**2022 WERA 1010 Agenda**

**Thursday - 8:30 start time for meeting**

* **Attendees**
  + Steve Swinford, Chair, Montana State University
  + Don Dillman, Washington State University
  + Ginny Lesser, Oregon State University
  + Rachel Gildersleeve, University of Arizona
  + Terrace Ewinghill, University of Arizona
  + Rachel Leih, University of Arizona
  + Michele Walsh, University of Arizona
  + Jessica Schad, Utah State University
  + Todd Rockwood, University of Minnesota
  + Melissa Constantine, University of Minnesota
  + Glenn Israel, University of Florida
  + Anil Chaudhary, Penn State University
  + Katherine Dentzman, Iowa State University

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

* Brief history of our committee
  + Edwin Carpenter - faculty at University of Arizona. Other disciplines have meeting where they talk about methodology - we could do that too. Created a research project committee to discuss projects we have related to survey research. **The constant** - share ideas of things you're thinking about doing and someone may be able to help you with the idea. A free forum to be helpful to one another.
* Dinner Planning for Thursday evening
  + Katie and locals
  + The Arizona Inn
  + El Charro
  + Ventana Canyon Clubhouse
  + The Grill at Hacienda del Sol
* Submission of publications and minutes for annual report

**MATURING OF SURVEY POSSIBILITIES**

* Topic has roots in previous discussions of being over-surveyed and survey fatigue.
* There may be a splitting of survey typologies
* With more and more people doing surveys (who have not been trained in doing surveys) due to online surveys in particular, we're seeing lots of very poorly designed surveys. Is this harming the general perception of surveys and/or response rates?
* There's this idea that people are being over-surveyed, but is that's actually what happening right now?
* Don and Kenny discussed where the future of surveys is going - how can we help more people do better surveys for different purposes
* **What is the Survey FOR** - what is the decision you're trying to make? How does that guide the kind of survey you're going to do.
  + Turning around and showing people what you do - bring the data back and do data interpretation sessions. Show people HOW you use the data. They really want to see it, and it impacts their willingness to answer future surveys.
  + Do people see the utility in responses?
* **Survey Fit for Purpose** - what is the need for a survey? Data has become huge and everyone can do a survey.
* **How Will the Data be Used?**
  + Thinking about the typologies that we did in our survey diary experiment
  + Utilization and usability might be one
  + Do people see the outcome? Do they see that their data is actually being used?
  + Do they have something you want? A.K.A. how motivated are they to answer the survey to get something?
  + Has this data already been collected in some way? WHO HAS ACCESS - issues of open access, secondary data. Do you even need to do a survey? Are we being forced to do more due to non-sharing of data?
  + Maybe we SHOULD be doing 2-3 questions surveys!
* **"We have met the enemy and it is us"**
  + Are survey methodologists TOO concerned about perfect methodology for every survey-like thing
  + We need a new vocabulary to start categorizing surveys - some may be types of surveys or not surveys at all.
  + Instead of a tragedy of the commons, we have a bunch of people trying to get feedback and maybe this isn't. bad thing - maybe people see it as a GOOD thing to be asked for their thoughts and opinions! Maybe marketing has it right and survey methodologies are too onerous and aren't even using all the data they collect.
  + There may be a closer connection people see between taking informal surveys and that information being ultimately useful to them
  + Maybe we can change surveys and have a bright new future - maybe the cultural context IS ripe for this
* **New Survey Vocabulary**
  + How to decide - one way to start dividing types of surveys
    - What is your **scope of inference**? What do you want to draw conclusions to?
    - Ex. Delta wants to know where there's something that's bad. Not looking to draw inference across the country about how people feel about their airline
    - Ex. State government wants to change how they tax electric vehicles. Before they change the law, the state legislature wants to know what the general public feels about it. We need a rigorous scientific survey.
  + Surveys
    - Rigorous scientific survey (what is the scope of inference vs. what do you want to accomplish)
  + Polls (what is the scope of inference vs. what do you want to accomplish)
* **Immediate Feedback**
  + Set up a Qualtrics survey that, when they finish it, shows them their answers compared to everyone else
    - See if this increases likelihood of answering future surveys
    - Obvs could be problematic because people might feel delayed social bias, might get a skewed perception of the results if only a few people have responded (maybe set up a conditional message that tells them how many people have taken it)
* **Cultural Shift/Context**
  + Towards 2-3 question quick surveys and away from longer surveys (is this something we can shift towards, especially with how much data already exists?)
  + Who is it from?
  + Academic model vs. pollsters, marketing, etc.

**PRESENTATIONS**

* **Don - WERA 1010 Report on the Diffusion of Web-Push Survey Methods**
  + Web-push surveys
    - Contacting people by mail (or another mode) to request they respond to a web questionnaire
    - Later contacts offer other modes of response
  + Many countries use this for their Census, other big surveys
    - Don was asked to help with making European Social Survey (traditionally a 50 minute in-person household survey) into web-push
    - European Social Survey
      * Every 2 years
      * Response rate goal 70% - in 2018 it was 52%
      * COVID made it impossible to do in-person for some countries
      * A lot of people did not want to change - modes would impact measurement of change, expected to see lower response rates, etc.
  + First trial test of web-push in Austria, Hungary, and Serbia
    - 20 minute section
    - Three contacts: web request by mail, reminder and second reminder with questionnaire, then incentives with request and conditional on return
    - Significantly better response rate on web-push portion!
  + Second trial test of web-push in Austria, Hungary, and Serbia
    - Four treatments based on time and $
      * 35 minutes, 5 and 10 incentives
      * 35 minutes, 5 and 25 incentives
      * 50 minutes, 5 and 10 incentives
      * 50 minutes, 5 and 25 incentives
  + Third trial currently underway for 10 of 32 countries
    - Full 50 min surveys
  + **Lessons Learned:**
    - Diffusion of innovations theory - premise that it takes a very long time to adopt a new technology
    - **Challenges**
      * Sample Frame Possibilities and Constraints Differ Across Countries
        + Ex. in Germany an apartment building with 5 units only has one address
        + Laws about who can access lists, who maintains the lists (aka individual communities)
      * Objectives to Incentives (esp sending cash)
        + Austria - Okay! We'll send 5 Euros and a conditional 10
        + Hungary - No! only 1.5 and then a conditional 10.5
        + Serbia - 5 Euros and a conditional 10
      * How Contact and Response Modes Affect Coverage and Response
        + Lots of conversation about this had to happen to encourage adoption
      * Respondent Selection Methods May Be Changing
        + Hard to select specific respondent with self-administered survey
      * Substituting Household Respondent Needs Attention
        + In-person you can just ask someone else to do it if the selected respondent isn't available
        + Web-push maybe eliminates this problem
      * Changing from Interviewer-Read to Visual Self-Administered Questionnaires is Hard for Many Surveyors to Accept
        + Need to be shorter
        + Need a unified mode approach to writing questions
        + Potential issues with measurement scales in the mode change
        + Lots of changes required from staff who are accustomed to doing it a certain way
      * Transforming Interviewer Behaviors into Written Persuasion is Necessary
        + Explain study and importance, persuasion
        + Things that used to be left up to the interviewer now need to be integrated on the front end of survey design
      * Using More Contacts than Interviews Typically Allow
        + In-person is highest response mode, but once there's a refusal it's very hard and expensive to convert
        + Mail and web allow more contacts and different approaches
      * Developing Communications as a Sequence of Compelling and Mutually Supportive Messages
        + Need to transition staff from just sending the same message over and over again
    - **It worked! Improvement in response rate on web-push portion with incentives**
    - Concern about measurement differences on 0-10 scales unfounded - no statistical differences!
      * In-person mode can get more extreme answers, esp on the positive end. But the ESS showed people in-person a visual scale! So it was pretty similar to a self-administered.
* **Glenn Israel - When Does Support from Organizational Leadership…**
  + The next survey frontier - tailored communication protocols
  + If we get a leader involved and pushing the survey, can we increase response rates?
    - Ex. if we involve the Dean of Extension in communications
  + Research Questions:
    - Does supporting messages from organizational leader improve survey response from extension clients?
    - Does adding a URL to messages from organizational leader improve survey response?
    - How does timing and source of messages impact survey response?
  + Methods:
    - Annual Client Experience Survey conducted by Florida Cooperative Extension
    - Contact with and without supporting Dean email
    - Contact with and without URL message from Dean
  + Findings
    - No significant difference when the Dean sent out supporting emails
  + Second Try Methods
    - Glenn sent out first message, Dean sent personal reminder with URL, Glenn sent reminders
  + Findings of Second Try
    - Again, no significant difference when the Dean sent out supporting emails
  + Third Try Methods
    - Glenn sent first contact, Dean sent personal reminder earlier than second try, and then went to standard protocol that had longer time between contacts
  + Findings of Third Try
    - Mode with the Dean contact was significantly higher! (only barely and only from email + mail mode)
  + Overall
    - Generally leader protocol did not substantially improve response rates
      * Playing with leader message and timing may change things
      * The audience may play a role - how close is their relationship, etc.
  + Discussion
    - Play with the modes
    - Who is the leader? Who matters to people actually on the ground? The Dean might not matter as much as a county person who is more familiar to the respondents.
      * Does the person's status matter more, or does their relationship to the respondents matter more?
    - What about time of day or day of the week?
    - If you're going to do it, have the leader sent a reminder with a URL one day after the initial invitation
* **Glenn Israel - American Opinion Survey on the Environment and Religion**
  + 5 Groups
    - Group 1 - Mail Only (no email available)
    - Group 2 - Web-Push from Mail (no email available)
    - Group 3 - Mail Only (email available)
    - Group 4 - Web-Push from Mail, with Email Augmentation (email available)
    - Group 5 - Email and Then Switch to Mail
  + Issue - Qualtrics doesn't format their links for paper surveys. You can include a QR code at least
  + Results
    - Mail Only had highest response rate (so far, but study is still on-going)
    - For the web-push via mail, most people used the QR code and not the link to access the survey
    - Emails appeared to just be going to the trash. They also seemed to have less validity than a letter.
* **Ginny Lesser**
  + Panel study
    - Panel surveys have not improved in the last 4 years - still around 50% outside of confidence interval
  + Cost per complete for different modes
    - Web + mail lowest cost for non-panel ($30 per complete)
    - Panel costs lowest BY FAR ($8 per complete)
  + Fewer studies last year, doubled so far this year
    - Five OSU surveys
    - Panels and probability surveys
    - General vs specific studies over the year
    - Upcoming studies
    - Committee Work
  + General pop studies -1
    - 2106, 18, 20, and planned for 22
    - Oregon DOT
    - Nearly identical quest used
    - Prob sample of mailing addresses from USPS
  + 7500 sample a year
    - All mail group and web+mail
    - Split sample
    - USPS DSF and up to 4 contacts
  + Results 2016, 18, 20 – graph
    - 2016 – Mail outperformed web+mail but web was the predominant
    - No incentive
  + 2018 and 2020
    - Mail, web+mail+postcard, and web+mail+letter
    - In 2018, the w+m+l had highest response rate
    - In 2020, rates went up over 2018 and a larger share were web responses (COVID effect?)
  + Once paper sent out the web response rates move to near zero
    - Can non-prob panels be useful for survey of general pop?
    - Questions of interest
    - Compare responses of prob and panel respondents
    - Compare demographics of prob and panel respondents
    - Tracking since 2016
  + Buying a panel (bought 500 completes in 16 and 18, 1000 in 2020)
    - Same letter
    - Response rates
      * 2016 – 6.25%
      * 2018 – 1%
      * 2020 – 6.5%
      * The companies do not want to give this info out
  + Study of General vs. Specific Questions
    - Specific Questions Highway Satisfaction Questions
      * Control of litter
      * Roadside guideposts
      * Control of vegetation
      * Etc.
    - General Highway Satisfaction Questions
      * Generic satisfaction question
    - When the specific questions come first, people say they're more satisfied in the overall satisfaction question
  + National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine
    - Demand for natives seeds by federal, stat, local agencies and private sector
    - Surveys of suppliers and users to native seeds to determine challenges and approaches to meeting demand
* **Todd Rockwood**
  + Pro-Choice / Pro-Life
    - Looking at more fine distinctions beyond favor or oppose
    - Qualitative Conditions
      * Ex. rape, birth control, mother with children, under 16
    - Using simple Pro-Choice vs. Pro-Life
      * 70% pro-choice, 30% missing
    - Using favor/oppose under qualitative conditions
      * See 4 basic categories
      * Indicates pro-choice/life isn't dichotomous--there are gradations depending on qualitative conditions
    - Takeaway - don't put all your question eggs in one basket
* **Jessica Schad**
  + South Dakota Producer Sustainability Re-Survey
    - Mail/online
    - Longitudinal - 2018 and 2021
    - Sense of place over time in working lands context
    - $2 bill and 1/10 chance of winning a $100 gift card (59% response rate)
    - Working on sending data back to respondents
      * Making it visually appealing
  + Chesapeake Bay Watershed Stakeholder Survey
    - Qualtrics Panel of residents
    - Mail/online survey of farmers
      * Experiments: $5 bill, $2 bill, no incentive, flashy vs. plain postcard
  + Soil Health Network Surveys (mail/online)
    - Utah growers adoptions of soil health practices
    - Considering which experiments to do - pre-suasion, views on science
    - Crop advisors in Utah
  + Courtney Flint
    - Online Utah Well-Being surveys in partnership with local municipalities
    - City-led recruitment (some novel ways like NextDoor)
    - Lots of cities want her to do this quite desperately
  + **"An Outline and Assessment of Sample Sources for Survey Research with Agricultural Producers in the U.S."**
    - SNR Research Note
    - What are some common samples researchers use to survey ag producers
    - Assess some indicators of quality
    - Discuss when best to use certain types of samples
    - Options
      * Can use Freedom of Information Act to get lists of farmers who participate in certain programs
      * NASS sometimes, but on the decline

**Friday - 8:30 start time for meeting**

* Plans for 2023 meeting
  + We need to resubmit next year - goal is around February, but MAYBE after the 2023 meeting
    - **UPDATE - needs to be in by early January 2023**
  + Might mean that we need an extra day or two at next year's meeting to do some planning/writing
  + Key - building on what we've already done, adding something new
    - Don- surveying is changing dramatically to a 'fit for purpose', etc. format. He thinks that we could work something like that into this next submission. A world where people don't get upset when they see a survey coming; they're the default and seen as useful.
  + Always have included 'rural and agricultural surveys', will likely include this in all titles/proposals going forward
* **2023 WERA Resubmission Ideas**
  + The changing landscape of surveying: Implications for rural and agricultural survey methodology
  + With the proliferation of academic and non-academic surveys, how have people's cognitive, physical, and metaphysical perceptions of the landscape of surveys changed in response to significant developments in technology facilitating simplified mass data collection?
  + Understandings of the utility of the survey, increasing perceptions and reality of utility
    - Does sharing information make a difference in willingness to answer future surveys
    - Can you share it immediately (what about early responders)?
    - What about sharing any preliminary data you have?
    - Anil - they send out a thank you postcard saying they'll send results of a question or two soon. Then relatively quickly they can send out a key finding.
    - **Respondents as a priority even after they've responded**
  + Panels are here to stay - how do we work with them?
    - Probability and non-probability
  + Maybe do some work with survey researchers - how aware are they of some of the issues we discuss?
  + Finding a balance between collecting data from EVERY sub-population and the resources that we have
    - Balancing equity concerns
  + Increasing diversity WITHIN WERA 1010
    - Funding is part of the issue - maybe we could bring HBCUs in? 1994's, HIS's. Maybe their own projects could fund them?
    - We'd also have a chance at doing some sort of Extension work, maybe targeted trainings?

**PRESENTATIONS**

* **Steve Swinford**
  + Looking at revising core course requirements at Montana State University
  + Each has to hit two of three requirements (Thinker and Problem Solver/Effective Communicator/Local and Global Citizen)
  + Every 2 years MSU does a student survey (about 30% response rate) on Qualtrics
  + Are students recognizing the new core words when they see them? Do they understand them?
  + Aiming to replace a couple questions and would like our input
  + Questions to replace:
    - Q1. Do you recall being exposed to any of the following Core Qualities in your core courses at MSU?
      * Thinker and Problem Solver (y/n)
      * Effective Communicator (y/n)
      * Local and Global Citizen (y/n)
    - Q2. If you answered yest to any of the above, in which core designations below do you recall being exposed to the Core Qualities? (select all that apply)
      * CS - Contemporary Issues in Science
      * D - Diversity
      * IA - Inquiry Arts
      * Etc.
    - Q2. *Alternative* : If you answered yest to any of the above, in which core designations below do you recall being exposed to the Core Qualities? (select all that apply)
      * All options above but instead of y/n, select WHICH Core Qualities match with which core designations
  + Will they be able to actually answer Q2 *Alternative*?
    - It seems like probably no?
    - Maybe you could ask students if they feel that they learned this kind of thing
    - Maybe you could do a link or hover over the different categories to show which classes count in the different categories
    - Lots of fundamental issues with the wording (what if you're not a local AND global citizen??)
    - Don - do individual cognitive interviews with students
    - Change the question stem to be less ambiguous! What does 'exposed to' mean? Make it more tangible (do you remember your syllabus having these phrases, did you instructor mention these)
    - Potentially this would lead to asking students about very specific courses, or maybe adding a question on the course evaluations to better assess this
* **University of Arizona Group - Michele Walsh**
  + Community Survey Methods for a Statewide Needs Assessment
  + Community, Research, Evaluation, and Development (CRED) group
  + Previous statewide needs assessment in 2015
  + **Challenges**
    - Do we have/need buy-in for this?
    - How can we engage Extension's primary stakeholders (esp those beyond agriculture)?
    - How can we hear wider community needs and expand the current scope of Extension work?
  + Potentially looking at using a **Community Capitals Framework**
  + Plan:
    - Pull and code secondary data sources at the county and community level
      * What data exists? What can we eliminate asking about to make things more streamlined
    - Use identified needs to create a community survey
    - Deploy survey
      * Still deciding on approach
    - Prioritize results for strategic planning at the state and county levels
  + How do you balance the need for statewide data with the local desire for county-level, highly local data?
  + Developed rural typologies for Arizona to map different kinds of rural communities
    - Also did Human Capital mapping **"Unpacking rurality - evaluating the impact of rural community characteristics and the built environment on SNAP"**
  + Serious methodological issue - many tribal populations do not have computers, much less internet access
  + **2015 Stakeholder Survey**
    - Each county was given same goal for # of people to sample - each County Director was in charge
    - Wanted to hear from users of Extension and non-users
    - Combination of web-based and paper-based surveys
    - Distribution method was highly variable and specific to locality
    - Each county had $500 to use in incentives
      * Again, highly variable by county
    - Counties did not do a fantastic job of documentation, couldn't get an accurate response rate
    - Actually reached a lot of people who did not know what Extension was! That's GREAT!
    - Q from Glenn - what kind of state-level budget was put into the needs assessment process in 2022?
      * They paid U of A $15,000 and provided the $500 in incentives
  + **Next Steps:**
    - Refine what secondary data is important/available
    - Achieve a more representative sample
    - How to contextualize results to be informative, effective, and reach desired audience
  + **2022 Stakeholder Survey**
    - Figure out what the most vital community needs are
    - Q from Glenn - how willing would the County Directors actually be to take this advice and create change?
      * How is the information going to be used and how quickly can it be put into action?
    - Suggestion from Glenn - maybe do a drop-off pick-up approach? Maybe do some mixed-methods and do listening sessions? Depends on how much time and resources you have and how much data you want to swim in.
    - There was some lack of structure with protocol for sampling - some asked their friends, some went out and did random sampling at libraries
      * Impacted credibility
      * Glenn suggests drop-off pick-up to help address this
    - Suggestion - have some questions that are the same on all surveys, but have some open-ended or more flexible questions as well to get more local-focused information
      * A couple or anchored items, but also some optional questions that are more tailored to what they're doing as well as some questions they can add themselves
    - What do the resources that the people who are actually going to do the work have?
      * Over time, try and build this up
    - Maybe have the core group from U of A drive around to different parts of the state to do surveys and supplement/assist the County Director portion
* **Katie Dentzman**
  + What is the PURPOSE? Understanding the structure and people's survey landscape - how this impacts their perceptions of surveys, willingness to take surveys, understanding of the utility of surveys, how we pitch and format our surveys. We don't want to just drop our surveys into a void or into our outdated understanding of the survey landscape.
  + Don suggests article: Not Your Grandmother's Survey
  + Ginny suggests article in USA TODAY to get improved public perception/understanding of the typology of surveys we identify
  + Farmer Survey – overview – farmer’s perceptions and management of herbicide resistant weeds
    - Crop Advisor Survey – role of crop advisors and perceptions of advice
    - Currently underway are a series of focus groups
      * Focus groups – 1 in 5 regions in US
      * Question themes
      * Source and validity of information
      * Barriers to discussing management
      * Future of management
      * Funded project
    - Survey builds on findings of focus groups
      * Sampling frame of certified crop advisors (13000 in NA)
      * Missing out on the uncertified
      * Gift card incentive
      * Email addresses-CCA handles distribution
      * National webinar
    - Maybe Farm Poll questions to add?  Get at uncertified and farmer perceptions of advisors
  + Survey Definition Experiment
    - Focus groups to find out what they think counts as a survey
    - Is there a typology?  Purpose, use, format
    - Could do a survey on what counts as a survey
    - Diary experiment testing the typology
    - Question – which population would you sample?