanne)

Coordinator 1 Dr Oliver Lipps (FORS Lausanne)

Session Details

Since some decades, Western countries have faced significant immigration. As a consequence, the population in these countries has become more and more heterogeneous. This poses a number of challenges to survey designers. On the one hand, ethno-national minorities are less likely to be represented in their proper proportion in general population surveys (Deding et al., 2008; Feskens et al., 2006; Myrberg, 2013). This underrepresentation can have a number of reasons, e.g., foreigners and especially those from a more distant culture may be less frequently present in sampling frames and harder to contact (Lipps et al. 2013, Lipps, 2016) cooperate less (Lipps, 2016), or cannot participate because of language problems (Lee et al., 2008; Laganà et al., 2013). On the other hand, some foreigners that do participate might not master the survey language well enough to answer the questions in the intended way, thus introducing measurement error and bias and deteriorating data quality. While there is a broad range of literature on translation and equivalence issues between countries, knowledge on language issues within countries is scarce. There is also a lack of methods to tackle representation issues concerning minorities. A similar situation prevails regarding measurement bias: there is a wide literature on methods for ex-post evaluation (and correction) of bias. Even though it would be wiser to reduce bias before fieldwork, knowledge on the effect of insufficient mastery of survey language and ways to solve it is missing. Therefore, we suggest a session on issues arising when surveying non-native speakers of the survey language(s).

This session will be dedicated to data quality issues stemming from respondents who are not native speakers of the survey language. As language issues can lead to representation bias as well as data quality issues, we welcome papers which present methods to analyse and/or improve representation of non-native speakers of the survey language(s) by adding or removing survey language(s) as well as papers that suggest methods or tools to analyse and/or improve the data quality of non-native speakers of the survey language(s). We especially seek for papers which analyse effects from changes in the design of repeated cross-sectional or panel surveys, by e.g. introducing or dropping survey languages

1. Who can be added in which survey domain by offering which additional language(s) for which survey topics in easy and complex surveys?

Dr Oliver Lipps (FORS)

Dr Michael Ochsner (FORS)

2. How many survey languages? Two examples for adding or reducing survey languages to illustrate effects on representations bias

Dr Michael Ochsner (FORS, Lausanne and ETH Zürich, Switzerland)

3. Language as a determinant for participation rates in Finnish health examination surveys

Dr Hanna Tolonen (National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL), Helsinki, Finland)
Dr Päivikki Kopnen (National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL), Helsinki, Finland)
Dr Katja Borodulin (National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL), Helsinki, Finland)
Dr Satu Männistö (National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL), Helsinki, Finland)
Professor Markku Peltonen (National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL), Helsinki, Finland)
Professor Erkki Vartiainen (National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL), Helsinki, Finland)

4. Multiple Strategies for Reaching out to Spanish-speaking respondents in an IRS Household Survey.

Ms Jennifer McNulty (Westat)
Dr Jocelyn Newsome (Westat)
Dr Kerry Levin (kerrylevin@westat.com)
Ms Brenda Schafer (IRS)
Mr Pat Langetieg (IRS)
Dr Saurabh Datta (IRS)

5. Language proficiency among respondents and implications for data quality in a face-to-face longitudinal survey

Mr Alexander Wenz (University of Essex)
Dr Tarek Al Baghal (University of Essex)
Dr Alessandra Gaia (University of Essex)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 107

Surveying elderly and people with age-associated cognitive impairment - barriers, challenges and opportunities

Chair Mr Patrick Kutschar (Institute of Nursing Science, Paracelsus Medical University)
Coordinator 1 Professor Martin Weichbold (University of Salzburg)

Session Details

Taking a survey basically assumes respondents to be able to understand the questions and to be aware of their answers. But what if these assumptions have to be doubted? In this session we want to discuss the challenges of surveying old people with or without cognitive impairments. Ageing is not causally linked but often accompanied by multifaceted changes and declines in cognitive functions. Against this background, we want to ask for the consequences and specificities which should be taken into account when dealing with such special populations in survey research.

Methodological research on the quality of data obtained by standardized surveys in such vulnerable, multi-morbid older populations especially with restrictions in cognitive function is rather scarce. Implementing fixed age-limits as it is common in some general population survey programmes and national traditions seems not to be an appropriate solution, especially in times of societal ageing. On the contrary, the demand for information about these people is rapidly growing and standardized surveys are applied in gerontological, medical, health care, or social science studies, for instance to examine quality of life or to evaluate satisfaction with perceived care services.

We encourage researchers to share their experiences and suggestions for surveying cognitively impaired and/or old people. Presentations should cover - not exclusively, but predominantly - the following topics:

- Special sampling strategies for these population groups
- Screening instruments or strategies to measure cognitive impairment and to determine the ability to survey participation
- Experiences with the implementation of thresholds in terms of cognitive impairment to obtain valid and reliable data
- Findings about data quality in surveys with elderly people or people with restrictions in cognitive functions
- Experiences with the linkage of additional measures (e.g. biomarkers, proxy interviewing or non-reactive process-produced data) to the primary survey data
- Alternative (quantitative) data collection strategies apart from the strict standardized approach

1. Balanced sampling to survey elderly people living in healthcare institutions

Mr Laurent Costa (INSEE)
Mr Xavier Besnard (SSM Santé - DREES)

2. "We do not want to lose you"! Panel attrition in a longitudinal study of older people in Italy

Dr Emanuela Sala (Dipartimento di Sociologia e ricerca sociale)
Dr Daniele Zaccaria (Fondazione Golgi Cenci)

3. Factorial Survey among Older Respondents: Age-associated Consistency Effects in Vignette Judgements

Dr Christiane Gross (Institute of Sociology, Leibniz University Hannover, Germany)
Dr Andrea Teti (Epidemiology and Health Monitoring, Robert Koch Institute, Berlin, Germany)

4. Combining negative and positive items in scales for older respondents: a split-ballot experiment on data quality

Dr Wander van der Vaart (University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht)
Dr Tina Glasner (University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, Netherlands)

5. Question and response order effects in a survey of nursing home residents with different grades of cognitive decline

Mr Patrick Kutschar (Institute of Nursing Science and Practice, Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: F2 108

Mixing modes and mode effects

Chair Professor Caroline Bayart (University Lyon 1)
Coordinator 1 Professor Patrick Bonnel (ENTPE - University Lyon 2)

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 a second (or more) media and let people chose the appropriate mode and moment to answer. The potential of new and interactive media (web, smartphones...) seems to be high to collect data. But these solutions also 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 remains an issue (penetration rate, technical feasibility...). 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 aims of the session will be to discuss the potential of new technologies for mixed modes framework, to characterize bias generated by mixed modes surveys and to give some perspectives for reduce these bias.

1. A method controlling and correcting for measurement mode-effect to aggregate samples in mix-mode surveys

Mr Stéphane Legleye (INSEE-DMCSI)
Mr Gaël de Peretti (INSEE-DMCSI)
Mr Tiarray Razafindranovona (INSEE-DMCSI)

2. Measuring cognition in a multi-mode context: Comparability and challenges in administering complex measures on the web

Ms Colleen McClain (University of Michigan)
Dr Mary Beth Ofstedal (University of Michigan)
Dr Mick P. Couper (University of Michigan)

3. Adult Education Survey in the mixed mode design

Ms Eva Belak (Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia)
Mrs Marta Arnež (Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia)
Professor Vasja Vehovar (Faculty of Social Sciences)

4. Mixed-modes transport survey: a French case study

Dr Caroline Bayart (University Lyon 1)
Professor Patrick Bonnel (ENTPE - University Lyon 2)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N AUD4

Unanticipated Effects of Drive to Increase Response Rates

Chair Dr Stephanie Eckman (RTI International)

Session Details

Many survey data analysts believe that high response rates are a signal for high data quality, despite much published research showing that the two are (at best) unrelated. Researchers and even journals continue to demand high response rates. In this session, we wish to explore the unintended effects of the push to increase response rates. For example, the pressure to keep response rates high might lead to:

- * interviewer falsification
- * increase in measurement error
- * decrease in coverage rate

These are just examples. We are open to any paper that highlights the unintended negative (or positive) effects that the push for high response rates has on survey data quality.

1. Chasing the reluctant respondents: Experience from the European Social Survey

Professor Zbigniew Sawiński (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)

2. E-mail reminders and data-quality in a two-stage household survey

Dr Johannes Eggs (infias)

Mrs Dana Gruschwitz (infias)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N AUD5

The teaching and learning survey research methods: developing pedagogy

Chair Ms Debbie Collins (University of Southampton)

Coordinator 1 Dr Sarah Lewthwaite (University of Southampton)

Coordinator 2 Professor Melanie Nind (University of Southampton)

Session Details

The teaching and learning of social research methods (SRM) plays an important role in developing capacity and ensuring that social scientists continue to possess the knowledge, skills and expertise to explore and address complex issues. Yet SRM teaching and learning is challenging: the subject matter is often difficult and students have to learn to engage in sophisticated decision-making, such as being able to weigh up the pros and cons of particular methods, techniques and designs (Kilburn et al, 2014). Teaching and learning can take place in different settings but is generally facilitated by more experienced research practitioners who pass on knowledge, share skills and induct team members in the usage of different survey research methods. Yet this training and capacity building is frequently a taken-for-granted element, receiving scant attention or left to trial and error (Earley, 2014). The aim of this session is to, as Garner et al (2009) propose, promote and develop a pedagogic culture in which 'the exchange of ideas' can take place, to deepen understanding of methods teaching and learning.

We welcome papers from those engaged in the teaching and learning of social research methods or in pedagogic research on its teaching and learning. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to the following.

- Principles and approaches that guide and inform your teaching and learning of research methods, and the strategies and tasks that you use
- Effectiveness and value of different tasks and strategies in facilitating SRM teaching and learning
- Demonstrating ways in which digital technology can support and or enhance SRM teaching and learning
- Whether MOOCs or other online SRM courses require a different pedagogical approach and if so what this looks like

References

Earley, M. (2014). A synthesis of the literature on research methods education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19, 242–253.

Garner, M., Wagner, C. and Kawulich, B. eds., (2009). *Teaching research methods in the social sciences*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd. P2.

Kilburn, D., Nind, M., & Wiles, R. (2014). Learning as researchers and teachers: The development of a pedagogical culture for social science research methods? *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 62, 191–207.

1. Teaching Surveys Methods: Classroom Experiences Among University Instructors

Dr Wojciech Jablonski (Utrecht University & University of Lodz)

2. Pedagogical Challenges in Training Survey Methodologists

Professor Frederick Conrad (University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research)

3. A frameworks approach to teaching survey research methods

Mr Ray Poynter (The Future Place)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: N 101

Ethics in research

Chair Dr Margarida Piteira (ISEG/SOCIUS)

Session Details

1. Do No Harm: challenges in research design of refugees studies

Ms Tatiana Morais (Phd Candidate at FDUNL and Researcher at CEDIS)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Representing the population: Improving European sampling practices 1

Chair Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (SHARE – Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)

Coordinator 1 Mrs Johanna Bristle (SHARE – Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)

Coordinator 2 Dr Stefan Zins (ESS-GESIS)

Session Details

Obtaining good probability samples is a key challenge for European cross-national studies in order to represent the population. Four large cross-national surveys: the European Social Survey (ESS), the Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe (SHARE), the Gender and Generations Program (GGP) and the European Values Study (EVS) have put their efforts together to improve and harmonize the sampling practices in their studies. This is done within the consortium “Synergies for Europe’s research infrastructures in the social sciences” (SERISS). The session aims to make the results of this effort available to other survey practitioners and exchange experiences with them. It is subdivided into three themes:

1. Mapping the use of population registers as sampling frames in Europe

The availability of central population registers that can be used as sampling frames varies a lot across countries, as do the regulations about who can or can’t access the registers and what information can be obtained from them. We welcome presentations addressing the problem of obtaining good quality probability samples of the European population or national populations, the quality of alternative methods of sampling such as random route procedures, or other experiences with the use of other registers as sampling frames.

2. Including special subpopulations in surveys of the European population

The SERISS working group addresses the issue of the representation of the institutionalized population in European surveys. We invite papers addressing this topic but also papers describing sampling practices and fieldwork measures for other specific subpopulations such as refugees.

3. Using administrative data to correct nonresponse bias

Many population registers used for sampling carry additional information, such as age, gender and household composition of the registered person. Moreover, surveys can use small-area contextual data on characteristics such as neighbourhood population density, crime rates or poverty to enrich their response data. We invite researchers to submit papers which make use of administrative, contextual or other auxiliary data in Europe for the analysis of nonresponse bias or for nonresponse adjustments.

Depending on the number of submitted abstracts we might split up the session into three parts.

1. Population registers in European countries: a literature review

Miss Angelica Maineri (Tilburg University)

Miss Ilziya Mindarova (Higher School of Economics (Moscow))

Mr Ruud Luijkx (Tilburg University)

2. The use of sampling frames in European studies

Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (Chair for Economics of Aging, Technical University of Munich)

Mrs Angelica Maineri (Tilburg University)

Ms Johanna Bristle (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging (MEA))

Mrs Senta-Melissa Pflüger (Munich Center for the Economics of Aging (MEA))

3. Income data linkage in the context of the Swiss federal elections. What can be learnt?

Professor Boris Wernli (FORS)

Mr Nicolas Pekari (FORS)

Professor Georg Lutz (FORS)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Mixed-Device Surveys and Device Preference

Chair Dr Marieke Haan (Utrecht University)

Coordinator 1 Dr Peter Lugtig (Utrecht University)

Coordinator 2 Dr Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)

Coordinator 3 Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)

Coordinator 4 Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)

Coordinator 5 Mr Tim Hanson (TNS BMRB)

Session Details

We live in a digital age with widespread use of technologies in everyday life. Technologies change very rapidly and affect all aspects of life, including surveys and their designs. Online data collection is now common in many countries. Online surveys are not only completed on PCs/Laptops but also on other devices such as tablets and smartphones (i.e., mobile devices). In this session we would like to address questions related to online device use and device preference for completing surveys.

Surveys can be completed with one or even multiple devices. For example, in a panel surveys there can be device combinations between waves but also within waves. Studies focusing on traditional mixed-mode surveys have shown that there are mode preferences and that age, frequency of internet use, number of times of participating in a survey, and education are consistent predictors for mode preference. The possibility of using multiple devices for an online questionnaire makes us wonder whether there is a device preference in mixed-device online survey context too. Recent studies have shown that there are specific respondents who are more inclined to use certain devices. Knowing more about a respondent's actual device preference may be helpful with regards to future survey participation of that specific respondent. Survey practice can perhaps cater to the device preference of survey respondents using adaptive or responsive designs. This session welcomes submissions of papers on different aspects of mixed-device online surveys in both cross-sectional and longitudinal contexts. Topics may include but are not restricted to the following areas:

- Coverage issues in mixed-device online surveys
- Data quality issues in mixed-device online surveys, including item and unit nonresponse, breakoffs and completion times
- Optimisation of surveys and adaptation of question design for online surveys
- Impact of different questions' designs or presentations on response across devices
- Comparison of different types of mobile devices, different operating systems and screen sizes
- Use of different devices over time in panel studies
- Device preference

We encourage papers from researchers with a variety of backgrounds and across different sectors, including academia, national statistics and research agencies. We particularly welcome contributions that use experimental designs, and/or other designs that can inform future strategies towards mixed-device surveys.

1. The mobile Web only population – socio-demographic characteristics and potential bias

Mrs Anke Metzler (Darmstadt University of Technology)

Mr Marek Fuchs (Darmstadt University of Technology)

2. Device use and effects of screen size on data quality in a cross-sectional probability-based online survey in Spain

Ms Sara Pasadas del Amo (Institute for Advanced Social Studies. Spanish National Research Council (IESA/CSIC))

Mr Juan Antonio Domínguez Álvarez (Institute for Advanced Social Studies. Spanish National Research Council (IESA/CSIC))

Ms Mónica Mendez Lago (Center for Sociological Research (CIS))

Mr Manuel Trujillo Carmona (Institute for Advanced Social Studies. Spanish National Research Council (IESA/CSIC))

3. What do we know about mixed-device online surveys and mobile device use in the UK?

Dr Olga Maslovskaya (University of Southampton)

Professor Gabriele Durrant (University of Southampton)
Professor Peter Smith (University of Southampton)

4. A Model for Device Use in Online Panel Surveys

Dr Marieke Haan (Utrecht University)
Dr Peter Lugtig (Utrecht University)
Dr Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)

5. Does mobile web survey completion affect response quality amongst young people? Evidence from the second Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE2)

Mrs Emily Bell (Kantar Public)
Mr Peter Matthews (Kantar Public)
Mr Alexander Wenz (University of Essex)
Mr Tim Hanson (Kantar Public)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Benefits and Challenges of Open-ended Questions 1

Chair Dr Evi Scholz (GESIS)
Coordinator 1 Mrs Cornelia Zuell (GESIS)

Session Details

Open-ended questions in surveys often support getting insights into respondents' understanding of concepts, ideas, or issues. The efforts to prepare, code and analyse data of open-ended questions in contrast to closed questions are considerable. Thus, open-ended questions in general population surveys are not as popular as closed questions. While for closed survey questions much methodological research has been conducted, open-ended questions are, in terms of methodology, rarely covered.

However, the increasing number of access panel web surveys offer the chance of more intensive use of open-ended survey questions and more investigation of related methodological aspects.

Recent research on open-ended questions examines, e.g., mode effects or the length of answers as quality indicator for responses. Other research deals with reasons for non-response. The quality of answers to open-ended questions is one source of survey error that, if based on factors other than randomness, will result in biased answers and put the validity of the data into question – often disregarded in substantive analyses and thus challenging its value.

The proposed session aims to help filling that gap. We welcome papers on open-ended questions referring to

- a. Use of open-ended questions,
- b. Typology of open-ended questions,
- c. Mode effects,
- d. Design and design effects, e.g., question order or position in a questionnaire,
- e. Coding techniques and their challenges,
- f. Response behaviour,
- g. Effects of response and non-response,
- h. Bias analyses,
- i. Comparison of software for textual data analysis,
- j. Analyses techniques,
- k. Any other topic that addresses quality or assesses the value of open-ended questions and their answers.

We also welcome papers that investigate other methodological aspects, e.g., comparative aspects (general population surveys vs. special sample surveys; response behaviour regarding open-ended vs. closed questions for the same topic; or cross-cultural differences in response behaviour to open-ended questions).

1. Construct Equivalence of Left-right Scale Placement in a Cross-national Perspective

Mrs Cornelia Zuell (GESIS)
Dr Evi Scholz (GESIS)

2. The challenges of measuring informal care among children and young people

Dr Martina McKnight (Queen's University Belfast)
Dr Grace Kelly (Queen's University Belfast)
Dr Dirk Schubotz (Queen's University Belfast)

3. Evaluating mode effects in answers to sensitive open-ended questions

Mrs Rosa Sanchez Tome (University of Lausanne)
Professor Caroline Roberts (University of Lausanne)
Professor Dominique Joye (University of Lausanne)

4. Open-ended questions - benefit or burden

Dr Marika Wenemark (PhD)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Testing the Behavioral Validity of Survey Experiments

Chair Dr Knut Petzold (Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt)

Coordinator 1 Mr Volker Lang (Bielefeld University)

Session Details

Many survey experiments, such as factorial surveys, conjoint analyses or choice experiments are designed to measure behavioral intentions. However, there is an ongoing discussion how well intentions measured by such experiments predict actual behavior. Especially, it remains an important open research questions how and to what extent the levels and determinants of behavioral intentions and choices made in actual decision situations are related.

Even given high quality measurements of intentions by survey experiments testing the behavioral validity of these intentions is challenging. First, actual behavioral alternatives are restricted by non-experimental set environmental conditions. Hence, the relevance of intentions for behavioral outcomes might substantially depend on the situational context. Second, related survey data is often prone to unobserved heterogeneity. Finally, it is often a practical challenge to collect data on intentions and comparable actual behavior of the same sample of participants.

This session addresses issues linked to cross-validating experimentally measured intentions in surveys with corresponding behavioral data. Welcome are all contributions discussing theoretical models, empirical designs, analytic strategies and exemplary applications aiming to overcome related problems. In particular we invite papers dealing with at least one of the following questions:

- Which theoretical models are useful to specify the relationship between intentions and actual behavior in a general and empirical testable fashion?
- Which empirical designs can help to test the behavioral validity of intentions?
- Which data sources can serve as behavioral benchmark for validating intentions?
- What are the advantages and limitations of a validation strategy using declared behavior in surveys?
- What are the advantages and limitations of a validation strategy using observed behavior in laboratory or field experiments?
- What are the advantages and limitations of a validation strategy using observed behavior in natural situations?
- Which validation strategies are appropriate in which circumstances?
- In which situations and under which conditions is it appropriate to measure behavioral intentions using survey experiments?

1. Validating behavioral intentions from survey experiments in the field. A comparison of supposed and realized everyday life discrimination

Dr Knut Petzold (Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt)

Professor Tobias Wolbring (University of Mannheim)

2. Behavioral intentions, actual behavior and the role of personality traits

Dr Katrin Drasch (Friedrich-Alexander-University of Erlangen-Nuremberg and Institute for Employment Research (IAB))

3. Normative attitudes, beliefs and behavior: The new NS6 scale measuring social norms and a comparison with the social value orientation slider measure.

Dr Fabian Winter (Max-Planck-Institute for Research on Collective Goods)

Professor Heiko Rauhut (Universität Zürich, Institut für Soziologie)

Dr Marc Höglinger (Universität Bern, Institut für Soziologie)

Dr Jürgen Fleiss (Universität Graz)

4. Cross-validating survey experiments on justice principles with data from the lab

Ms Sandra Gilgen (University of Bern)

Friday 21st July, 09:00 - 10:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Occupations and survey research: methodological and substantive applications on the occupation-inequality link 1

Chair Dr Daniela Rohrbach-Schmidt (German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

Coordinator 1 Professor Christian Ebner (University of Cologne)

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). Following the “microclass” approach (e.g. Weeden/Grusky 2005, 2012), occupations can be viewed as status categories per se, being comprised of individuals that are similar to each other with regards to attitudes, behaviour and several inequality dimensions such as income, job stability or work strains. This view is also interesting from a methodological view, as it understands occupations as a contextual unit, in which individuals are nested, socialized and rewarded.

Following this approach and taking up the session’s success at the last ESRA conference on 'occupations as social contexts', our interest again is on occupations as a higher-level unit of analysis in multi-level designs. The session is a good opportunity to reflect on:

- 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 social stratification and labor market inequalities. In particular, we are interested in the following topics: the individuals’ access to occupations, outcomes at the occupational level (income, job stability, and occupational health), intra- and intergenerational occupational mobility, comparisons over time (e.g. changing occupational wage structures) as well as comparison across countries. Substantive papers should also address underlying mechanisms, which lead to occupational outcomes and differences, such as social closure (ibid.), technological change (Autor et al. 2003) and institutions in a broader sense.

References:

- Autor, David H.; Levy, Frank; Murnane, Richard J. 2003. The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change: An Empirical Exploration. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118(4): 1279–1333.
- Weeden, Kim A.; Grusky, David B. 2005. The Case for a New Class Map. *American Journal of Sociology* 111(1): 141-212.
- Weeden, Kim A.; Grusky, David B. 2012. The three worlds of inequality. *American Journal of Sociology* 117:1723-1785

1. Decisive at labor market entry – and beyond? The role of occupational characteristics for labor market chances after apprenticeship training in Germany

Mrs Laura Menze (WZB Berlin Social Science Center)

2. Precarity of job entry histories of graduates of different training occupations

Mr Ralf Dorau (Bundesinstitut für Berufsbildung)

3. Skill Mismatch after labour market entry: Do institutional characteristics of VET programs matter?

Ms Miriam Grønning (Swiss Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

Dr Irene Kriesi (Swiss Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

4. Sheltered Labor Markets

Dr Stefan Stuth (Berlin Social Science Center)

5. Varying returns to education between occupations? An over-time analysis for Germany

Dr Daniela Rohrbach-Schmidt (German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB))

Dr Holger Alda (German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB))

Mrs Anett Friedrich (German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB))

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 102

Quantitative Spatial Analysis of Micro and Macro Data: Methodological Challenges and Solutions 2

Chair Professor Henning Best (TU Kaiserslautern)

Coordinator 1 Professor Corinna Kleinert (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Coordinator 2 Mr Tobias Ruettenauer (TU Kaiserslautern)

Coordinator 3 Dr Michaela Sixt (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

The session intends to bring together methodological experiences made when working with spatial data in quantitative empirical social research. On the one hand, spatial data offers the opportunity to investigate the relationship between regional characteristics on the macro level. On the other hand, spatial data can be used to enrich survey data with structural information

on a certain regional level, either to control for context effects or to explicitly analyse these effects and their interplay with mechanisms on the individual level. By using GIS, addresses of survey participants can be linked with objective measures of their neighbourhood (e.g. pollution data) or proximity to institutions (e.g. of educational institutions or workplaces). Thus, these data allow investigating the relevance of infrastructure distances for social action as well as processes of spatial spillovers and diffusion.

In doing so, several methodological questions arise: What kind of regional level is adequate to what kind of question ("MAUP")? And how can we handle social action at borders of administrative units? To derive closer estimates of real individual distances and potential spaces of action a possible solution could be to weight the importance of neighbouring regions by information on actual traveling times with different means of transport. What are the challenges and limitations of these approaches and how can it be done reliably?

Furthermore, innovative statistical methods are necessary to adequately analyse spatial data. Various regression models (e.g. SAR, SARAR, SLX, Durbin and others) address the spatial dependence in different ways and offer alternative approaches to identify different types of spatial spillovers or spatial interdependences, in cross-sectional and longitudinal data. Which types of models are adequate for which type of questions? Which models can be used to simultaneously analyse individual and aggregate data?

In sum, in this session we are especially interested in methodological and applied studies dealing with topics of:

1. Choice of adequate regional level and handling of borders when using administrative data
2. Connection of individual data and spatially aggregate as well as infrastructural data
3. Spatial analysis of time-series and cross-sectional data
4. Modelling spatial relationships (e.g. commuting flows, distances, traveling times, social interactions)
5. Modelling spatial interaction, spillover or diffusion processes
6. Further challenges and solutions when using georeferenced data

1. Modeling Spatial Opportunity Structures and Youths' Transitions from School to Training

Miss Alexandra Wicht (University of Siegen)

Professor Alexandra Nonnenmacher (University of Siegen)

2. Small-scale regional partner market indicators for the analysis of relationship formation and the choice of partners

Dr Johannes Stauder (University of Heidelberg)

Dr Jan Eckhard (University of Heidelberg)

Mr Tom Kossow (University of Heidelberg)

Mrs Laura Unsöld (University of Heidelberg)

3. Where is the context that matters? Utilizing travel-time radii to assess socio-spatial context influences on individuals' transitions across the educational career

Ms Katarina Weßling (University of Cologne)

4. Correlation of high school attendance and availability of high schools: using administrative data or distances?

Dr Michaela Sixt (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 103

Surveys, ipsative and compositional data analysis (CODA)

Chair Dr Berta Ferrer-Rosell (University of Lleida)

Coordinator 1 Dr Marina Vives-Mestres (University of Girona)

Coordinator 2 Dr Juan Jose Egozcue (Technical University of Catalonia)

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 mainly 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 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), and social network compositions (% of family members, friends, neighbours, etc.). Beyond ipsative measures, Likert items can also be understood as a distribution of response frequencies adding up to 100% and ranking items containing k stimuli as a distribution of response options adding up to $k(k+1)/2$.

Statistical analysis of compositional data focus on the relative importance components. A popular approach is to transform compositional data by means of logarithms of ratios of components before applying otherwise standard analysis methods.

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 more user friendly 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, spurious correlations, 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. Descriptive Compositional Data Analysis. A Reanalysis of a Social Support Survey

Dr Tina Kogovšek (University of Ljubljana)
Dr Valentina Hlebec (University of Ljubljana)
Ms Maja Mrzel (University of Ljubljana)
Dr Germa Coenders (University of Girona)

2. Compositional data in the community innovation survey

Mr Abdennassar Joueid (University of Girona)
Dr Germa Coenders (University of Girona)

3. Are the Sweden Democrats really Sweden's largest party? A maximum likelihood ratio test on the simplex

Dr Jakob Bergman (Lund University)
Professor Björn Holmquist (Lund University)

4. FROM LIKERT SCALES TO COMPOSITIONAL DATA VIA ORDERED PREFERENCES

Dr Berta Ferrer-Rosell (University of Lleida)
Dr Vera Pawlowsky-Glahn (University of Girona)
Dr Germà Coenders (University of Girona)
Dr Juan Jose Egozcue (Technical University of Catalonia)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 105

Measuring the change (or the lack of) of political attitudes 2

Chair Dr Roula Nezi (GESIS-Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Dr Theofanis Exadaktylos (University of Surrey)

Session Details

Since the onset of the financial crisis in Europe in 2008 a series of tumultuous events have unfolded across Europe. The European Union is confronted with a series of social and political challenges that affect European citizens across all member states, such as the rise of austerity as a result of the economic crisis, the migration influx from inside and outside the European Union, terrorism and security threats, as well as the rise of new political forces questioning the future of European Integration. This chain of events has not only challenged the political elites of the European Union and its member states but it has also affected citizens' political attitudes.

The purpose of this panel is the understanding of the stability or change of citizens' behaviour as an essential element in political science and comparative politics, especially within the context of turbulence in Europe. The panel incorporates ideas linked to the wider topics of the rise of populism, the questioning of established democratic values, norms and institutions by European citizens, and the rise of support for extreme and radical voices within mainstream politics.

This panel accepts papers that use survey based research including survey experiments and experimental designs to gauge short or long term changes of political attitudes, including but not limited to:

- Attitudes towards democracy
- Political preferences including party choice
- Perceptions of authoritarian personalities, and
- Support for populist or anti-systemic parties and political formations.

The focus of the panel is not the case(s) selected but rather the application of the method and its connection to rigorous empirical analysis.

1. The transformation of political preference structures

Mr Jakob Horneber (University Bonn)

2. A Dynamic Forecasting Model for the 2017 German Federal Election

Dr Simon Munzert (University of Mannheim, Mannheim Centre for European Social Research)
Professor Thomas Gschwend (University of Mannheim)
Dr Lukas Stoetzer (University of Zurich)
Mr Steffen Zittlau (University of Mannheim)
Mr Marcel Neunhoeffler (University of Mannheim)
Mr Sebastian Sternberg (University of Mannheim)

3. Studying Trump-like voters in Mexico

Dr Rene Bautista (NORC at the University of Chicago)

Dr Marco Morales (ITAM)

Mr Javier Marquez (Buendia & Laredo)

Mr Jose Merino (Data4)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 106

Survey Research in the Developing World: A Transferral of Western Methods or a Context-Driven Approach?

Chair Mrs Leila Demarest (KU Leuven)

Session Details

Development actors such as the UN and The World Bank have been increasingly interested in survey projects in various Third World countries. One large-scale initiative concerns the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), which are funded by USAID and are conducted in various development countries. Yet many smaller-scaled projects are also conducted with regard to, for example, local food security, water provision etc. Besides this ever-increasing interest in surveys to acquire socio-economic information for project targeting, research interests are also directed at political attitudes and behaviours of developing countries' populations. For example, developing countries are increasingly being covered by the World Values Survey, and region-specific opinion surveys have been conducted regularly (e.g. Afrobarometer, Asian Barometer).

This panel welcomes papers that address current challenges of survey research in the developing world and propose innovative ways of overcoming them. We specifically welcome contributions that challenge Western textbooks on survey methodology and reshape their recommendations in a creative way to apply them to their specific country contexts. Contributions can focus on the sampling and response level, but also on the level of questionnaire development. With regard to sampling we are interested in classical problems such as the lack of a sampling frame (including access to difficult populations), problems of non-response, methods to reduce non-response, (post-)stratification, etc. With regard to questionnaire development, we aim to challenge the practice of transferring items with a strong history in Western survey research to developing country questionnaires. These items can concern socio-demographic and economic variables. Well-known examples here are for example the age item, which is recommended to be questioned by using the birth year in Western surveys, while this is far less applicable for some respondent groups in the Third World; and the blurred understanding of 'family' and 'household' terms in some cultural contexts. Yet, we can also expect important divergences occurring for questions concerning (political) opinions and attitudes. Contributions can also focus on problems of translation and measurement equivalence, question comprehension among local populations, and interviewer effects.

1. Survey Attitudes in the Middle East and Arab Gulf: Hindrance or Help?

Dr Justin Gengler (SESRI, Qatar University)

2. "No Opinion responses" in the NSS survey in Ghana: Satisficing or non-opinions?

Mr Maarten Schroyens (KU Leuven)

Professor Arnim Langer (KU Leuven)

Professor Bart Meuleman (KU Leuven)

3. Evaluating SMS-Based Surveys in an African Context

Dr Stacey Giroux (Indiana University)

Dr Tom Evans (Indiana University)

Dr Kurt Waldman (Indiana University)

Mr Jacob Schumacher (Indiana University)

4. An Assessment of Interviewer Error in the Afrobarometer Project

Miss Leila Demarest (KU Leuven)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 107

Special populations

Chair Dr Margarida Piteira (ISEG/SOCIUS)

Session Details

1. MobiCampus-UDL: combining web-based travel survey and smartphone app data collection

Dr Caroline Bayart (University Lyon 1)

Dr Louafi Bouzouina (ENTPE - University Lyon 2)

2. Surveying the physician and dentists using Mixed Mode Design

Professor Franciszek Sztabinski (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology Polish Academy of Sciences)

Professor Pawel Sztabinski (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology Polish Academy of Sciences)

3. Longitudinal Research with Canadian Families Living with Low Income

Ms Carla Ginn (Faculty of Nursing, University of Calgary)

Dr Karen Benzies (Faculty of Nursing, University of Calgary)

Dr Leslie Anne Keown (Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University)

Dr Shelley Raffin Bouchal (Faculty of Nursing, University of Calgary)

Dr Wilfreda E. (Billie) Thurston (Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary)

4. Methods of surveying and sampling event visitors by the example of football spectators

Mr Tim Ziesmann (University of Münster)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: F2 108

Mixed modes & mode effects 2

Chair Ms Franziska Gebhard (German Internet Panel, SFB 884, University of Mannheim, Germany)

Session Details

1. Methodological Aspects of Measuring Policy Attitudes – An Investigation of Response Scale Effects in different Survey Modes

Mrs Chariklia Hoefig (Bw Center for Military History and Social Sciences)

2. Analysis of online mode coverage and non-response bias in 4th European Quality of Life Survey

Miss Aleksandra Wilczynska (Kantar Public Brussels)

Mr Hayk Gyuzalyan (Kantar Public Brussels)

3. Mode Effect and Social Desirability Bias: The Example of Happiness

Dr Pei-shan Liao (RCHSS, Academia Sinica)

4. Results from an Internet experimental household survey

Dr Stéphane Legleye (Insee)

Ms Klara Vinceneux (Insee)

5. How much does the mode of response matter? A comparison of web-based and mail-based response when examining sensitive issues in social surveys

Mr Aki Koivula (University of Turku)

Professor Pekka Räsänen (University of Turku)

Dr Outi Sarpila (University of Turku)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N AUD4

What do we tell them, and how? Reviewing current practices for communicating about surveys with respondents 1

Chair Mr Alfred Tuttle (US Census Bureau)

Session Details

Surveys generally involve more than just the interaction between a respondent and the survey instrument or interviewer. Surveyors must also communicate information about a survey that prepares respondents for response – what types of

information will be collected, how to access the survey, time frame of completion, availability of modes, etc. In addition, surveyors may provide information intended to convey the importance of the survey – planned and past uses of results, names of important sponsors and other stakeholders, etc. In short, surveyors attempt to affect respondents' decisions 1) to respond 2) in a timely manner and 3) with the effort needed to ensure the reporting of accurate data.

This long-standing problem is complicated by rapid technological and social changes. Today's surveyors, faced with new challenges such as declining response rates, changes in communication behaviors among target populations, competition from telemarketers for respondents' attention, the emergence of cyber-security threats, etc., must adapt their communications to address changes in the survey environment.

This session will explore surveyors' experiences with developing, implementing, and evaluating survey communications. Of particular interest are (but are not limited to):

- Empirical evaluations of the effectiveness of survey communications
- Development and evaluation of messages related to privacy, data security, use of administrative records, and other recent topics of concern to respondents and surveyors
- The use of newer communication modes such as email, SMS, social media, etc., as well as novel uses of traditional modes
- Research into respondent behaviors with regard to processing survey materials and making decisions about cooperation
- Application of theoretical approaches to crafting messages to positively affect respondents' decision to participate, e.g., social exchange theory, cost-benefit analysis, principles of psychological influence, etc.
- The impacts of imposed requirements – legal statutes, informed consent policies, institutional review boards, etc. – and how surveyors adapt their communications to meet these requirements

1. what should we (and should we not) tell them? Qualitative testing of different approaches and materials to recruit members of a new Australian online probability panel

Ms Karen Kellard (Australian National University)

2. Improving mail contact communications; results from an experimental test of a new approach

Dr Don Dillman (Washington State University)

Mr Pierce Greenberg (Washington State University)

3. The effectiveness of introductory motivational messages for response quality improvement in web surveys

Dr Nejc Berzelak (University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences)

Dr Ana Villar (City University London)

Ms Elena Sommer (City University London)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N AUD5

Reflecting on Failed Research

Chair Professor Martin Weichbold (University of Salzburg)

Coordinator 1 Professor Wolfgang Aschauer (University of Salzburg)

Coordinator 2 Professor Nina Baur (Technical University Berlin)

Session Details

At conferences we usually hear about remarkable outcomes in scientific research: Colleagues report how they achieved striking results, using sophisticated research designs and applying complex analytical tools. But everybody who has ever conducted research by him/herself knows that during the research process not necessarily everything runs smoothly. Of course, dealing with unforeseen difficulties is an essential part of empirical research, but sometimes we have to admit that certain decisions were wrong, a research strategy didn't work out or maybe even the whole research project failed in the end.

This session wants to provide space to discuss research attempts that finally disappeared in a drawer. The aim of the session is not to make someone look like a fool or to satisfy the other's curiosity, but to reflect on causes of failed research and to learn from mistakes. As failing is not always a matter of the researchers' incompetence but can have multiple reasons, reporting what happened - and why - this session may be a step forward to prevent others from making the same mistakes.

In our proposal the term "failed" should be understood in a broad sense: reasons can reach from practical things (difficult access to the field, problems with funding, external incidents...), methodical problems (bad questionnaire, inappropriate survey period, sampling difficulties, problems with interviewers, etc. ...) to methodological misconceptions (incoherent or too complex research design, incompatibilities of different parts of the study,...) or theoretical issues (difficulties in the implementation of theoretical concepts for empirical research,...).

We encourage researchers to present their reflections on failed research projects. The session should provide an open platform to discuss about difficulties in our daily research activities and to encourage a new code of practice – not to ignore failed research but to learn from it.

[3rd coorganizer Dr. Dimitri Prandner; male; dimitri.prandner@jku.at; University of Linz]

1. The trickiness of conducting interviews: when aggression turns up during interviews

Dr Heidi Siller (Medical University of Innsbruck/Women's Health Centre)
Professor Margarethe Hochleitner (Medical University of Innsbruck/Women's Health Centre)

2. First-mover disadvantage? Adapting a new measure from social identity research for the measurement of party identification

Dr Sabrina Jasmin Mayer (University of Duisburg-Essen)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: N 101

Meta-Analysis in Survey Methodology

Chair Professor Michael Bosnjak (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Professor Katja Lozar-Manfreda (University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences)

Session Details

In a nutshell, meta-analysis can be described as a set of statistical methods for aggregating, summarizing, and drawing inferences from collections of thematically related studies. The key idea is to quantify the size, direction, and/or strength of an effect, and to cancel out sampling errors associated with individual studies. Meta-analytic techniques have become the standard methods for aggregating the results from thematically related studies in the health and behavioural sciences. They can be used to describe a research field, to test and/or compare theories on a high level of abstraction, and to derive conclusions about the effectiveness of interventions.

Despite the exponentially growing amount of primary studies in survey methodology, the use of meta-analysis to synthesize this body of knowledge is scarce. Only about 40 meta-analyses on survey methodology topics do currently exist, which equals the annual output of meta-analyses in top tier journals in the health and behavioural sciences. The few famous and often cited meta-analysis cover issues such as survey (non)response, validity/reliability of scales, and survey measurement of specific concepts etc.

The overall aim of this session is to promote the use of meta-analysis in survey methodology by encouraging authors to (a) contribute papers on methodological advances and tools in the area of meta-analysis relevant for survey methodology and (b) to present most recent meta-analytic findings in the area of, or relevant for, survey methodology. Authors are specifically encouraged to submit meta-analyses on the determinants of survey representativeness and/or about explaining survey errors and biases.

1. Meta-analysis in Survey Methodology

Mr Gregor ?ehovin (Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana)

Professor Michael Bosnjak (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Professor Katja Lozar Manfreda (Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana)

2. Are Web Surveys More Successful in the US? A Multilevel Meta-Analysis Investigating Web Response Rate Experiments across Countries

Miss Jessica Wengrzik (GESIS, Mannheim, Germany)

Mrs Katja Hanke (GESIS, Mannheim, Germany)

Mr Ronald Fischer (University of Wellington, New Zealand)

Mr Michael Bosnjak (GESIS, Mannheim, Germany)

3. How to Improve Data Quality with Interviewer training? A Meta-Analytical Approach

Mrs Jessica Wengrzik (GESIS, Mannheim, Germany)

Professor Michael Bosnjak (GESIS, Mannheim, Germany)

4. A meta-analysis on the impact of survey questions' format on measurements' quality

Miss Anna DeCastellarnau (Tilburg University / European Social Survey - Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD1 CGD

Representing the population: Improving European sampling practices 2

Chair Dr Annette Scherpenzeel (SHARE – Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)

Coordinator 1 Mrs Johanna Bristle (SHARE – Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe)

Coordinator 2 Dr Stefan Zins (ESS-GESIS)

Session Details

Obtaining good probability samples is a key challenge for European cross-national studies in order to represent the population. Four large cross-national surveys: the European Social Survey (ESS), the Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe (SHARE), the Gender and Generations Program (GGP) and the European Values Study (EVS) have put their efforts together to improve and harmonize the sampling practices in their studies, This is done within the consortium “Synergies for Europe’s research infrastructures in the social sciences” (SERISS). The session aims to make the results of this effort available to other survey practitioners and exchange experiences with them. It is subdivided into three themes:

1. Mapping the use of population registers as sampling frames in Europe

The availability of central population registers that can be used as sampling frames varies a lot across countries, as do the regulations about who can or can’t access the registers and what information can be obtained from them. We welcome presentations addressing the problem of obtaining good quality probability samples of the European population or national populations, the quality of alternative methods of sampling such as random route procedures, or other experiences with the use of other registers as sampling frames.

2. Including special subpopulations in surveys of the European population

The SERISS working group addresses the issue of the representation of the institutionalized population in European surveys. We invite papers addressing this topic but also papers describing sampling practices and fieldwork measures for other specific subpopulations such as refugees.

3. Using administrative data to correct nonresponse bias

Many population registers used for sampling carry additional information, such as age, gender and household composition of the registered person. Moreover, surveys can use small-area contextual data on characteristics such as neighbourhood population density, crime rates or poverty to enrich their response data. We invite researchers to submit papers which make use of administrative, contextual or other auxiliary data in Europe for the analysis of nonresponse bias or for nonresponse adjustments.

Depending on the number of submitted abstracts we might split up the session into three parts.

1. The non-coverage of the institutional population living in retirement and nursing homes: Assessing the peril of coverage bias in a cross-national survey

Mr Jan-Lucas Schanze (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Stefan Zins (GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. Weighting procedures using administrative data for countering unit nonresponse bias of EU-SILC in Austria

Mr Thomas Glaser (Statistics Austria)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

New measurement capabilities of mobile devices

Chair Dr Peter Lugtig (Utrecht University)

Coordinator 1 Dr Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)

Coordinator 2 Miss Anne Elevelt (Utrecht University)

Coordinator 3 Mr Randall Thomas (GfK Custom Research)

Coordinator 4 Dr Frances Barlas (GfK Custom Research)

Session Details

Mobile devices (tablets and phones) can be used as a mode of administration in web surveys. Nowadays, between 10-40% of web surveys are being completed on mobile devices. While there is still much to learn about how to design questionnaires for mobile devices, this session focuses on data that mobile devices can record in addition to survey data. When mobile surveys are taken through a browser, one can the same paradata that can also be recorded on desktops and laptops. Additional data can however also be collected, both through browsers and mobile apps. Examples of such data are GPS data, data from environmental sensors (light, temperature, speed, pictures, sound), and device use data.

In this session we invite presentations that show how sensor data can and should be used in mobile surveys. We particularly would welcome papers on the following topics:

- Successful examples of recording sensor data
- Integrating sensor data and survey data
- Practical issues in designing apps and browsers for recording sensor data
- Ethical issues in recording sensor data
- Asking for consent

1. Making Grid Questions Mobile Friendly - An Impossible Dream?

Dr Frances Barlas (GfK Custom Research)
Dr Nicole Buttermore (GfK Custom Research)
Mr Randall K. Thomas (GfK Custom Research)

2. All Thumbs? Improving Measurement for Smartphones.

Professor Randall K. Thomas (GfK Custom Research)
Dr Frances M. Barlas (GfK Custom Research)
Dr Nicole R. Buttermore (GfK Custom Research)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q2 AUD3

Benefits and Challenges of Open-ended Questions 2

Chair Dr Evi Scholz (GESIS)
Coordinator 1 Mrs Cornelia Zuell (GESIS)

Session Details

Open-ended questions in surveys often support getting insights into respondents' understanding of concepts, ideas, or issues. The efforts to prepare, code and analyse data of open-ended questions in contrast to closed questions are considerable. Thus, open-ended questions in general population surveys are not as popular as closed questions. While for closed survey questions much methodological research has been conducted, open-ended questions are, in terms of methodology, rarely covered. However, the increasing number of access panel web surveys offer the chance of more intensive use of open-ended survey questions and more investigation of related methodological aspects.

Recent research on open-ended questions examines, e.g., mode effects or the length of answers as quality indicator for responses. Other research deals with reasons for non-response. The quality of answers to open-ended questions is one source of survey error that, if based on factors other than randomness, will result in biased answers and put the validity of the data into question – often disregarded in substantive analyses and thus challenging its value.

The proposed session aims to help filling that gap. We welcome papers on open-ended questions referring to

- a. Use of open-ended questions,
 - b. Typology of open-ended questions,
 - c. Mode effects,
 - d. Design and design effects, e.g., question order or position in a questionnaire,
 - e. Coding techniques and their challenges,
 - f. Response behaviour,
 - g. Effects of response and non-response,
 - h. Bias analyses,
 - i. Comparison of software for textual data analysis,
 - j. Analyses techniques,
 - k. Any other topic that addresses quality or assesses the value of open-ended questions and their answers.
- We also welcome papers that investigate other methodological aspects, e.g., comparative aspects (general population surveys vs. special sample surveys; response behaviour regarding open-ended vs. closed questions for the same topic; or cross-cultural differences in response behaviour to open-ended questions).

1. Effects on Response Quality of Open-Ended Questions in Web Surveys

Ms Katharina Schmidt (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Tobias Gummer (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)
Dr Joss Rossmann (GESIS – Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

2. Eliciting Social Norms by Situations with Open-ended Questions

Professor Jürgen Friedrichs (University of Cologne)
Dr Sebastian Kurtenbach (University of Bielefeld)

3. How we see it: Young People's attitudes to cross-community relations in Northern Ireland

Dr Grace Kelly (Queen's University Belfast)
Dr Martina McKnight (Queen's University Belfast)
Dr Dirk Schubotz (Queen's University Belfast)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF2

Validity of Vignette-Designs

Chair Mrs Lena Verneuer (University of Bielefeld, Faculty of Sociology)
Coordinator 1 Professor Stefanie Eifler (Catholic University Eichstätt, Faculty of History and Social Science)

Session Details

Although Vignette-Designs are very common in social science, the question, what their empirical outcome really is, remains stable and has led to many (opposing) findings concerning validity aspects. Designed to measure behavioral intentions with the help of hypothetical situations, it is still not clear how these intentional measurements of the vignettes correspond with and to what extent they can serve as determinants for actual behavior.

To anticipate this issue different approaches have been made: In order to validate the vignettes externally, cross-validation strategies such as comparisons of field- and/or laboratory-experiments with written situations have been set up. Furthermore, different studies deal with the content validity of vignettes and draw upon questions of how detailed vignettes should be or how prone they are to evoke social desirable answers.

In our session we want to draw attention to this ongoing debate and pool recent findings of projects that try to enrich the discussion. As there are many different ways of applying vignettes, we do not focus on special designs and welcome all contributions dealing with different analytical strategies or empirical designs to disentangle the questions of validity. Against this background, papers matching one of the following aspects are cordially invited to be part of this session:

- theoretical ideas for modeling the relationship between intentions and behavior for further empirical analyses
- comparison and discussion of different Vignette-Designs concerning validity aspects
- cross-validation strategies (new approaches, replications)
- new developments in measuring intentions with Vignettes
- issues of data-collection (how to measure behavior and intentions)
- discussion of (dis-)advantages of Vignette-Designs, validation strategies and/or measurements

1. Learning- and fading-effects in factorial survey experiments: An assessment using eye-tracking data

Mr Volker Lang (Bielefeld University)
Professor Stefan Liebig (Bielefeld University)

2. Validating vignette-judgements in the assessment of recruitment strategies

Ms Alexandra Mergener (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

3. Consistency research within factorial surveys: Does being familiar with the topic affect consistency?

Dr Christiane Gross (University of Hanover, Germany)
Professor Peter Kriwy (Technical University of Chemnitz)

Friday 21st July, 11:00 - 12:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Occupations and survey research: methodological and substantive applications on the occupation-inequality link 2

Chair Dr Daniela Rohrbach-Schmidt (German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)
Coordinator 1 Professor Christian Ebner (University of Cologne)

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). Following the "microclass" approach (e.g. Weeden/Grusky 2005, 2012), occupations can be viewed as status categories per se, being comprised of individuals that are similar to each other with regards to attitudes, behaviour and several inequality dimensions such as income, job stability or work strains. This view is also interesting from a methodological view, as it understands occupations as a contextual unit, in which individuals are nested, socialized and rewarded.

Following this approach and taking up the session's success at the last ESRA conference on 'occupations as social contexts', our interest again is on occupations as a higher-level unit of analysis in multi-level designs. The session is a good opportunity to reflect on:

- 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 social stratification and labor market inequalities. In particular, we are interested in the following topics: the individuals' access to occupations, outcomes at the occupational level (income, job stability, and occupational health), intra- and intergenerational occupational mobility, comparisons over time (e.g. changing occupational wage structures) as well as comparison across countries. Substantive papers should also address underlying mechanisms, which lead to occupational outcomes and differences, such as social closure (ibid.), technological change (Autor et al. 2003) and institutions in a broader sense.

References:

Autor, David H.; Levy, Frank; Murnane, Richard J. 2003. The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change: An Empirical Exploration. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118(4): 1279–1333.

Weeden, Kim A.; Grusky, David B. 2005. The Case for a New Class Map. *American Journal of Sociology* 111(1): 141-212.

Weeden, Kim A.; Grusky, David B. 2012. The three worlds of inequality. *American Journal of Sociology* 117:1723-1785

1. Transitions into professional education in Switzerland: The influence of institutional characteristics of the vocational education system

Mr Fabian Sander (Swiss Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

Mrs Irene Kriesi (Swiss Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

2. Digitalisation of the economy and labour market polarisation. Evidence from the European Digital Skills Survey

Dr Maurizio Curtarelli (Policy and Research, Ecorys UK)

Mrs Valentina Gualtieri (ISFOL-INAPP)

3. A look inside: Using German Microcensus information to analyse task changes within occupations from 1973 to 2011

Mr Tobias Maier (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training)

4. Disaggregate and Segregate. How Indices of Occupational Segregation Depend on the Level of Data Aggregation

Dr Szymon Czarnik (Jagiellonian University)

Friday 21st July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: F2 102

Quantitative Spatial Analysis of Micro and Macro Data: Methodological Challenges and Solutions 3

Chair Professor Henning Best (TU Kaiserslautern)

Coordinator 1 Professor Corinna Kleinert (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Coordinator 2 Mr Tobias Ruettenauer (TU Kaiserslautern)

Coordinator 3 Dr Michaela Sixt (Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories)

Session Details

The session intends to bring together methodological experiences made when working with spatial data in quantitative empirical social research. On the one hand, spatial data offers the opportunity to investigate the relationship between regional characteristics on the macro level. On the other hand, spatial data can be used to enrich survey data with structural information on a certain regional level, either to control for context effects or to explicitly analyse these effects and their interplay with mechanisms on the individual level. By using GIS, addresses of survey participants can be linked with objective measures of their neighbourhood (e.g. pollution data) or proximity to institutions (e.g. of educational institutions or workplaces). Thus, these data allow investigating the relevance of infrastructure distances for social action as well as processes of spatial spillovers and diffusion.

In doing so, several methodological questions arise: What kind of regional level is adequate to what kind of question ("MAUP")? And how can we handle social action at borders of administrative units? To derive closer estimates of real individual distances and potential spaces of action a possible solution could be to weight the importance of neighbouring regions by information on actual traveling times with different means of transport. What are the challenges and limitations of these approaches and how can it be done reliably?

Furthermore, innovative statistical methods are necessary to adequately analyse spatial data. Various regression models (e.g. SAR, SARAR, SLX, Durbin and others) address the spatial dependence in different ways and offer alternative approaches to identify different types of spatial spillovers or spatial interdependences, in cross-sectional and longitudinal data. Which types of models are adequate for which type of questions? Which models can be used to simultaneously analyse individual and aggregate data?

In sum, in this session we are especially interested in methodological and applied studies dealing with topics of:

1. Choice of adequate regional level and handling of borders when using administrative data
2. Connection of individual data and spatially aggregate as well as infrastructural data

3. Spatial analysis of time-series and cross-sectional data
4. Modelling spatial relationships (e.g. commuting flows, distances, traveling times, social interactions)
5. Modelling spatial interaction, spillover or diffusion processes
6. Further challenges and solutions when using georeferenced data

1. Employment-Projections at the Regional Level for Germany: The Forecasting-Performances of Time Series- versus Spatio-Temporal-Procedures

Dr Andreas Gohs (University of Kassel (Germany))

2. Using geographically weighted regression to explore spatial variation in survey nonresponse

Dr Sarah Butt (City, University of London)

Ms Kaisa Lahtinen (Statistics Finland)

Professor Christopher Brunson (University of Ireland, Maynooth)

3. Contextual unemployment and the willingness for job-related mobility - results from hierarchical spatial models

Mr Sebastian Bähr (Institute for Employment Research (IAB))

4. Making contexts: describing spatial variations of poverty using unemployment and welfare benefit register data

Mr Sebastian Jeworutzki (Ruhr-Universität Bochum)

Professor Jörg-Peter Schräpler (Ruhr-Universität Bochum)

Friday 21st July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: F2 105

Measuring the change (or the lack of) of political attitudes 3

Chair Dr Roula Nezi (GESIS-Leibniz-Institute for the Social Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Dr Theofanis Exadaktylos (University of Surrey)

Session Details

Since the onset of the financial crisis in Europe in 2008 a series of tumultuous events have unfolded across Europe. The European Union is confronted with a series of social and political challenges that affect European citizens across all member states, such as the rise of austerity as a result of the economic crisis, the migration influx from inside and outside the European Union, terrorism and security threats, as well as the rise of new political forces questioning the future of European Integration. This chain of events has not only challenged the political elites of the European Union and its member states but it has also affected citizens' political attitudes.

The purpose of this panel is the understanding of the stability or change of citizens' behaviour as an essential element in political science and comparative politics, especially within the context of turbulence in Europe. The panel incorporates ideas linked to the wider topics of the rise of populism, the questioning of established democratic values, norms and institutions by European citizens, and the rise of support for extreme and radical voices within mainstream politics.

This panel accepts papers that use survey based research including survey experiments and experimental designs to gauge short or long term changes of political attitudes, including but not limited to:

- Attitudes towards democracy
- Political preferences including party choice
- Perceptions of authoritarian personalities, and
- Support for populist or anti-systemic parties and political formations.

The focus of the panel is not the case(s) selected but rather the application of the method and its connection to rigorous empirical analysis.

1. Ideology Versus Party Identification: Which Measure is More Stable?

Miss Sarah Cho (SurveyMonkey)

2. Left and Right Political Orientation in Eastern and Western Europe: Is it the same? A Study on Metric Invariance and External Validation

Dr Adrian Wojcik (Nicolaus Copernicus University, Poland)

3. Constraining Change or changing constraints? Attitude-Predisposition relations and employment status changes

Ms Nadja Wehl (Bamberg Graduate School of Social Sciences)

4. Is There A Religious Base for Feelings of European Identity?

Dr Vera Lomazzi (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Dr Markus Quandt (GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences)

Friday 21st July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: F2 106

Survey research in Conflict Areas: Learnings from Case Studies

Chair Ms Magali Rheault (Gallup)

Session Details

Conducting research in conflict areas presents a unique set of challenges. From civil war in Syria and South Sudan to sectarian violence in Myanmar and Lebanon to gang violence in Mexico and Honduras, large swaths of populations in entire countries, regions, cities and neighborhoods are often left out of the research process. The need to collect accurate survey data from conflict areas cannot be overemphasized. Data are critical not only to guide meaningful interventions so that populations can receive the assistance that they need, but survey data can also inform the resolution process in a given conflict.

Three areas are of particular interest in this context: 1) sampling and research design, 2) data collection logistics and 3) ethics. Often times, population frames are out-of-date or unavailable and research designs need to be adapted to the local context and its limitations. The implementation of data collection is also fraught with difficulties due to the dynamic nature of conflicts, the need to ensure the safety of field staff and respondents as well as the need for innovative solutions to deal with poor or non-existent infrastructure. Further, the vulnerability of populations living in conflict areas puts an even greater emphasis on ethical requirements before, during and after data collection, including the feasibility of conducting the survey. This proposed research session seeks to draw from concrete examples to advance knowledge in the development of a scientific framework in which populations living in conflict areas can be surveyed.

1. Conflict Exposure and Post-war Behavior: Survey Evidence from Angola

Professor Tilman Brück (International Security and Development Center)

Dr Wolfgang Stojetz (International Security and Development Center)

2. Electoral observation random sample: experiences from Tunisia, Kosovo and Honduras - Implementation, methodological and ethical issues.

Dr LUCA DI GENNARO (Sogeti)

Professor Fedele Greco (Università di Bologna - Alma Mater)

3. Conducting survey research in South Sudan: challenges and solutions

Miss Sally Widdop (Ipsos MORI)

Mr Peter Edopu (Tango Consult)

Ms Sara Grant-Vest (Ipsos MORI)

Dr Nata Duvvury (National University of Ireland, Galway)

Friday 21st July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: F2 108

Mixed modes & mode effects 1

Chair Professor Franciszek Sztabinski (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology Polish Academy of Sciences)

Coordinator 1 Professor Pawel Sztabinski (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology Polish Academy of Sciences)

Session Details

1. Combining modes in electoral research

Dr Eva Zeglovits (IFES - Institute for empirical research)

Mr Nikolaus Eder (IFES - Institute for empirical research)

Mr Julian Aichholzer (University of Vienna)

2. Comparing the results of a face-to-face survey and a web survey to estimate sensitive characteristics

Mr David Molina (Department of Statistics and O. R. University of Granada)

Mrs María del Mar Rueda (Department of Statistics and O. R. University of Granada)

Mr Antonio Arcos (Department of Statistics and O. R. University of Granada)

Mrs Francisca López-Torrecillas (Department of personality, evaluation and psychological treatment. University of Granada)

3. Moving Establishment Survey Mail to Web: Unit and Item Nonresponse

Mrs Georg-Christoph Haas (Institute for Employment Research)

Dr Stephanie Eckman (RTI International)
Mr Bach Ruben (Institute for Employment Research)
Professor Frauke Kreuter (Institute for Employment Research)

4. Mode preference in the census : a multilevel model to take into account the enumerator effect

Mrs Heidi Koumarianos (Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques)

5. Do face-to-face interviews used in a Mixed Mode design improve the sample composition?

Professor Pawel B. Sztabinski (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)
Professor Franciszek Sztabinski (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences)

Friday 21st July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: N AUD4

What do we tell them, and how? Reviewing current practices for communicating about surveys with respondents 2

Chair Mr Alfred Tuttle (US Census Bureau)

Session Details

Surveys generally involve more than just the interaction between a respondent and the survey instrument or interviewer. Surveyors must also communicate information about a survey that prepares respondents for response – what types of information will be collected, how to access the survey, time frame of completion, availability of modes, etc. In addition, surveyors may provide information intended to convey the importance of the survey – planned and past uses of results, names of important sponsors and other stakeholders, etc. In short, surveyors attempt to affect respondents' decisions 1) to respond 2) in a timely manner and 3) with the effort needed to ensure the reporting of accurate data.

This long-standing problem is complicated by rapid technological and social changes. Today's surveyors, faced with new challenges such as declining response rates, changes in communication behaviors among target populations, competition from telemarketers for respondents' attention, the emergence of cyber-security threats, etc., must adapt their communications to address changes in the survey environment.

This session will explore surveyors' experiences with developing, implementing, and evaluating survey communications. Of particular interest are (but are not limited to):

- Empirical evaluations of the effectiveness of survey communications
- Development and evaluation of messages related to privacy, data security, use of administrative records, and other recent topics of concern to respondents and surveyors
- The use of newer communication modes such as email, SMS, social media, etc., as well as novel uses of traditional modes
- Research into respondent behaviors with regard to processing survey materials and making decisions about cooperation
- Application of theoretical approaches to crafting messages to positively affect respondents' decision to participate, e.g., social exchange theory, cost-benefit analysis, principles of psychological influence, etc.
- The impacts of imposed requirements – legal statutes, informed consent policies, institutional review boards, etc. – and how surveyors adapt their communications to meet these requirements

1. Communication strategies in the German sample of the European Social Survey (ESS)

Dr Michael Weinhardt (Bielefeld University)
Mrs Jule Adriaans (Bielefeld University)

2. Do Focus Group Participants Mean what they Say? A Field Test of Mailing Materials Updated Based Qualitative Feedback

Dr Rachel Horwitz (U.S. Census Bureau)
Mr John Finamore (National Science Foundation)
Mrs Jennifer Tancreto (U.S. Census Bureau)

3. "Whatever decision you make, we would like you to take part in the survey": Asking for administrative data linkage consent in the Next Steps Age 25 Survey

Dr Darina Peycheva (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)
Dr Lisa Calderwood (Centre for Longitudinal Studies, UCL Institute of Education)
Mr Mehul Kotecha (NatCen Social Research)

4. Advance mailing experiments on the Crime Survey for England and Wales

Mr Luke Taylor (Kantar Public)
Miss Catherine Grant (Kantar Public)

Friday 21st July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: N 101

Is Clean Data Better?

Chair Dr Frances Barlas (GfK Custom Research)
Coordinator 1 Mr Randall Thomas (GfK Custom Research)

Session Details

Though many researchers have worked hard to improve survey response rates, there are challenges being posed by respondents who do respond and provide lower quality responses. Many researchers have argued that, to improve the quality of data from respondents, we should exclude cases that fail to meet a minimum quality standard from analyses. This session covers papers that provide an empirical evaluation of data cleaning techniques, including considerations of sub-optimal response such as speeding, non-differentiation on grid questions, failing trap or red-herring questions, lack of item completion, and extreme responding, as well as concerns about faked data and identity verification procedures. The aim of the session is to include studies that examine the impact of data cleaning on substantive responses or the extent of bias compared to national benchmarks. These studies will help inform best practice guidelines around data cleaning and considerations of data quality.

We encourage the submission of papers with a focus on:

- evaluating data cleaning techniques for impact on data quality
- survey accuracy and data validity resulting from data quality
- methods to identify poor survey responses and improve data quality

1. Speed Check: Is Data Quality Improved by Eliminating Speeders?

Professor Randall Thomas (GfK Custom Research)
Dr Frances M. Barlas (GfK Custom Research)
Dr Nicole R. Buttermore (GfK Custom Research)

2. Effects of Data Cleaning on Bias Reduction

Dr Frances Barlas (GfK Custom Research)
Mr Randall K. Thomas (GfK Custom Research)
Dr Mansour Fahimi (GfK Custom Research)

Friday 21st July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: Q2 AUD2

Passive Mobile Data Collection

Chair Professor Florian Keusch (University of Mannheim)
Coordinator 1 Professor Frauke Kreuter (University of Maryland, University of Mannheim, IAB)

Session Details

The increasing popularity of smartphones poses new challenges for researchers but also opens up new opportunities for novel ways of data collection. For example, a rising share of respondents access Web surveys that were designed to be taken on large screen computers on their smartphones (a.k.a. “unintentional mobile respondents”), and recent research demonstrates the impact of smartphones on survey participation and data quality due to . On the other hand, researchers are now also able to collect additional data from smartphone users – such as geolocation, online behavior and browser history, app usage – through passive measurement via apps. Compared to surveys that rely on self-reported data, Passive Mobile data collection has the potential to provide richer data, to decrease respondent burden (because fewer survey questions need to be asked), and to reduce measurement error (because of less forgetting and social desirability). However, to collect passive data via mobile phones, participants need to volunteer to download an app that tracks their behavior and location over a longer period of time. This leads to concerns about nonresponse and consent as well as privacy and ethics.

This session invites presentations that investigate the potentials and the challenges when collecting passive mobile data, either as a stand-alone approach or in combination with a mobile web survey. We welcome contributions that report on one or both of the following areas:

- * application of passive data collection in a specific context (for example, for hard-to-survey populations, educational research, labor market research, health studies)
- * methodological issues of passive mobile data collection (e.g., coverage, nonresponse, consent, ethics)

1. Usage of Passive Electronic Media Measurement for Agenda Setting Analysis

Mr Daniel Prokop (MEDIAN, s.r.o. / Faculty Of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague)
Miss Lea Michalová (MEDIAN, s.r.o. / Faculty Of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague)

2. Analyzing everyday mobility: a comparison of smartphone-based GPS-Tracking and web-based trip diary to collect

travel data

Ms Dana Gruschwitz (infas)
Dr Robert Schönduwe (InnoZ)

3. Predictors of nonresponse at different stages in a smartphone-only Time Use Survey.

Miss Anne Elevelt (Utrecht University)
Dr Peter Lugtig (Utrecht University)
Dr Vera Toepoel (Utrecht University)

4. Measuring geographical information of web survey respondents

Dr Barbara Felderer (University of Mannheim)
Professor Annelies Blom (University of Mannheim)

Friday 21st July, 13:00 - 14:30, Room: Q4 ANF3

Measurement issues in household surveys

Chair Dr Tobias Schmidt (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Coordinator 1 Dr Junyi Zhu (Deutsche Bundesbank)
Coordinator 2 Dr Alessandra Gaia (ISER, University of Essex)
Coordinator 3 Dr Jonathan Burton (ISER, University of Essex)

Session Details

While for policy evaluation the provision of high quality survey data on household finances (i.e. income, wealth, expenditures, benefits take up, etc.) is crucial, survey error on this topic seems not negligible: empirical evidence from the UK suggests that income is underreported at the extremes of the distribution and that this is one of the items with higher levels of non-response.

Within the “Total Survey Error” conceptual framework, various sources of error may impact on estimates of household finances. For example, non-response error may arise if top income earners are less likely to participate in surveys; coverage error may arise when homeless people are excluded from the sample frame; and measurement error may happen when sample members fail to recall all sources of household income or misreport benefit take-up due to social desirability.

It is unclear which are the main mechanisms leading to survey error in estimates of household finances and how different mechanisms interact with each other. On one hand, surveys on household finances are often long and burdensome for respondents; on the other hand, these studies are also prone to recall error – as they often rely heavily on the respondents’ ability to recall financial information – and to social desirability bias, as they usually rely on the respondents’ willingness to reveal sensitive information, such as income and benefits take-up.

Assessing which mechanisms lead to survey error in data on household finances is of utmost importance to choose the best strategies for improving data quality as different methods have different levels of effectiveness depending on which mechanisms influence data quality. For example, “forgiving introductions” can lower social desirability, but may not be particularly effective in reducing recall bias.

We encourage submissions from academic scholars, researchers from national statistical offices, and researchers from market research companies on the challenges in estimating household finances.

Specifically, we are interested in:

- research (including cross-countries comparisons) on the different mechanisms (e.g. recall bias, response burden, social desirability) leading to survey error in measures of household finances;
- the sources of Total Survey Error in survey data on household finances (i.e. non-response error, coverage error, measurement error, processing error, etc.);
- methods to reduce Total Survey Error in data collection on household finances (e.g. “gamification” to lower response burden, “indirect questioning techniques” to lower social desirability bias, etc.);
- the use of administrative data to enhance data collection

1. Measuring income in household surveys: evidence from a collection of experiments

Dr Paul Fisher (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)
Professor Thomas Crossley (University of Essex and Institute for Fiscal Studies)
Dr Alessandra Gaia (Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex)

2. The Growth and Sensitivity of Wealth Concentration Estimates

Dr Jesse Bricker (Federal Reserve Board)

3. Extrapolating the income and wealth distributions – a joint distributional approach

Dr Viktor Steiner (Free University, Berlin)
Mr Junyi Zhu (Deutsche Bundesbank)

