

Meta-Analyses in Survey Methodology: A Systematic Review

Online Only Appendix

Part A Meta-Analysis as a Scientific Method

This section presents a short summary of several meta-analytic concepts to acquaint readers who are unfamiliar with meta-analysis, as well as to prevent ambiguity. The concepts are presented in a sequence that closely matches their hierarchy in the discussion throughout the paper.

Effect size. In a meta-analysis, quantitative estimates of the results are presented in the form of effect sizes, which present the results of each primary study on a common scale to describe the size, direction, and variability of findings (Card 2012; Cumming 2013). The effect sizes can represent any relationship between two variables, such as the impact of a medical treatment on the risk of infection (Borenstein et al. 2009).

Summary effect size. To demonstrate the results across all primary studies included in a meta-analysis, the meta-analysis enables the computation of the summary effect size. An example from the survey methodology field is a paper by Lozar Manfreda et al. (2008), in which the effect size is the difference in the unit response rate between web and other survey modes. The authors reported a summary effect of -0.11 , which is interpreted as web surveys yielding, on average, a response rate that is 11 percentage points lower than other modes.

Experimental meta-analysis. This paper refers to a study as an experimental meta-analysis when it utilizes an *intervention variable*, that is, a single variable that accounts for effect size

differences. One example is Lozar Manfreda et al.'s (2008) paper, which defines the survey mode as the intervention variable that accounts for the differences in response rates. While this type of meta-analysis may subsequently consider additional variables by performing a homogeneity analysis (see below), the key characteristic of an experimental meta-analysis is that a single variable is initially used to quantify the effect of an intervention.

Non-experimental meta-analysis. In contrast to an experimental meta-analysis, a non-experimental meta-analysis immediately investigates multiple *non-experimental moderator variables* to account for effect size differences. An example of a non-experimental meta-analysis is the study by Edwards et al. (2002), in which the odds of responding to postal questionnaires are investigated according to an extensive set of 75 non-experimental moderator variables, corresponding to different questionnaire and study design strategies.

Homogeneity analysis. This approach can be used in a meta-analysis to investigate whether the variability in effects is present only due to chance (i.e., sampling error) or whether systematic differences exist in effect sizes between primary studies, which are explained by variables, such as study, sample, or treatment characteristics. A common method for investigating homogeneity is the Q test, which tests the null hypothesis of all studies sharing a common effect size against the alternative hypothesis of heterogeneity. Another method is the I^2 statistic, which reports the percentage of the variability in effect sizes that occurs due to heterogeneity (Borenstein et al. 2009; Card 2012). In the previous example by Lozar Manfreda et al. (2008), the homogeneity analysis indicated a statistically non-significant Q score at $\alpha = 0.05$ (59.9, $df = 44$, $p = 0.06$) suggesting homogeneity of the effect sizes. However, because the result was marginally

significant, the authors followed additional steps that are taken when heterogeneous effect sizes are assumed, which are discussed in the next paragraph.

Moderator analysis. If effect size heterogeneity is likely, an experimental meta-analysis can also utilize a moderator analysis, in which different variables (i.e., characteristics of primary studies) are examined to identify which variables, and to what extent, explain the systematic variability between the effect sizes (Card 2012; Cumming 2013). For example, Lozar Manfreda et al. (2008) conducted a moderator analysis identifying sample recruitment strategy, solicitation mode, and the number of contacts as the three moderators that systematically influence the response rate difference between web and other survey modes. To differentiate between moderators in experimental and non-experimental meta-analyses, this paper denotes moderators in non-experimental meta-analyses as *non-experimental moderators*.

Fixed-effect model (FEM). This is one type of model used in meta-analyses to compute the summary effect by assigning weights to studies. The FEM should be used when all primary studies are believed to be functionally identical, and the aim is to compute a summary effect that is not generalized beyond the population of the analysis. FEM weights largely ignore small studies, as large studies are assumed to provide better information for the true effect that is considered the same across primary studies (Hedges and Vevea 1998; Borenstein et al. 2010).

Random-effects model (REM). Assigning weights to studies is a different process under the REM than it is under the FEM (Borenstein et al. 2009). The REM allows for unconditional inferences and is appropriate when the studies are not functionally identical and the findings are to be generalized to a broader context. Specifically, the REM includes the between-study

variance as an additional variance source and allows for the effect size to differ between studies, which results in assigning more balanced relative weights to each study (Hedges and Vevea 1998; Borenstein et al. 2010).

Part B Lists of Bibliographic Databases and Search Terms

Each bibliographic harvester uses a different search interface, and searches as similar as possible were performed to search for publications related to the keywords “meta-analysis” and “survey.” Specifically, the search of the DiKUL bibliographic harvester used the phrase (SU meta-analy* OR SU meta-study) AND SU survey. The CLICsearch bibliographic harvester was searched with the phrase for subject entries relating to “survey questionnaire” OR “survey data” OR “survey meth*” OR “survey research” OR respondent* OR “mail* survey” OR “web* survey” OR “face* survey” OR F2F OR “telephone survey” OR “phone survey” OR interviewer OR CASI OR CASIC OR CATI OR CAPI OR CAWI OR “mixed-mode survey” OR “cross-sectional survey” OR “longitudinal survey,” with any other fields relating to “meta-analy*” OR “meta-study.” The DiKUL harvester searched 135 bibliographic databases, and the CLICsearch harvester searched 170 databases. Excluding repeated databases, both harvesters searched 265 different bibliographic databases. See Tables A1 and A2 below for a list of bibliographic databases included in each of the two harvesters.

Table A1. Bibliographic Databases (135 Total) Comprising the DiKUL Bibliographic Harvester

Tool

ABI/INFORM Complete (ProQuest)	Engineered Materials Abstracts (ProQuest)	PERINORM International
Academic Search Complete (EBSCO)	ePrints FRI	PILOTS (Published International Literature On Traumatic Stress)
AccessMedicine	ERIC (EBSCO)	Political Science Complete (EBSCO)
ACM Digital Library	FindINFO	Preprinti IMFM
ACS Online Package	FSTA (Food Science and Technology Abstracts)	Primal Pictures
AgEcon: Research in Agricultural and Applied Economics	GeoScienceWorld (GSW)	ProQuest Central
AGRICOLA Articles (NAL)	GreenFILE (EBSCO)	ProQuest Computing
AGRICOLA Books (NAL)	GVIN	ProQuest Materials Science Collection
AGRIS (FAO)	Hein online	ProQuest Social Science Journals
Allied & Complementary Medicine (Ovid)	Highwire Press	ProQuest Telecommunications
Aluminium Industry Abstracts (ProQuest)	ICONDA	PsycArticles
American Medical Association (AMA journals)	IEEE Xplore	PsycBooks
American Physical Society (APS) Journals	IOP Science (Institute of Physics Journals)	PsycINFO
Analytical Abstracts	IOS Press	PsycTESTS
AnthroSource	IUS-INFO	PubMed
ArXiv.org	JSTOR	Regional Business News (EBSCO)
ASCE Library	Keesing's World News Archive	Religious & Theological Abstracts
Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals	Laboratory Hazards Bulletin	RILM Music Literature (EBSCO)
Best Practice (BMJ)	Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (EBSCO)	RSC Gold
BioMed Central Journals	Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts – LLBA (ProQuest)	SAGE Journals Online
bizi.si	LISA: Library and Information Science Abstracts (ProQuest)	ScienceDirect (Elsevier)
Business Source Premier (EBSCO)	LISTA Library, Information Science & Technology (EBSCO)	Science Online (Science Magazine)
CAB Abstracts	Literature Resource Center (Gale)	SciFinder
Ceramic Abstracts (ProQuest)	MasterFILE Premier (EBSCO)	Scopus
Chemical Hazards in Industry	Materials Business File (ProQuest)	SHADIS
CINAHL with Full Text (EBSCO)	MathSciNet (AMS)	Slovarji AMEBIS
Cochrane Library (Wiley)	MDConsult	Social Services Abstracts (ProQuest)
Communication & Mass Media Complete (EBSCO)	MECH	SocINDEX with Full Text (EBSCO)
Copper Technical Reference Library (ProQuest)	MEDLINE (EBSCO)	Sociological Abstracts (ProQuest)

Corrosion Abstracts (ProQuest)	MEDLINE (Ovid)	SPORTDiscus with Full Text (EBSCO)
Credo Online Reference Service, Academic Core Collection	METADEX (ProQuest)	SpringerLink
Dela FDV	Military & Government (EBSCO)	Springer Protocols
Delovni zvezki EF	MLA International Bibliography (Gale)	Synthetic Reaction Updates
Dentistry & Oral Sciences Source	Natural Product Updates	Tax-Fin_Lex
Digitalna knjižnica BF	nature.com	Taylor & Francis Online
Directory of Open Access Journals	Naxos Music Library	TEMA@ Technology and Management
Dissertations and Theses A&I (ProQuest)	Naxos Music Library Jazz	Ulrichsweb.com
DRUGG – Digitalni repozitorij FGG, UL	Naxos Video Library	UNWTO eLibrary
DXplain	NLM Gateway	WARC
eBook Business Collection (EBSCO)	OECDiLibrary	Web of Science
eBook Collection (EBSCO)	Oxford Art Online	Wiley Online Library – Journals
EconLit with Full Text (EBSCO)	Oxford English Dictionary Online	WorldCat – OCLC
Embase Ovid	Oxford Journals Online	Your Journals@Ovid Full Text (Ovid)
Emerald Management Xtra	Oxford Music Online	Zaključna dela EF
Encyclopedia Britannica Online Academic Edition	PeFprints	Zentralblatt MATH – English XML

SOURCE.— Central Technological Library at the University of Ljubljana (2017).

Table A2. Bibliographic Databases (170 Total) Comprising the CLICsearch Bibliographic

Harvester Tool

Academic Search Premier Popular Databases	Gartner Research	New York Times Index
Academic Video Online	GenderWatch	News & Newspapers
ACLS Humanities E-Book collection	General Science Collection	Newseum: Today's Front Page
ACS Publications	Global Newsstream	Nexis Uni
AgEcon Search	Google News	NPR (National Public Radio)
Agricola	Google Scholar	OAIster
Al Jazeera	GPO Monthly Catalog	OCLC Electronic Books
Alexander Street Press	GreenFILE	Oracle (Hamline University)
Alt HealthWatch	Hamline Institutional Data	Oxford English Dictionary
Annual Reviews	Handbook of Latin American Studies (HLAS)	Oxford Reference Online
AnthroSource	HathiTrust	PapersFirst
Art and Architecture streaming video	Health Sciences streaming videos	Philosopher's Index
Art Full Text	Health Source - Consumer Edition	Picture Book Database
ArticleFirst	Health Source - Nursing/Academic Edition	Points of View Reference Center
Artstor	HeinOnline	Primary Search
Associated Press (AP)	Historical Abstracts with full text	ProceedingsFirst
BBC News	Historical Minneapolis Tribune	Professional Development Collection
Bibliography of the History of Art	Historical New York Times	Project MUSE
Britannica Academic	History streaming video	ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global Full Text
Business Searching Interface	ICPSR Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research	ProQuest News & Newspapers
Business Source Premier Popular Databases	Informe Académico	Proquest Newsstand
Cambridge Core	InfoTrac	PsycARTICLES
Case Studies in the Environment	InfoTrac Student Edition	Psychology & Counseling streaming video
Catalog of Art Museum Images Online (CAMIO)	Ingenta Connect	PsycINFO Popular Databases
Christian Science Monitor	IOPscience	Public Library of Science (PLoS)
Chronicle of Higher Education	Job & Career Accelerator	PubMed Central
Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers	JoVE Science Education Advanced Biology	PubMed.gov
CIOS (Communication Institute for Online Scholarship)	JoVE Science Education Basic Biology	RefWorks
City Pages	JoVe Science Education Chemistry	Regional Business News
Clase/Periodica	JoVE Video Articles - Biochemistry	Research InContext
CLICsearch	JSTOR Popular Databases	Reuters
ComAbstracts	Kanopy streaming video	Royal Society of Chemistry publications

ComIndex	Kids InfoBits	S&P Capital IQ NetAdvantage
Communication and Mass Media Complete	LearningExpress Library	SAGE Journals Online
Computer Skills Center	LexisNexis	Science & Engineering streaming video
Consumer Health Complete	Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts (LISTA)	Science Reference Center
CQ Researcher	Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA)	ScienceDirect
Credo Reference	Literature Resource Center	SciFinder
Criminal Justice Abstracts	London Times	Social Science Research Network (SSRN)
Current News	Lynda.com	Social Sciences streaming video
Data-Planet Statistical Datasets	MasterFILE Premier	Social Services Abstracts
Data-Planet Statistical Ready Reference	MathSciNet	Sociological Abstracts
Dissertations	Medline Plus	Springer eBooks
Diversity streaming video	Middle Search Plus	SpringerLink
Ebook Central	Minneapolis StarTribune	St. Paul Pioneer Press (TwinCities.com)
eBooks Collection (EBSCO)	Minnesota Daily	Standard and Poors
Ebooks Minnesota	Minnesota Historical Society Collections	StarTribune
EBSCO MegaFILE	Minnesota Reflections	Student Edition - K12 (Gale)
EconLit	MNopedia	Student Resources in Context
Education Full Text (EBSCO) Popular Databases	Modern Language Association (MLA) International Bibliography	Taylor & Francis
Education Index Retrospective (1929-1983)	Morningstar Investment Research Center	Teacher Reference Center
Educator's Reference Complete	MPR (Minnesota Public Radio)	UN News Centre
Electronic Books	Music & Performing Arts streaming video	Wall Street Journal
ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center)	National Criminal Justice Reference Service Abstracts (NCJRS)	Washington Post
Expanded Academic ASAP	Naxos Music Library	Wiley Online Library
Films on Demand	NetAdvantage	WorldCat Dissertations and Theses
Gale Virtual Reference Library	New York Times	

SOURCE.— Bush Memorial Library (2018).

Part C List of Included Manuscripts

Table A3 summarizes the 54 eligible manuscripts and introduces the ID column, which enumerates the studies and effect sizes that are nested within the manuscripts. The IDs in Table A3 match the IDs used in Tables A5 and A6 (see Part E of the Online Appendix), so Table A3 can be used to extrapolate bibliographic information about the authors and the titles of manuscripts. In addition, Table A3 summarizes meta-analytic designs (i.e., experimental and non-experimental) and search reporting levels (i.e., how exhaustive is the approach to documenting the literature search and selection in a particular meta-analysis).

Table A3. List of 54 Manuscripts Included in the Systematic Review, Manuscript IDs, Studies and Effect Sizes Reported within Manuscripts, Type of Meta-Analytic Design, and Level of Literature Search Reporting

Manuscript reference	Manuscript ID(s) ^a	Study within manuscript	Effect size within manuscript	Search reporting ^b	Meta-analytic design ^c
Churchill and Peter (1984)	M08/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
Armstrong and Lusk (1987)	M03/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
	M03/1.2	1	2	Level 0	E
	M03/1.3	1	3	Level 0	E
	M03/1.4	1	4	Level 0	E
de Leeuw and van der Zouwen (1988)	M13/1.1	1	1	Level 1	E
	M13/1.2	1	2	Level 1	E
	M13/1.3	1	3	Level 1	E
	M13/1.4	1	4	Level 1	E
	M13/1.5	1	5	Level 1	E
R. J. Fox, Crask, and Kim (1988)	M19/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
Yammarino, Skinner, and Childers (1991)	M52/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
	M12/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
	M12/1.2	1	2	Level 1	N-E
	M12/1.3	1	3	Level 1	N-E
	M12/1.4	1	4	Level 1	N-E
de Leeuw (1992)	M12/1.5	1	5	Level 1	N-E
	M24/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
Hopkins and Gullickson (1992)	M24/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E

Aguinis, Pierce, and Quigley (1993)	M01/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
Church (1993)	M07/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
Hox and de Leeuw (1994)	M25/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
Patrick et al. (1994)	M36/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
	M36/1.2	1	2	Level 1	N-E
	M36/1.3	1	3	Level 1	N-E
	M36/1.4	1	4	Level 1	N-E
Singer, von Thurn, and Miller (1995)	M46/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
Richman et al. (1999)	M40/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
	M40/1.2	1	2	Level 0	E
	M40/1.3	1	3	Level 0	E
Singer et al. (1999)	M47/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
Cook, Heath, and Thompson (2000)	M09/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
P. Edwards et al. (2002)	M34/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
Etter, Cucherat, and Perneger (2002)	M17/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
Lensvelt-Mulders et al. (2005)	M28/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
	M28/2.2	2	2	Level 1	N-E
Ross, Forbes, and Blackburn (2005)	M42/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
Cycyota and Harrison (2006)	M10/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
Dolders et al. (2006)	M16/1.1	1	1	Level 2	E
Göritz (2006)	M22/1.1	1	1	Level 1	E
	M22/1.2	1	2	Level 1	E
Nakash et al. (2006)	M33/1.1	1	1	Level 2	N-E
Bremner et al. (2007)	M04/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
	M04/1.2	1	2	Level 1	N-E
Shih and Fan (2007)	M43/1.1	1	1	Level 1	E
	M43/2.2	2	2	Level 1	N-E
de Leeuw et al. (2007)	M14/1.1	1	1	Level 1	E
	M14/1.2	1	2	Level 1	E
Tourangeau and Yan (2007)	M48/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
	M48/2.2	2	2	Level 0	E
	M48/2.3	2	3	Level 0	E
	M48/2.4	2	4	Level 0	E
	M48/3.5	3	5	Level 0	E
Groves and Peytcheva (2008)	M23/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
Lozar Manfreda et al. (2008)	M29/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
Shih and Fan (2008)	M44/1.1	1	1	Level 1	E
P. J. Edwards et al. (2009)	M35/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
	M35/1.2	1	2	Level 0	N-E
Fanelli (2009)	M18/1.1	1	1	Level 2	N-E
Shih and Fan (2009)	M45/1.1	1	1	Level 1	E
Van Horn, Green, and Martinussen (2009)	M49/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
Anseel et al. (2010)	M02/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
Peeters and Stiggelbout (2010)	M37/1.1	1	1	Level 1	E

Rolstad, Adler, and Ryden (2011)	M41/1.1	1	1	Level 1	E
Ye, Fulton, and Tourangeau (2011)	M54/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
	M54/1.2	1	2	Level 0	E
Medway and Fulton (2012)	M31/1.1	1	1	Level 1	E
Cho, Johnson, and VanGeest (2013)	M06/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
Villar, Callegaro, and Yang (2013)	M50/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
Yarger et al. (2013)	M53/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
	M11/1.1	1	1	Level 2	E
	M11/1.2	1	2	Level 2	E
	M11/1.3	1	3	Level 2	E
	M11/1.4	1	4	Level 2	E
David and Ware (2014)	M11/1.5	1	5	Level 2	E
	M15/1.1	1	1	Level 2	E
	M15/1.2	1	2	Level 2	E
Dodou and de Winter (2014)	M15/1.1	1	1	Level 2	E
	M15/1.2	1	2	Level 2	E
Kormos and Gifford (2014)	M26/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
Perneger et al. (2014)	M38/1.1	1	1	Level 2	E
Pupovac and Fanelli (2014)	M39/1.1	1	1	Level 2	N-E
	M39/1.2	1	2	Level 2	N-E
Callegaro et al. (2015)	M05/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
	M05/1.2	1	2	Level 0	E
Gnambs and Kaspar (2015)	M20/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
Mavletova and Couper (2015)	M30/1.1	1	1	Level 0	N-E
Mercer et al. (2015)	M32/1.1	1	1	Level 1	N-E
Voutilainen et al. (2015)	M51/1.1	1	1	Level 2	N-E
	M51/1.2	1	2	Level 2	N-E
Gnambs and Kaspar (2016)	M21/1.1	1	1	Level 0	E
	M21/2.2	2	2	Level 0	E
	M21/3.3	3	3	Level 0	E
Lee et al. (2016)	M27/1.1	1	1	Level 2	N-E

^a Paper ID in Table A3 matches the paper ID in Tables A5 and A6.

^b Refers to how precisely the literature search and selection is documented, which is discussed in the systematic review and summarized in Table 1. Level 0 means that the paper reports only the final number of eligible papers.

Level 1 denotes reporting of at least one other metric, but not enough information to construct a PRISMA chart.

Level 2 means that the study included a PRISMA or comparable chart.

^c E stands for an experimental meta-analytic design and N-E for a non-experimental meta-analytic design.

Part D List of Excluded Manuscripts

Table A4 below lists 85 of the 139 full-text manuscripts that were excluded during full-text evaluation¹ on the basis of the defined criteria. The full text was evaluated for all search results where eligibility was not possible to be determined beyond any doubt solely on the basis of the appendix, or the appendix was unavailable. Each of the 85 manuscripts listed below did not meet at least one of the two broad criteria (i.e., the study is a meta-analysis, and the meta-analysis is a study in survey methodology), which are both defined with additional sub-criteria in the systematic review’s method section. In addition, studies reporting identical results published multiple times were eligible to be included only once (e.g., a journal article published again as a book chapter with identical results would be eligible only once).

Table A4. List of 85 Manuscripts Excluded during Full-Text Evaluation

#	Manuscript reference	Manuscript title
1	Ahtiainen et al. (2015)	Importance of Economic, Social, and Environmental Objectives of Agriculture for Stakeholders—a Meta-Analysis
2	Altare, Delbiso, and Guha-Sapir (2016)	Child Wasting in Emergency Pockets: A Meta-Analysis of Small-Scale Surveys from Ethiopia
3	Andrews (1984)	Construct Validity and Error Components of Survey Measures: A Structural Modeling Approach
4	Armstrong (1990)	Class of Mail Does Affect Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires: Evidence from Meta-Analysis
5	Arnulf et al. (2014)	Predicting Survey Responses: How and Why Semantics Shape Survey Statistics on Organizational Behaviour
6	Asch, Jedrzejewski, and Christakis (1997)	Response Rates to Mail Surveys Published in Medical Journals
7	Barber, Barnes, and Carlson (2013)	Random and Systematic Error Effects of Insomnia on Survey Behavior
8	Baruch (1999)	Response Rate in Academic Studies-A Comparative Analysis
9	Benton (2014)	Using Meta-Regression to Explore Moderating Effects in Surveys of International Achievement
10	Birkhäuser et al. (2017)	Trust in the Health Care Professional and Health Outcome: A Meta-Analysis

¹ See Figure 1 for a PRISMA flowchart of the manuscript selection process.

11	Bowman and DeLucia (1992)	Accuracy of Self-Reported Weight: A Meta-Analysis
12	Boyle et al. (2016)	Investigating Internet and Mail Implementation of Stated-Preference Surveys While Controlling for Differences in Sample Frames
13	Brannick, Yang, and Cafri (2011)	Comparison of Weights for Meta-Analysis of r and d Under Realistic Conditions
14	Breen et al. (2010)	Cost-Effectiveness of Follow-up Contact for a Postal Survey: A Randomised Controlled Trial
15	Bruck and Ceci (1999)	The Suggestibility of Children's Memory
16	Button and Pinney (2004)	A Meta-Analysis of Outcome Rating Scales in Foot and Ankle Surgery: Is There a Valid, Reliable, and Responsive System?
17	Chiarotto et al. (2016)	Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire and Oswestry Disability Index: Which Has Better Measurement Properties for Measuring Physical Functioning in Nonspecific Low Back Pain?
18	Choi and Kim (2016)	A Meta-Analysis of the Variables Related to Job Satisfaction among Korean Nurses
19	de Leeuw (2013)	Thirty Years of Survey Methodology / Thirty Years of "BMS."
20	Desmarais and Don Read (2011)	After 30 Years, What Do We Know about What Jurors Know? A Meta-Analytic Review of Lay Knowledge Regarding Eyewitness Factors
21	Duhachek, Coughlan, and Iacobucci (2005)	Results on the Standard Error of the Coefficient Alpha Index of Reliability
22	Dykema et al. (2013)	Surveying Clinicians by Web: Current Issues in Design and Administration
23	Fan and Yan (2010)	Factors Affecting Response Rates of the Web Survey: A Systematic Review
24	Filippin and Crosetto (2016)	A Reconsideration of Gender Differences in Risk Attitudes
25	Fox, Schwartz, and Hart (2006)	Work-Family Balance and Academic Advancement in Medical Schools
26	Gelman, Stevens, and Chan (2003)	Regression Modeling and Meta-Analysis for Decision Making: A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Incentives in Telephone Surveys
27	Glynn, Hayes, and Shanahan (1997)	Perceived Support for One's Opinions and Willingness to Speak Out: A Meta-Analysis of Survey Studies on the "Spiral of Silence."
28	Goyder (1982)	Further Evidence on Factors Affecting Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires
29	Groves (1990)	Theories and Methods of Telephone Surveys
30	Hays, Liu, and Kapteyn (2015)	Use of Internet Panels to Conduct Surveys
31	Heberlein and Baumgartner (1978)	Factors Affecting Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires: A Quantitative Analysis of the Published Literature
32	Hidano and Kato (2008)	Determining Variability of Willingness to Pay for Japan's Antiglobal-Warming Policies: A Comparison of Contingent Valuation Surveys
33	Hlebec and Kogovšek (2012)	Different Approaches to Measure Ego-Centered Social Support Networks: A Meta-Analysis
34	Holden and Edwards (1989)	Parental Attitudes toward Child Rearing: Instruments, Issues, and Implications
35	Holleman (1999)	Wording Effects in Survey Research Using Meta-Analysis to Explain the Forbid/Allow Asymmetry
36	Hox, de Leeuw, and Chang (2012)	Nonresponse versus Measurement Error: Are Reluctant Respondents Worth Pursuing?
37	Ingram and Ternes (2016)	The Detection of Content-Based Invalid Responding: A Meta-Analysis of the MMPI-2-Restructured Form's (MMPI-2-RF) over-Reporting Validity Scales
38	Ioannidis et al. (2016)	On a Modular Approach to the Design of Integrated Social Surveys

39	Johns and Miraglia (2015)	The Reliability, Validity, and Accuracy of Self-Reported Absenteeism from Work: A Meta-Analysis
40	Jonge, Veenhoven, and Arends (2014)	Homogenizing Responses to Different Survey Questions on the Same Topic: Proposal of a Scale Homogenization Method Using a Reference Distribution
41	Ju et al. (2006)	Rigor in MIS Survey Research: In Search of Ideal Survey Methodological Attributes
42	Keusch (2015)	Why Do People Participate in Web Surveys? Applying Survey Participation Theory to Internet Survey Data Collection
43	Knäuper et al. (2016)	How Aging Affects Self-Reports
44	Knoppen et al. (2015)	A Comprehensive Assessment of Measurement Equivalence in Operations Management
45	Krebber et al. (2014)	Prevalence of Depression in Cancer Patients: A Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Interviews and Self-Report Instruments
46	Krosnick and Schuman (1988)	Attitude Intensity, Importance, and Certainty and Susceptibility to Response Effects
47	Kunze, de Jong, and Bruch (2016)	Consequences of Collective-Focused Leadership and Differentiated Individual-Focused Leadership
48	Lowndes et al. (2012)	Polling Booth Surveys: A Novel Approach for Reducing Social Desirability Bias in HIV-Related Behavioural Surveys in Resource-Poor Settings
49	Lubinski (2016)	From Terman to Today: A Century of Findings on Intellectual Precocity
50	Mavis et al. (2015)	Patient Participation in Clinical Encounters: A Systematic Review to Identify Self-Report Measures
51	McGonagle, Schoeni, and Couper (2013)	The Effects of a Between-Wave Incentive Experiment on Contact Update and Production Outcomes in a Panel Study
52	Mead and Drasgow (1993)	Equivalence of Computerized and Paper-and-Pencil Cognitive Ability Tests: A Meta-Analysis
53	Page et al. (2006)	Recruit to Mammography Screening: A Randomised Trial and Meta-Analysis of Invitation Letters and Telephone Calls
54	Peeters (2011)	Mind the Gap: Explanations for the Differences in Utilities between Respondent Groups
55	Pit, Vo, and Pyakurel (2014)	The Effectiveness of Recruitment Strategies on General Practitioner's Survey Response Rates – a Systematic Review
56	Rausch, Dekker, and Rettenberger (2017)	The Construct of Sexual Openness for Females in Steady Intimate Relationships
57	Rietbergen et al. (2016)	Expert Elicitation of Study Weights for Bayesian Analysis and Meta-Analysis
58	Rogelberg et al. (2001)	Attitudes toward Surveys: Development of a Measure and Its Relationship to Respondent Behavior
59	Roth and BeVier (1998)	Response Rates in HRM/OB Survey Research: Norms and Correlates, 1990-1994
60	Saris and Gallhofer (2007)	Estimation of the Effects of Measurement Characteristics on the Quality of Survey Questions
61	A. C. Scherpenzeel and Saris (1997)	The Validity and Reliability of Survey Questions: A Meta-Analysis of MTMM Studies
62	A. Scherpenzeel and Saris (1993)	The Evaluation of Measurement Instruments By Meta-Analysis of Multitrait-Multimethod Studies
63	Schneider (2009)	Method Differences in Measuring Working Families' Time
64	Sheehan and McMillan (1999)	Response Variation in E-Mail Surveys: An Exploration

65	Shin, Johnson, and Rao (2012)	Survey Mode Effects on Data Quality: Comparison of Web and Mail Modes in a U.S. National Panel Survey
66	Sierra, Hyman, and Heiser (2012)	Ethnic Identity in Advertising: A Review and Meta-Analysis
67	Singer and Ye (2013)	The Use and Effects of Incentives in Surveys
68	Sixma, Spreeuwenberg, and van der Pasch (1998)	Patient Satisfaction with the General Practitioner: A Two-Level Analysis
69	Smith, Fisher, and Heath (2011)	Opportunities and Challenges in the Expansion of Cross-National Survey Research
70	Spector and Brannick (2010)	Common Method Issues: An Introduction to the Feature Topic in Organizational Research Methods
71	Sufek (2012)	Ordinary Poles Look at the Jews
72	Tanner et al. (2008)	A Meta-Study of the Values of Visitors to Four Protected Areas in the Western United States
73	Thompson and Cook (2002)	Stability of the Reliability of LibQual+™ Scores a Reliability Generalization Meta-Analysis Study
74	Torres van Grinsven, Bolko, and Bavdaž (2014)	In Search of Motivation for the Business Survey Response Task
75	Tourangeau, Couper, and Conrad (2013)	Up Means Good”: The Effect of Screen Position on Evaluative Ratings in Web Surveys
76	van der Waerden, Hoefnagels, and Hosman (2011)	Psychosocial Preventive Interventions to Reduce Depressive Symptoms in Low-SES Women at Risk: A Meta-Analysis
77	van der Zouwen and de Leeuw (1990)	The Relationship Between Mode of Administration and Quality of Data in Survey Research I
78	VanGeest, Johnson, and Welch (2007)	Methodologies for Improving Response Rates in Surveys of Physicians: A Systematic Review
79	Viola et al. (2016)	The Influence of Geographical and Economic Factors in Estimates of Childhood Abuse and Neglect Using the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire: A Worldwide Meta-Regression Analysis
80	Viswesvaran, Barrick, and Ones (1993)	How Definitive Are Conclusions Based on Survey Data: Estimating Robustness to Nonresponse
81	Warren and Halpern-Manners (2012)	Panel Conditioning in Longitudinal Social Science Surveys
82	Whitley (1988)	Sex Differences in Heterosexuals’ Attitudes toward Homosexuals: It Depends upon What You Ask
83	Worley et al. (2008)	Factor Structure of Scores From the Maslach Burnout Inventory: A Review and Meta-Analysis of 45 Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor-Analytic Studies
84	Yamazaki et al. (2015)	Effect of Obesity on the Effectiveness of Hormonal Contraceptives: An Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis
85	Yarnold and Mueser (1989)	Meta-Analyses of the Reliability of Type A Behaviour Measures

Part E Full Tables of Thematic Areas

The columns in Tables A5 and A6 structure the thematic areas of the effect sizes of the meta-analyses according to the seven dimensions of the Total Survey Error (TSE) paradigm. The rows consist of the intervention variables (for the experimental meta-analyses, see Table A5) and non-experimental moderator variables (for non-experimental meta-analyses, see Table A6) and are structured according to several survey design characteristics that are under vs. not under control of the researcher (e.g., Groves and Couper 1998; Vehovar et al. 2002). Accordingly, an individual cell in Tables A5 and A6 lists the IDs of manuscripts, studies, and effect sizes that correspond to a particular combination of TSE dimensions of the manuscript's research questions crossed with intervention/non-experimental moderator variables.

The ID format in the cells of Tables A5 and A6 precisely matches the ID format initially introduced in Table A3. For example, the ID M03/1.2 in Table A5 refers to manuscript M03, study 1, effect size 2. It can be interpreted from Table A3 as belonging to the manuscript by Armstrong and Lusk (1987). In fact, it is listed in Table A3 with IDs M03/1.1, M03/1.2, M03/1.3 and M03/1.4, meaning that the manuscript by Armstrong and Lusk (1987) reports one meta-analytic study but four effect sizes. In addition, cells of combinations in Tables A5 and A6 that do not make sense within the framework of survey methodology are marked with a light grey diagonal pattern. For example, it would not make sense to analyze how the personalization of survey invitations affects a processing error (e.g., data coding).

Table A5. Thematic Areas of Experimental Meta-Analyses: Effect Sizes (Structured by TSE) According to Intervention Variables

INTERVENTION VARIABLES		TOPICS OF EFFECT SIZES: by TSE (errors and biases)							
		Measurement related error/bias				Representation related error/bias			
		Specification	Measurement	Processing	Coverage	Sampling	Nonresponse	Adjustment	
		ID (the format matches Table A3 and enumerates the manuscript, study, and effect size)							
UNDER THE RESEARCHER'S CONTROL									
Survey design characteristics	Data quality (e.g., survey burden, item nonresponse, response quality)								
	Sample characteristics								
	Contacting protocols	Prenotification						M14/1.1; M14/1.2	
		Follow-up, reminders							
		Delivery, contacting method						M03/1.1; M03/1.2; M03/1.3; M03/1.4	
		Sponsorship, researcher							
		Personalization of invitations							
		Incentives						M07/1.1; M11/1.1; M11/1.2; M11/1.3; M11/1.4; M11/1.5; M22/1.1; M22/1.2; M24/1.1	
		Anonymity, confidentiality, data security						M38/1.1	
	Other								
Mode of administration		M13/1.1; M13/1.2; M13/1.4; M13/1.5; M15/1.1; M15/1.2; M20/1.1; M21/1.1; M21/2.2; M21/3.3; M40/1.1; M40/1.2; M40/1.3; M48/1.1; M54/1.1; M54/1.2					M13/1.3; M29/1.1; M31/1.1; M44/1.1; M43/1.1; M45/1.1		
	Topic: Content								

	Questionnaire design	Topic: Salience						
		Topic: Sensitivity						
		Format of questions	M05/1.1; M05/1.2					
		Format (general): Structure, length, visual	M48/3.5				M17/1.1; M41/1.1; M50/1.1	
	Target population type		M16/1.1; M37/1.1					
	Type of survey	Panel, cross-sectional, longitudinal						
		Other						
	Survey setting (e.g., individual vs. group administration, standardized laboratory environment)		M01/1.1; M48/2.2; M48/2.3; M48/2.4;					
	Interviewer	Socio-demographic characteristics						
		Experience						
		Expectations						
Other								
Other								
NOT UNDER THE RESEARCHER'S CONTROL								
Social environment	Economic conditions							
	Social conditions (e.g., institutions, cohesion)							
	Survey-taking climate (e.g., perceived legitimacy)							
	Neighborhood/environment (e.g., gatekeeping)							
	Urbanicity							
	National/country specifics							
	Other							
Technological environment								
Researcher-respondent interaction								
Respondent characteristics	Household structure (e.g., member characteristics)							
	Socio-demographic characteristics							
	Psychological predisposition, social desirability							
	Other							

SOURCE.—Values in cells based on analyses by the authors. Category labels for intervention variables are adapted from Groves and Couper (1998) and Vehovar et al. (2002). Category labels for topics of effect sizes (by TSE) are adapted from Groves et al. (2009) and Biemer (2010).

Table A6. Thematic Areas of Non-Experimental Meta-Analyses: Effect Sizes (Structured by TSE) According to Non-Experimental Moderator Variables

NON-EXPERIMENTAL MODERATOR VARIABLES		TOPICS OF EFFECT SIZES: by TSE (errors and biases)						
		Measurement related error/bias			Representation related error/bias			
		Specification	Measurement	Processing	Coverage	Sampling	Nonresponse	Adjustment
		ID (the format matches Table A3 and enumerates the manuscript, study, and effect size)						
UNDER THE RESEARCHER'S CONTROL								
Survey design characteristics	Data quality (e.g., survey burden, item nonresponse, response quality)		M08/1.1; M39/1.1; M39/1.2			M09/1.1; M32/1.1; M46/1.1; M47/1.1		
	Sample characteristics		M08/1.1; M39/1.1; M39/1.2; M51/1.1			M25/1.1; M30/1.1; M49/1.1		
	Contacting protocols	Prenotification					M02/1.1; M09/1.1; M10/1.1; M19/1.1; M23/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M52/1.1	
		Follow-up, reminders					M02/1.1; M06/1.1; M10/1.1; M19/1.1; M30/1.1; M33/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M43/2.2; M49/1.1; M52/1.1; M53/1.1	
		Delivery, contacting method		M18/1.1; M39/1.1; M39/1.2			M02/1.1; M09/1.1; M19/1.1; M30/1.1; M33/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M35/1.2; M43/2.2; M46/1.1; M52/1.1	

		Sponsorship, researcher					M02/1.1; M09/1.1; M10/1.1; M19/1.1; M23/1.1; M32/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M35/1.2; M52/1.1		
		Personalization of invitations					M02/1.1; M09/1.1; M10/1.1; M19/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M35/1.2; M52/1.1		
		Incentives					M02/1.1; M06/1.1; M09/1.1; M23/1.1; M30/1.1; M32/1.1; M33/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M35/1.2; M43/2.2; M47/1.1; M52/1.1; M53/1.1		
		Anonymity, confidentiality, data security					M02/1.1; M10/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M46/1.1; M52/1.1		
		Other							
	Mode of administration			M04/1.2; M08/1.1; M12/1.1; M12/1.3; M12/1.4; M12/1.5; M28/1.1; M28/2.2; M36/1.1; M36/1.2; M36/1.3; M36/1.4; M51/1.1				M02/1.1; M06/1.1; M12/1.2; M23/1.1; M25/1.1; M32/1.1; M35/1.1; M47/1.1; M53/1.1	
	Questionnaire design	Topic: Content		M04/1.1; M04/1.2; M08/1.1; M18/1.1; M26/1.1; M28/2.2; M39/1.1; M39/1.2; M42/1.1; M51/1.1				M09/1.1; M23/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1	
		Topic: Salience						M02/1.1; M09/1.1; M10/1.1; M23/1.1; M25/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M35/1.2	
		Topic: Sensitivity		M18/1.1; M28/1.1; M28/2.2				M09/1.1; M12/1.2; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M46/1.1	
		Format of questions							
		Format (general): Structure, length, visual		M08/1.1; M26/1.1; M28/2.2; M51/1.1; M51/1.2				M09/1.1; M19/1.1; M30/1.1; M33/1.1; M34/1.1; M35/1.1; M35/1.2; M46/1.1; M52/1.1	
	Target population type			M04/1.1; M08/1.1; M18/1.1; M26/1.1; M27/1.1; M36/1.1; M36/1.2; M36/1.3; M36/1.4;				M06/1.1; M09/1.1; M23/1.1; M43/2.2; M49/1.1; M53/1.1	

			M39/1.1; M39/1.2; M42/1.1; M51/1.1; M51/1.2					
Type of survey	Panel, cross-sectional, longitudinal							
	Other							
Survey setting (e.g., individual vs. group administration, standardized laboratory environment)			M04/1.2; M08/1.1; M27/1.1; M36/1.1; M36/1.2; M36/1.3; M36/1.4				M06/1.1; M30/1.1; M46/1.1; M43/2.2; M53/1.1	
Interviewer	Socio-demographic characteristics							
	Experience							
	Expectations							
	Other							
Other								
Other			M12/1.4; M18/1.1; M39/1.1; M39/1.2				M02/1.1; M06/1.1; M10/1.1; M25/1.1; M32/1.1	
NOT UNDER THE RESEARCHER'S CONTROL								
Social environment	Economic conditions							
	Social conditions (e.g., institutions, cohesion)							
	Survey-taking climate (e.g., perceived legitimacy)							
	Neighborhood/environment (e.g., gatekeeping)							
	Urbanicity							
	National/country specifics		M18/1.1; M26/1.1; M27/1.1; M39/1.1; M39/1.2				M06/1.1	
	Other							
Technological environment								
Researcher-respondent interaction								
Respondent characteristics	Household structure (e.g., member characteristics)							
	Socio-demographic characteristics							
	Psychological predisposition, social desirability							
	Other							

SOURCE.— Values in cells based on own analyses by authors. Category labels for non-experimental moderator variables are adapted from Groves and Couper (1998) and Vehovar et al. (2002). Category labels for topics of effect sizes (by TSE) are adapted from Groves et al. (2009) and Biemer (2010).

References

- *Aguinis, Herman, Charles A. Pierce, and Brian M. Quigley. 1993. Conditions Under Which a Bogus Pipeline Procedure Enhances the Validity of Self-Reported Cigarette Smoking: A Meta-Analytic Review¹. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 23:352–73. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1993.tb01092.x/abstract>.
- Ahtiainen, Heini, Eija Pouta, Eero Liski, Sami Myyrä, and Aino Assmuth. 2015. Importance of Economic, Social, and Environmental Objectives of Agriculture for Stakeholders—a Meta-Analysis. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 39:1047–68. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/21683565.2015.1073207>.
- Altare, Chiara, Tefera Darge Delbiso, and Debarati Guha-Sapir. 2016. Child Wasting in Emergency Pockets: A Meta-Analysis of Small-Scale Surveys from Ethiopia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 13:178. Available at: <http://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/13/2/178>.
- Andrews, Frank M. 1984. Construct Validity and Error Components of Survey Measures: A Structural Modeling Approach. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48:409–42. Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/poq/article/48/2/409/1870805>.
- *Anseel, Friderik, Filip Lievens, Eveline Schollaert, and Beata Choragwicka. 2010. Response Rates in Organizational Science, 1995-2008: A Meta-Analytic Review and Guidelines for Survey Researchers. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 25:335–49. Available at: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10869-010-9157-6>.

- Armstrong, J. Scott. 1990. Class of Mail Does Affect Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires: Evidence from Meta-Analysis. *Journal of the Market Research Society* 32:469–71. Available at: https://repository.upenn.edu/marketing_papers/92/.
- *Armstrong, J. Scott, and Edward J. Lusk. 1987. Return Postage in Mail Surveys: A Meta-Analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51:233–48. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/51/2/233.abstract>.
- Arnulf, Jan Ketil, Kai Rune Larsen, Øyvind Lund Martinsen, and Chih How Bong. 2014. Predicting Survey Responses: How and Why Semantics Shape Survey Statistics on Organizational Behaviour. *PLoS One* 9 (9):e106361. Available at: <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0106361>.
- Asch, David A., Kathryn M. Jedrzewski, and Nicholas A. Christakis. 1997. Response Rates to Mail Surveys Published in Medical Journals. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 50:1129–36. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9368521>.
- Barber, Larissa K., Christopher M. Barnes, and Kevin D. Carlson. 2013. Random and Systematic Error Effects of Insomnia on Survey Behavior. *Organizational Research Methods* 16:616–49. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1094428113493120>.
- Baruch, Yehuda. 1999. Response Rate in Academic Studies-A Comparative Analysis. *Human Relations* 52:421–38. Available at: <http://hum.sagepub.com/content/52/4/421>.
- Benton, Tom. 2014. Using Meta-Regression to Explore Moderating Effects in Surveys of International Achievement. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation* 19 (3):1–9. Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1031263>.
- Biemer, Paul P. 2010. Total Survey Error: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74:817–48. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/74/5/817.abstract>.

- Birkhäuser, Johanna, Jens Gaab, Joe Kossowsky, Sebastian Hasler, Peter Krummenacher, Christoph Werner, and Heike Gerger. 2017. Trust in the Health Care Professional and Health Outcome: A Meta-Analysis. *PLoS ONE* 12 (2):e0170988. Available at: <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0170988>.
- Borenstein, Michael, Larry V. Hedges, Julian P. T. Higgins, and Hannah R. Rothstein. 2009. *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. Statistics in Practice. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Borenstein, Michael, Larry V. Hedges, Julian P.T. Higgins, and Hannah R. Rothstein. 2010. A Basic Introduction to Fixed-Effect and Random-Effects Models for Meta-Analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods* 1:97–111. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jrsm.12/abstract>.
- Bowman, Robert L., and Janice L. DeLucia. 1992. Accuracy of Self-Reported Weight: A Meta-Analysis. *Behavior Therapy* 23:637–55. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0005789405802266>.
- Boyle, Kevin, Mark Morrison, Darla Macdonald, Roderick Duncan, and John Rose. 2016. Investigating Internet and Mail Implementation of Stated-Preference Surveys While Controlling for Differences in Sample Frames. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 64:401–19. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10640-015-9876-2>.
- Brannick, Michael T., Liu-Qin Yang, and Guy Cafri. 2011. Comparison of Weights for Meta-Analysis of r and d Under Realistic Conditions. *Organizational Research Methods* 14:587–607. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1094428110368725>.
- Breen, Courtney L., Anthony P. Shakeshaft, Christopher M. Doran, Rob W. Sanson-Fisher, and Richard P. Mattick. 2010. Cost-Effectiveness of Follow-up Contact for a Postal Survey: A Randomised Controlled Trial. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 34:508–12. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1753-6405.2010.00598.x>.

- *Bremner, Karen E., Christopher A. K. Y. Chong, George Tomlinson, Shabbir M. H. Alibhai, and Murray D. Krahn. 2007. A Review and Meta-Analysis of Prostate Cancer Utilities. *Medical Decision Making* 27:288–98. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0272989X07300604>.
- Bruck, Maggie, and Stephen J. Ceci. 1999. The Suggestibility of Children’s Memory. *Annual Review of Psychology* 50:419–39. Available at: <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.419>.
- Bush Memorial Library. 2018. Databases & Articles. Available at: <https://bushlibraryguides.hamline.edu/find/databases>.
- Button, Gavin, and Stephen Pinney. 2004. A Meta-Analysis of Outcome Rating Scales in Foot and Ankle Surgery: Is There a Valid, Reliable, and Responsive System? *Foot & Ankle International* 25:521–25. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/107110070402500802?journalCode=faib>.
- *Callegaro, Mario, Michael H. Murakami, Ziv Tepman, and Vani Henderson. 2015. Yes-No Answers versus Check-All in Self-Administered Modes. *International Journal of Market Research* 57:203–23. Available at: https://www.mrs.org.uk/ijmr_article/article/103786.
- Card, Noel. A. 2012. *Applied Meta-Analysis for Social Science Research*. Methodology in the Social Sciences. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Central Technological Library at the University of Ljubljana. 2017. DiKUL Search: Catalog of Information Sources. Available at: <http://dikul.uni-lj.si/viri/>.
- Chiarotto, Alessandro, Lara J. Maxwell, Caroline B. Terwee, George A. Wells, Peter Tugwell, and Raymond W. Ostelo. 2016. Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire and Oswestry Disability Index: Which Has Better Measurement Properties for Measuring Physical Functioning in Nonspecific Low Back Pain? Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Physical*

Therapy 96:1620–37. Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/ptj/article/96/10/1620/2870251>.

*Cho, Young Ik, Timothy P. Johnson, and Jonathan B. VanGeest. 2013. Enhancing Surveys of Health Care Professionals A Meta-Analysis of Techniques to Improve Response. *Evaluation & the Health Professions* 36:382–407. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23975761>.

Choi, So Eun, and Sang Dol Kim. 2016. A Meta-Analysis of the Variables Related to Job Satisfaction among Korean Nurses. *Contemporary Nurse* 52:462–76. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10376178.2016.1221736>.

*Church, Allan H. 1993. Estimating the Effect of Incentives on Mail Survey Response Rates: A Meta-Analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 57:62–79. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/57/1/62.short>.

*Churchill, Gilbert A., Jr., and J. Paul Peter. 1984. Research Design Effects on the Reliability of Rating Scales: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research* 21:360–75. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3151463>.

*Cook, Colleen, Fred Heath, and Russel L. Thompson. 2000. A Meta-Analysis of Response Rates in Web- or Internet-Based Surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 60:821–36. Available at: <http://epm.sagepub.com/content/60/6/821.abstract>.

Cumming, Geoff. 2013. *Understanding The New Statistics: Effect Sizes, Confidence Intervals, and Meta-Analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.

*Cycyota, Cynthia S., and David A. Harrison. 2006. What (Not) to Expect When Surveying Executives: A Meta-Analysis of Top Manager Response Rates and Techniques over Time. *Organizational Research Methods* 9:133–60. Available at: <http://orm.sagepub.com/content/9/2/133>.

- *David, Michael C., and Robert S. Ware. 2014. Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials Supports the Use of Incentives for Inducing Response to Electronic Health Surveys. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 67:1210–21. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0895435614003278>.
- *de Leeuw, Edith D. 1992. Empirical Evidence of Mode Effects: A Meta-Analysis. In *Data Quality in Mail, Telephone and Face to Face Surveys*, 21–33. Amsterdam: T. T. Publikaties. Available at: <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED374136>.
- . 2013. Thirty Years of Survey Methodology / Thirty Years of “BMS.” *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology / Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique* 120:47–59. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24311189>.
- *de Leeuw, Edith D., Mario Callegaro, Joop Hox, Elly Korendijk, and Gerty Lensvelt-Mulders. 2007. The Influence of Advance Letters on Response in Telephone Surveys: A Meta-Analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 71:413–43. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/71/3/413>.
- *de Leeuw, Edith D., and Johannes van der Zouwen. 1988. Data Quality in Telephone and Face to Face Surveys: A Comparative Meta-Analysis. In *Telephone Survey Methodology*, edited by Robert M. Groves, Paul P. Biemer, Lars E. Lyberg, James T. Massey, William L. Nicholls II, and Joseph Waksberg. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Desmarais, Sarah, and J. Don Read. 2011. After 30 Years, What Do We Know about What Jurors Know? A Meta-Analytic Review of Lay Knowledge Regarding Eyewitness Factors. *Law and Human Behavior* 35:200–210. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41488989>.
- *Dodou, D., and J. C. F. de Winter. 2014. Social Desirability Is the Same in Offline, Online, and Paper Surveys: A Meta-Analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior* 36:487–95. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563214002143>.

- *Dolders, Maria G. T., Maurice P. A. Zeegers, Wim Groot, and André Ament. 2006. A Meta-Analysis Demonstrates No Significant Differences between Patient and Population Preferences. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 59:653–64. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0895435606000114>.
- Duhachek, Adam, Anne T. Coughlan, and Dawn Iacobucci. 2005. Results on the Standard Error of the Coefficient Alpha Index of Reliability. *Marketing Science* 24:294–301. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2693300.
- Dykema, Jennifer, Nathan R. Jones, Tara Piché, and John Stevenson. 2013. Surveying Clinicians by Web: Current Issues in Design and Administration. *Evaluation & the Health Professions* 36:352–81. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0163278713496630>.
- *Edwards, Phil, Ian Roberts, Mike Clarke, Carolyn Diguseppi, Sarah Pratap, Reinhard Wentz, and Irene Kwan. 2002. Increasing Response Rates To Postal Questionnaires: Systematic Review. *British Medical Journal* 324:1183–85. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25228325>.
- *Edwards, Philip James, Ian W. Roberts, Mike J. Clarke, Carolyn Diguseppi, Reinhard Wentz, and Irene Kwan. 2009. Methods to Increase Response to Postal and Electronic Questionnaires. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009 (3):1–533. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.MR000008.pub4/abstract>.
- *Etter, Jean-François, Michel Cucherat, and Thomas V. Perneger. 2002. Questionnaire Color and Response Rates to Mailed Surveys: A Randomized trial And a Meta-Analysis. *Evaluation & the Health Professions* 25:185–99. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12026752>.

Fan, Weimiao, and Zheng Yan. 2010. Factors Affecting Response Rates of the Web Survey: A Systematic Review. *Computers in Human Behavior* 26:132–39. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563209001708>.

*Fanelli, Daniele. 2009. How Many Scientists Fabricate and Falsify Research? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Survey Data. *PLOS ONE* 4 (5):e5738. Available at: <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0005738>.

Filippin, Antonio, and Paolo Crosetto. 2016. A Reconsideration of Gender Differences in Risk Attitudes. *Management Science* 62:3138–60. Available at: <https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/mnsc.2015.2294>.

Fox, Geri, Alan Schwartz, and Katherine M. Hart. 2006. Work-Family Balance and Academic Advancement in Medical Schools. *Academic Psychiatry* 30:227–234. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1176/appi.ap.30.3.227>.

*Fox, Richard J., Melvin R. Crask, and Johghoon Kim. 1988. Mail Survey Response Rate: A Meta-Analysis of Selected Techniques for Inducing Response. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 52:467–91. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/52/4/467.short>.

Gelman, Andrew, Matt Stevens, and Valerie Chan. 2003. Regression Modeling and Meta-Analysis for Decision Making: A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Incentives in Telephone Surveys. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 21:213–25. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1198/073500103288618909>.

Glynn, Carroll J., Andrew F. Hayes, and James Shanahan. 1997. Perceived Support for One's Opinions and Willingness to Speak Out: A Meta-Analysis of Survey Studies on the "Spiral of Silence." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 61:452–63. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2749581>.

- *Gnambs, Timo, and Kai Kaspar. 2015. Disclosure of Sensitive Behaviors across Self-Administered Survey Modes: A Meta-Analysis. *Behavior Research Methods* 47:1237–59. Available at: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.3758/s13428-014-0533-4>.
- *———. 2016. Socially Desirable Responding in Web-Based Questionnaires: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Candor Hypothesis. *Assessment*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.3758/s13428-014-0533-4.
- *Görizt, Anja S. 2006. Incentives in Web Studies: Methodological Issues and a Review. *International Journal of Internet Science* 1:58–70. Available at: http://www.ijis.net/ijis1_1/ijis1_1_goeritz_pre.html.
- Goyder, John C. 1982. Further Evidence on Factors Affecting Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires. *American Sociological Review* 47:550–53. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095199>.
- Groves, Robert M. 1990. Theories and Methods of Telephone Surveys. *Annual Review of Sociology* 16:221–40. Available at: <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.so.16.080190.001253>.
- Groves, Robert M., and Mick P. Couper. 1998. *Nonresponse in Household Interview Surveys*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Groves, Robert M., Floyd J. Fowler Jr, Mick P. Couper, James M. Lepkowski, Eleanor Singer, and Roger Tourangeau. 2009. *Survey Methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- *Groves, Robert M., and Emilia Peytcheva. 2008. The Impact of Nonresponse Rates on Nonresponse Bias: A Meta-Analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72:167–89. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/72/2/167.abstract>.

- Hays, Ron, Honghu Liu, and Arie Kapteyn. 2015. Use of Internet Panels to Conduct Surveys. *Behavior Research Methods* 47:685–90. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.3758/s13428-015-0617-9>.
- Heberlein, Thomas A., and Robert Baumgartner. 1978. Factors Affecting Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires: A Quantitative Analysis of the Published Literature. *American Sociological Review* 43:447–62. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2094771>.
- Hedges, Larry V., and Jack L. Vevea. 1998. Fixed- and Random-Effects Models in Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Methods* 3:486–504. Available at: <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/met/3/4/486/>.
- Hidano, Noboru, and Takaaki Kato. 2008. Determining Variability of Willingness to Pay for Japan's Antiglobal-Warming Policies: A Comparison of Contingent Valuation Surveys. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 9:259–81. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF03354011>.
- Hlebec, Valentina, and Tina Kogovšek. 2012. Different Approaches to Measure Ego-Centered Social Support Networks: A Meta-Analysis. *Quality & Quantity* 47:3435–55. Available at: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11135-012-9731-2>.
- Holden, George W., and Lee A. Edwards. 1989. Parental Attitudes toward Child Rearing: Instruments, Issues, and Implications. *Psychological Bulletin* 106:29–58. Available at: <http://psycnet.apa.org/buy/1989-35220-001>.
- Holleman, Bregje. 1999. Wording Effects in Survey Research Using Meta-Analysis to Explain the Forbid/Allow Asymmetry. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics* 6:29–40. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1076/jqul.6.1.29.4145>.

- *Hopkins, Kenneth D., and Arlen R. Gullickson. 1992. Response Rates in Survey Research: A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Monetary Gratuities. *Journal of Experimental Education* 61:52–62. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20152353>.
- *Hox, Joop J., and Edith D. de Leeuw. 1994. A Comparison of Nonresponse in Mail, Telephone, and Face-to-Face Surveys. *Quality and Quantity* 28:329–44. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01097014>.
- Hox, Joop J., Edith D. de Leeuw, and Hsuan-Tzu Chang. 2012. Nonresponse versus Measurement Error: Are Reluctant Respondents Worth Pursuing? *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique* 113:5–19. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0759106311426987>.
- Ingram, Paul B., and Michael S. Ternes. 2016. The Detection of Content-Based Invalid Responding: A Meta-Analysis of the MMPI-2-Restructured Form's (MMPI-2-RF) over-Reporting Validity Scales. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist* 30:473–96. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13854046.2016.1187769>.
- Ioannidis, Evangelos, Takis Merkouris, Li-Chun Zhang, Martin Karlberg, Michalis Petrakos, Fernando Reis, and Photis Stavropoulos. 2016. On a Modular Approach to the Design of Integrated Social Surveys. *Journal of Official Statistics* 32:259–86. Available at: <https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/jos/32/2/article-p259.xml>.
- Johns, Gary, and Mariella Miraglia. 2015. The Reliability, Validity, and Accuracy of Self-Reported Absenteeism from Work: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 20:1–14. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25181281>.
- Jonge, Tineke, Ruut Veenhoven, and Lidia Arends. 2014. Homogenizing Responses to Different Survey Questions on the Same Topic: Proposal of a Scale Homogenization Method Using a

Reference Distribution. *Social Indicators Research* 117:275–300. Available at:

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-013-0335-6>.

Ju, Teresa L., Yueh-Yang Chen, Szu-Yuan Sun, and Chang-Yao Wu. 2006. Rigor in MIS Survey Research: In Search of Ideal Survey Methodological Attributes. *Journal of Computer Information Systems* 47 (2):112–23. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08874417.2007.11645959>.

Keusch, Florian. 2015. Why Do People Participate in Web Surveys? Applying Survey Participation Theory to Internet Survey Data Collection. *Management Review Quarterly* 65:183–216. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11301-014-0111-y>.

Knäuper, Bärbel, Kimberly Carrière, Melodie Chamandy, Zhen Xu, Norbert Schwarz, and Natalie O. Rosen. 2016. How Aging Affects Self-Reports. *European Journal of Ageing* 13:185–93. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-016-0369-0>.

Knoppen, Desirée, Melek Akin Ateş, Alistair Brandon-Jones, Davide Luzzini, Erik Van Raaij, and Finn Wynstra. 2015. A Comprehensive Assessment of Measurement Equivalence in Operations Management. *International Journal of Production Research* 53:166–82. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00207543.2014.944629>.

*Kormos, Christine, and Robert Gifford. 2014. The Validity of Self-Report Measures of Proenvironmental Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 40:359–71. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272494414000851>.

Krebber, A. M. H., L. M. Buffart, G. Kleijn, I. C. Riepma, R. de Bree, C. R. Leemans, A. Becker, et al. 2014. Prevalence of Depression in Cancer Patients: A Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Interviews and Self-Report Instruments. *Psycho-Oncology* 23:121–30. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/pon.3409>.

- Krosnick, Jon A., and Howard Schuman. 1988. Attitude Intensity, Importance, and Certainty and Susceptibility to Response Effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54:940–52. Available at: <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1988-31432-001>.
- Kunze, Florian, Simon Barend de Jong, and Heike Bruch. 2016. Consequences of Collective-Focused Leadership and Differentiated Individual-Focused Leadership. *Journal of Management* 42:886–914. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0149206313498903>.
- *Lee, Chin-Pang, Yu-Wen Chiu, Chun-Lin Chu, Yu Chen, Kun-Hao Jiang, Jiun-Liang Chen, and Ching-Yen Chen. 2016. A Reliability Generalization Meta-Analysis of Coefficient Alpha and Test-Retest Coefficient for the Aging Males' Symptoms (AMS) Scale. *The Aging Male: The Official Journal Of The International Society For The Study Of The Aging Male* 19:244–53. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13685538.2016.1246525>.
- *Lensvelt-Mulders, Gerty J. L. M., Joop J. Hox, Peter G. M. van der Heuden, and Cora J. M. Maas. 2005. Meta-Analysis of Randomized Response Research Thirty-Five Years of Validation. *Sociological Methods & Research* 33:319–48. Available at: <http://smr.sagepub.com/content/33/3/319>.
- Lowndes, Catherine M., A. Jayachandran, Pradeep Banandur, Banadakoppa Ramesh, Reynold Washington, B. Sangameshwar, Stephen Moses, James Blanchard, and Michel Alary. 2012. Polling Booth Surveys: A Novel Approach for Reducing Social Desirability Bias in HIV-Related Behavioural Surveys in Resource-Poor Settings. *AIDS and Behavior* 16:1054–62. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10461-011-0004-1>.
- *Lozar Manfreda, Katja, Michael Bosnjak, Jernej Berzelak, Iris Haas, and Vasja Vehovar. 2008. Web Surveys versus Other Survey Modes: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Response Rates.

International Journal of Market Research 50: 79–104. Available at: https://www.mrs.org.uk/ijmr_article/article/87205.

Lubinski, David. 2016. From Terman to Today: A Century of Findings on Intellectual Precocity. *Review of Educational Research* 86:900–44. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316675476>.

Mavis, Brian, Margaret Holmes Rovner, Sarah Jorgenson, John Coffey, Nandita Anand, Emi Bulica, Carolyn Marie Gaulden, Jacob Peacock, and Alycia Ernst. 2015. Patient Participation in Clinical Encounters: A Systematic Review to Identify Self-Report Measures. *Health Expectations* 18:1827–43. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/hex.12186>.

*Mavletova, Aigul, and Mick P. Couper. 2015. A Meta-Analysis of Breakoff Rates in Mobile Web Surveys. In *Mobile Research Methods: Opportunities and Challenges of Mobile Research Methodologies*, edited by Daniele Toninelli, Robert Pinter, and Pablo de Pedraza, 81–98. London: Ubiquity Press.

McGonagle, Katherine A., Robert F. Schoeni, and Mick P. Couper. 2013. The Effects of a Between-Wave Incentive Experiment on Contact Update and Production Outcomes in a Panel Study. *Journal of Official Statistics* 29:261–76. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3763831/>.

Mead, Alan D., and Fritz Drasgow. 1993. Equivalence of Computerized and Paper-and-Pencil Cognitive Ability Tests: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 114:449–58. Available at: <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1994-08003-001>.

*Medway, Rebecca L., and Jenna Fulton. 2012. When More Gets You Less: A Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Concurrent Web Options on Mail Survey Response Rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76:733–46. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/76/4/733>.

- *Mercer, Andrew, Andrew Caporaso, David Cantor, and Reanne Townsend. 2015. How Much Gets You How Much? Monetary Incentives and Response Rates in Household Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 79:105–29. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/79/1/105.abstract>.
- *Nakash, Rachel A, Jane L Hutton, Ellen C Jørstad-Stein, Simon Gates, and Sarah E Lamb. 2006. Maximising Response to Postal Questionnaires – A Systematic Review of Randomised Trials in Health Research. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 6 (February):5. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1421421/>.
- Page, Andrew, Stephen Morrell, Clayron Chiu, Richard Taylor, and Richard Tewson. 2006. Recruit to Mammography Screening: A Randomised Trial and Meta-Analysis of Invitation Letters and Telephone Calls. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 30:111–18. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-842X.2006.tb00101.x>.
- *Patrick, Donald L., Allen Cheadle, Diane C. Thompson, Paule Diehr, Thomas Koepsell, and Susan Kinne. 1994. The Validity of Self-Reported Smoking: A Review and Meta-Analysis. *American Journal of Public Health* 84:1086–93. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1614767/>.
- Peeters, Yvette. 2011. Mind the Gap: Explanations for the Differences in Utilities between Respondent Groups. Doctoral Thesis, Leiden, Netherlands: Faculty of Medicine, Leiden University. Available at: <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/17625>.
- *Peeters, Yvette, and Anne M. Stiggelbout. 2010. Health State Valuations of Patients and the General Public Analytically Compared: A Meta-Analytical Comparison of Patient and Population Health State Utilities. *Value in Health* 13:306–9. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1098301510603762>.

- *Perneger, Thomas V., Stephane Cullati, Sandrine Rudaz, Thomas Agoritsas, Ralph E. Schmidt, Christophe Combescure, and Delphine S. Courvoisier. 2014. Effect of Numbering of Return Envelopes on Participation, Explicit Refusals, and Bias: Experiment and Meta-Analysis. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 14 (6): 1–7. Available at: <http://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2288-14-6>.
- Pit, Sabrina Winona, Tham Vo, and Sagun Pyakurel. 2014. The Effectiveness of Recruitment Strategies on General Practitioner’s Survey Response Rates – a Systematic Review. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 14 (June):76. Available at: <https://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2288-14-76>.
- *Pupovac, Vanja, and Daniele Fanelli. 2014. Scientists Admitting to Plagiarism: A Meta-Analysis of Surveys. *Science and Engineering Ethics* 21:1331–52. Available at: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11948-014-9600-6>.
- Rausch, Diana, Arne Dekker, and Martin Rettenberger. 2017. The Construct of Sexual Openness for Females in Steady Intimate Relationships. *PLoS One* 12 (6):e0172274. Available at: <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0172274>.
- *Richman, Wendy L., Sara Kiesler, Suzanne Weisband, and Fritz Drasgow. 1999. A Meta-Analytic Study of Social Desirability Distortion in Computer-Administered Questionnaires, Traditional Questionnaires, and Interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84:754–75. Available at: <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/apl/84/5/754/>.
- Rietbergen, Charlotte, Rolf H. H. Groenwold, Herbert J. A. Hoijtink, Karl G. M. Moons, and Irene Klugkist. 2016. Expert Elicitation of Study Weights for Bayesian Analysis and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 10:168–81. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689814553850>.

- Rogelberg, Steven G., Gwenith G. Fisher, Douglas C. Maynard, Milton D. Hakel, and Michael Horvath. 2001. Attitudes toward Surveys: Development of a Measure and Its Relationship to Respondent Behavior. *Organizational Research Methods* 4:3–25. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/109442810141001>.
- *Rolstad, S, J Adler, and A Ryden. 2011. Response Burden and Questionnaire Length: Is Shorter Better? A Review and Meta-Analysis. *Value in Health* 14:1101–8. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22152180>.
- *Ross, M.E., S. Forbes, and M. Blackburn. 2005. Reliability Generalization of the Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey Goal Orientation Scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 65:451–64. Available at: <http://epm.sagepub.com/content/65/3/451.abstract>.
- Roth, Philip L., and Craig A. BeVier. 1998. Response Rates in HRM/OB Survey Research: Norms and Correlates, 1990-1994. *Journal of Management* 24:97–117. Available at: <http://jom.sagepub.com/content/24/1/97.abstract>.
- Saris, Willem E., and Irmtraud N. Gallhofer. 2007. Estimation of the Effects of Measurement Characteristics on the Quality of Survey Questions. In *Design, Evaluation, and Analysis of Questionnaires for Survey Research*, 237–53. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9780470165195.ch12/summary>.
- Scherpenzeel, Annette C., and Willem E. Saris. 1997. The Validity and Reliability of Survey Questions: A Meta-Analysis of MTMM Studies. *Sociological Methods & Research* 25:341–83. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124197025003004>.
- Scherpenzeel, Annette, and Willem Saris. 1993. The Evaluation of Measurement Instruments By Meta-Analysis of Multitrait-Multimethod Studies. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique* 39:20–44. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/075910639303900102>.

- Schneider, Barbara L. 2009. Method Differences in Measuring Working Families' Time. *Social Indicators Research* 93:105–10. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-008-9410-9>.
- Sheehan, Kim, and Sally McMillan. 1999. Response Variation in E-Mail Surveys: An Exploration. *Journal of Advertising Research* 39 (4):45–54. Available at: <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-01294-005>.
- *Shih, Tse-Hua, and Xitao Fan. 2007. Response Rates and Mode Preferences in Web-Mail Mixed-Mode Surveys : A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Internet Science* 2:59–82. Available at: http://www.ijis.net/ijis2_1/ijis2_1_shih.pdf.
- *———. 2008. Comparing Response Rates from Web and Mail Surveys: A Meta-Analysis. *Field Methods* 20:249–71. Available at: <http://fm.sagepub.com/content/20/3/249>.
- *———. 2009. Comparing Response Rates in E-Mail and Paper Surveys: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Research Review* 4:26–40. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1747938X08000055>.
- Shin, Eunjung, Timothy P. Johnson, and Kumar Rao. 2012. Survey Mode Effects on Data Quality: Comparison of Web and Mail Modes in a U.S. National Panel Survey. *Social Science Computer Review* 30 (2): 212–28. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0894439311404508>.
- Sierra, Jeremy J., Michael R. Hyman, and Robert S. Heiser. 2012. Ethnic Identity in Advertising: A Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Promotion Management* 18:489–513. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10496491.2012.715123>.
- *Singer, Eleanor, John Van Hoewyk, Nancy Gebler, Trivellore Raghunathan, and Katherine McGonagle. 1999. The Effect of Incentives on Response Rates in Interviewer-Mediated

Surveys. *Journal of Official Statistics* 15:217–30. Available at: <http://www.websm.org/db/12/3067/>.

*Singer, Eleanor, Dawn R. von Thurn, and Esther R. Miller. 1995. Confidentiality Assurances and Response: A Quantitative Review of the Experimental Literature. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59:66–77. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/59/1/66.abstract>.

Singer, Eleanor, and Cong Ye. 2013. The Use and Effects of Incentives in Surveys. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645:112–222. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0002716212458082>.

Sixma, Herman J., Peter M. M. Spreeuwenberg, and Marja A. A. van der Pasch. 1998. Patient Satisfaction with the General Practitioner: A Two-Level Analysis. *Medical Care* 36:212–29. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3767183>.

Smith, Shawna N., Stephen D. Fisher, and Anthony Heath. 2011. Opportunities and Challenges in the Expansion of Cross-National Survey Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 14:485–502. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13645579.2011.611386>.

Spector, Paul E., and Michael T. Brannick. 2010. Common Method Issues: An Introduction to the Feature Topic in Organizational Research Methods. *Organizational Research Methods* 13:403–6. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110366303>.

Sulek, Antoni. 2012. Ordinary Poles Look at the Jews. *East European Politics and Societies* 26:425–44. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0888325411415402>.

Tanner, Randy J., Wayne A. Freimund, William T. Borrie, and R. Neil Moisey. 2008. A Meta-Study of the Values of Visitors to Four Protected Areas in the Western United States. *Leisure Sciences* 30:377–90. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400802353026>.

- Thompson, Bruce, and Colleen Cook. 2002. Stability of the Reliability of LibQual+™ Scores a Reliability Generalization Meta-Analysis Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 62:735–43. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164402062004013>.
- Torres van Grinsven, Vanessa, Irena Bolko, and Mojca Bavdaž. 2014. In Search of Motivation for the Business Survey Response Task. *Journal of Official Statistics* 30:579–606. Available at: <https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/jos/30/4/article-p579.xml>.
- Tourangeau, Roger, Mick P. Couper, and Frederick G. Conrad. 2013. “Up Means Good”: The Effect of Screen Position on Evaluative Ratings in Web Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77:69–88. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24634546>.
- *Tourangeau, Roger, and Ting Yan. 2007. Sensitive Questions in Surveys. *Psychological Bulletin* 133: 859–83. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17723033>.
- van der Waerden, Judith E. B., Cees Hoefnagels, and Clemens M. H. Hosman. 2011. Psychosocial Preventive Interventions to Reduce Depressive Symptoms in Low-SES Women at Risk: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 128:10–23. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165032710002752>.
- van der Zouwen, Johannes, and Edith D. de Leeuw. 1990. The Relationship Between Mode of Administration and Quality of Data in Survey Research 1. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique* 29:3–14. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/075910639002900101>.
- *Van Horn, Pamela S., Kathy E. Green, and Monica Martinussen. 2009. Survey Response Rates and Survey Administration in Counseling and Clinical Psychology A Meta-Analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 69: 389–403. Available at: <http://epm.sagepub.com/content/69/3/389>.

- VanGeest, Jonathan B., Timothy P. Johnson, and Verna L. Welch. 2007. Methodologies for Improving Response Rates in Surveys of Physicians: A Systematic Review. *Evaluation & the Health Professions* 30:303–21. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0163278707307899>.
- Vehovar, Vasja, Zenel Batagelj, Katja Lozar Manfreda, and Metka Zaletel. 2002. Nonresponse in Web Surveys. In *Survey Nonresponse*, edited by Robert M. Groves, Don A. Dillman, John L. Eltinge, and Roderick J. A. Little, 229–42. New York: Wiley.
- *Villar, Ana, Mario Callegaro, and Yongwei Yang. 2013. Where Am I? A Meta-Analysis of Experiments on the Effects of Progress Indicators for Web Surveys. *Social Science Computer Review* 31:744–62. Available at: <http://ssc.sagepub.com/content/31/6/744>.
- Viola, Thiago Wendt, Giovanni Abrahão Salum, Bruno Kluwe-Schiavon, Breno Sanvicente-Vieira, Mateus Luz Levandowski, and Rodrigo Grassi-Oliveira. 2016. The Influence of Geographical and Economic Factors in Estimates of Childhood Abuse and Neglect Using the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire: A Worldwide Meta-Regression Analysis. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 51:1–11. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0145213415004433>.
- Viswesvaran, Chockalingam, Murray R. Barrick, and Deniz S. Ones. 1993. How Definitive Are Conclusions Based on Survey Data: Estimating Robustness to Nonresponse. *Personnel Psychology* 46:551–67. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00884.x/abstract>.
- *Voutilainen, Ari, Taina Pitkäaho, Katri Vehviläinen-Julkunen, and Paula R. Sherwood. 2015. Meta-Analysis: Methodological Confounders in Measuring Patient Satisfaction. *Journal of Research in Nursing* 20: 698–714. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1744987115619209>.

- Warren, John Robert, and Andrew Halpern-Manners. 2012. Panel Conditioning in Longitudinal Social Science Surveys. *Sociological Methods & Research* 41:491–534. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0049124112460374>.
- Whitley, Bernard E., Jr. 1988. Sex Differences in Heterosexuals' Attitudes toward Homosexuals: It Depends upon What You Ask. *The Journal of Sex Research* 24:287–91. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00224498809551426>.
- Worley, Jody A., Matt Vassar, Denna L. Wheeler, and Laura L. B. Barnes. 2008. Factor Structure of Scores From the Maslach Burnout Inventory: A Review and Meta-Analysis of 45 Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor-Analytic Studies. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 68:797–823. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0013164408315268>.
- Yamazaki, Michiyo, Kate Dwyer, Mahboob Sobhan, Daniel Davis, Myong-Jin Kim, Lisa Soule, Gerald Willett, and Chongwoo Yu. 2015. Effect of Obesity on the Effectiveness of Hormonal Contraceptives: An Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis. *Contraception* 92:445–52. Available at: [https://www.contraceptionjournal.org/article/S0010-7824\(15\)00508-9/fulltext](https://www.contraceptionjournal.org/article/S0010-7824(15)00508-9/fulltext).
- *Yammarino, Francis J., Steven J. Skinner, and Terry L. Childers. 1991. Understanding Mail Survey Response Behavior a Meta-Analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55:613–39. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/55/4/613>.
- *Yarger, John B., T. A. James, T. Ashikaga, A. J. Hayanga, V. Takyi, Y. Lum, H. Kaiser, and J. Mammen. 2013. Characteristics in Response Rates for Surveys Administered to Surgery Residents. *Surgery* 154:38–45. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23809484>.

Yarnold, Paul R., and Kim T. Mueser. 1989. Meta-Analyses of the Reliability of Type A Behaviour Measures. *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 62:43–50. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.2044-8341.1989.tb02809.x>.

*Ye, Cong, Jenna Fulton, and Roger Tourangeau. 2011. More Positive or More Extreme? A Meta-Analysis of Mode Differences in Response Choice. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75:349–65. Available at: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/75/2/349.short>.